

December 2022

Cultural Profile as Determinant of Work Outcomes in a Collectivist Context

Edward Akoto
Henderson State University, USA

Emmanuel Owusu
AAMUSTED, Ghana

Prince Gyimah
AAMUSTED, Ghana

Augustine Acheampong
AAMUSTED, Ghana

Veronica Adu-Brobbey
AAMUSTED, Ghana

Recommended Citation

Akoto, Edward; Owusu, Emmanuel; Gyimah, Prince; Acheampong, Augustine; and Adu-Brobbey, Veronica (2022) "Cultural Profile as Determinant of Work Outcomes in a Collectivist Context," *Journal of Global Awareness*: Vol. 3: No. 2, Article 7.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24073/jga/3/02/07>

Available at: <https://scholar.stjohns.edu/jga/vol3/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by St. John's Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Global Awareness* by an authorized editor of St. John's Scholar. For more information, please contact karniks@stjohns.edu, fuchsc@stjohns.edu.

Abstract

Extant research evidence shows that interpersonal bonds—the bond to the immediate supervisor and work team—have an incremental predictive effect in western settings, neglecting emerging economic and cultural environments. This study, thus, examines the impact of cultural profiles on interpersonal bonds and related performance in an emerging market context. Specifically, the study examines the emergence of profiles based on micro-level psychological collectivism (individualism) and power distance orientations. The study further examines the effect of the emerged profiles on interpersonal bonds and the performance of activities related to the targets of the bonds. A survey questionnaire was used to collect data from 148 multiple public and private organizations of varied industries (banking, manufacturing, education, and local government) in an emerging market. Using the MANOVA analytic procedure, the study finds that the supervisor-oriented and team-involved profile rather than the team-alienated profile demonstrates a significantly higher level of work outcomes involving interpersonal commitment to the supervisor and substantially higher task performance. The outcome suggests that power distance cultural value may have a negative psychological effect while collectivism has a positive psychological effect on work outcomes in this context. The implication of the outcome for theory and policy in the collectivist context is discussed.

Keywords: Culture, cultural profiles, interpersonal bonds, supervisory commitment, workgroup commitment, performance.

Introduction

The bond or commitment on the job is a vital workplace attitude, and research has long configured multiple commitments on the job, including supervisors and workgroups. The volitional dedication to the immediate supervisor and the workgroup is known as a relational or interpersonal bond because of their interactional influence on the job (Becker, 2009). Although the bond to the interpersonal foci has been postulated for years (Becker, 1992), only recently has the research intensified and demonstrated the important role of interpersonal bonds, including the effect of supervisory and workgroup bonds on outcomes. Industrial psychology research has shown that attitudes toward proximal targets on the job,

such as supervisors and workgroups, predict outcomes (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002; Marique & Stinglhamber, 2011). Extant research suggests that commitment to the immediate supervisor is strongly related to employee performance and may have incremental value in predicting performance over and above the effect of other bonds on the job (Becker & Kernan, 2003; Chen et al., 2002; Siders, George, & Dharwadkar, 2001; Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Panaccio, 2014).

The research stream suggests that focusing on the proximal foci of commitment, such as interpersonal bonds, may better predict outcomes. However, most of the research has focused on samples from western individualistic settings, with only limited studies from emerging economic and cultural contexts. Also, most studies have employed the variable-centered approach. The question, therefore, is whether the interpersonal bond has a similar effect on outcomes among samples of varied cultural profiles. This study aims to examine the effect of cultural profiles on interpersonal bonds and related performance. The study examines the association of the cultural profiles with supervisor and workgroup interpersonal bonds and the effect on performance relevant to the commitment targets. The study is relevant to the emerging context of Ghana, a collectivist and high power distance setting (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004), where interpersonal bonds have cultural relevance. Therefore, this study informs practitioners of the essential precursors of the different interpersonal bonds and which cultural profiles are likely to exhibit relevant performance outcomes.

This paper contributes to the commitment literature in two ways; by examining how the cultural-based profiles affect the bond to the interpersonal foci (supervisory and team), and the eventual effect on performance. A recent study of cultural profiles in a western setting revealed four cultural profiles and found that non-dominant profiles significantly reported higher team orientation and contributions to the team (Akoto & Taras, in-press). This study replicates and extends this research stream by examining the emergence of these profiles and their effect on outcomes. Cultural values have been shown to affect commitment (Clugston et al., 2000; Jackson, Meyer, & Wang, 2013), and this study extends this knowledge to interpersonal bonds. Also, focusing on varied organizations in a collectivist setting in deriving the profiles provides a comparative test of the profile emergence and their effect on the interpersonal bonds and performance outcomes in a different cultural setting. This study should inform human resources and general managers on the combined

impact of cultural orientations on bonds and performance, hence, the performance management process in multinational enterprises (MNEs).

Theoretical Background

Commitment bond. There are various conceptualizations of commitment, but the concept of perceived bond is adopted for this study since it is not confounded by antecedents (Klein, Molloy, & Cooper, 2009). Consequently, commitment or bond to the interpersonal foci is defined as the volitional psychological bond reflecting the dedication to and responsibility for the interpersonal target; hence, high emotional involvement and embracement of the bond (Klein et al., 2012). The focus on the commitment bond is because it is most likely to apply to most targets and contexts, including cross-cultural settings, although Klein et al. (2012) have postulated different kinds of bonds.

Performance. In this paper, performance is viewed as behaviors that contribute directly or indirectly to the achievement of organizational goals. We focus on the multi-dimensional view of performance involving in-role (task) and extra-role (citizenship) performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Extra-role or citizenship, a discretionary act, refers to behaviors not specified in the goal or responsibility statement. In contrast, in-role behavior is specified a priori in goals. Although citizenship may not be directly linked to the performance management system, it has been noted to be beneficial to the performance management process (Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999).

Interpersonal bonds on performance. Among the interpersonal bonds in the organization, we focus on the supervisor and the workgroup. Technically, teams and groups are different as groups may be loosely knitted, but we focus on workgroups since they are formally sanctioned by the organization and the literature applied to both. The effect of interpersonal bonds (commitment to supervisor and workgroup) on performance has been well documented in western settings. One of the seminal works on supervisory commitment was by Becker (1992), who reported that supervisor commitment was an important determinant of citizenship. Other studies following these earlier studies have supported the primacy of supervisory commitment in affecting performance (Becker & Kernan, 2003; Redman & Snape, 2005; Siders et al., 2001). A recent longitudinal study revealed that organizational commitment preceded supervisory commitment in

predicting turnover (Vandenberghe et al., 2014). Though not focused on performance, the study outcome suggests that commitment to the supervisor may carry the effect of organizational commitment on outcomes.

Research on teams and groups shows that workgroup or team commitment benefits the organization, including increased task performance and extra-role behaviors (Bishop, Scott & Burroughs, 2000; Becker, 1992; Becker & Billings, 1993). Bishop et al. (2000) found that work-team commitment positively relates to task performance and citizenship behavior. One recent meta-analysis revealed that workgroup commitment strongly predicts outcomes, including performance (Ricketta & Van Dick, 2005). Though limited, these studies on teams and groups also show the important role of this interpersonal bond when predicting performance. Together, these studies on supervisors and workgroups suggest a stronger association involving interpersonal bonds and performance. Thus, the question being addressed in this study is whether interpersonal bonds associate with certain cultural profiles and how these influence performances on the job in a collectivist context.

Conceptual Analysis and Hypotheses

According to Klein et al. (2012), the commitment bond is associated with a high level of concern for the target, greater psychological investment in the target, and target-associated tasks. Thus, the operationalization of the commitment bond in this study has two important implications; first, the volitional nature of the bond and the felt responsibility for the target would lead to the personalization of the values of the target; and second, the willingness to undertake both prescribed and non-prescribed activities on behalf of the target. The internalization of the target's values (performance goals) is essential for behavioral effectiveness and should increase performance quality.

In the employee-organization relationship, the organization may be represented by multiple entities, most importantly the supervisor, as well as the workgroup in the performance management process. Supervisory and workgroup bonds are defined as the volitional dedication and responsibility to the supervisor or workgroup. The bond to each entity determines how close employees are related to and feel responsible for each target. The interpersonal foci in the organization are more proximal to employees in the performance of their jobs, and the entities of the

employee attachment may be representatives of the organization in enforcing policies and programs of the organization geared toward achieving performance goals (Chen et al., 2002). In the organizational performance management system, supervisors and workgroups are relevant and highly influential in setting performance goals and standards, evaluating performance, and giving feedback—the monitoring and supervision functions (Becker et al., 1996). These include ensuring harmony on the job, providing help when others are struggling, sharing job-relevant information, etc. Given the influential role of the interpersonal foci, employees' dedication to these bond targets should have a greater influence on employee behavior. 'Employees' volitional dedication and responsibility to the interpersonal bond targets should intensify their psychological involvement with the targets. The high psychological involvement will lead to the internalization of the targets' values, including the targets' goals or interests. Goals that signify future values will fuel 'employees' actions on the job. Such goals established by the interpersonal targets are proximal, task-specific, and performance-focused leading to informational power. Hence, internalizing such goals provides the internal force (the motivation) that engenders actions on the job. Thus, the positive perception and responsibility to the targets have a greater chance of influencing behaviors on the job by arousing the motivation for action (Akoto & Akoto, 2019).

Culture and interpersonal bonds. Individualism and its polar opposite of collectivism are among the most important cultural factors shown to affect job attitudes, including commitments (Wasti & Onder, 2009). The two cultural factors are employed in this study because they are highly correlated at the country level (Hofstede, 2001). Thus, most high-PD countries tend to be collectivist at the macro level. Cross-cultural research has drawn on the Hofstede framework to explicate the effect of culture on commitment on the job, arguing that individualists /collectivists will be important in pursuing individual versus group priorities on the job.

In individualistic cultures, social behavior and attitudes are guided by personal needs and rights, favoring contractual relationships based predominantly on economic exchanges—transactional (Triandis, 1995; Wasti & Onder, 2009). In contrast, collectivists' social behavior and attitudes are in keeping with the norms of the social group (or the in-group) and the obligations and duties that ensure social harmony in the group—high relational obligation. Thus, personal interest is affected by the social group/in-group interest. Individualistic cultures stress

autonomy and the feeling of merit and self-worth, fostering a stronger bond with the supervisor than with the workgroup. But in collectivist cultures, the stress on the group interest will foster a strong bond to the workgroup or team but not necessarily the supervisor. As collectivists internalize the goals of the workgroup, this will lead to performance towards the team. On the other hand, individualists will internalize the supervisor's goals, leading to higher performance towards the supervisor.

Another cultural factor of significance to attitudes on the job is power distance, the degree to which inequality in status is accepted in society. In cultures with high power distance, there is a strong adherence to authority and the acceptance and dependency on authority, while low power distance cultures are associated with an egalitarian relationship (Hofstede, 2001; Jackson et al., 2013). In high power distance cultures, adherence to authority will engender compliance and probably increase the demand for loyalty, hence, the bond to the supervisor. However, this transactional bond may not engender greater performance than the bond to the workgroup, especially when the culture is also collectivist. In low power distance cultures, the perceived unrestricted relationship with the supervisor will lead to a strong bond with the supervisor and the performance of goals relevant to the supervisor. Table 1 reports the possible profile combinations based on the two cultural components.

Table 1

Proposed Cultural Profiles and their Prevalence

Dimensions of Culture	Psychological Collectivism (<i>Emotional dependence on groups, we consciousness</i>)	Psychological Individualism (<i>Emotional independence from groups, I consciousness</i>)
Perceived high power distance (<i>emotional dependence on more powerful</i>) <i>-belief in the more powerful, inequality in power</i>	1 COL/HPD Profile (Dominant)	2 IND/HPD Profile (Highly Likely)
Perceived low power distance (<i>emotional independence from the powerful</i>) <i>-belief in shared leadership, equality of power</i>	3 COL/LPD Profile (Highly Likely)	4 IND/LPD Profile (Less Likely)

Note: Adapted from Akoto & Taras (in-press)

The prevalence of the four profile combinations is theorized in Table 1, following the prevailing cultural literature showing Ghana as a collectivist and high-power distance cultural setting (e.g., Hofstede, 2001). Based on this evidence, we postulate that the profile in quadrant 1 (collectivist-high power distance) is likely to be prevalent in the emerging Ghanaian context, but the profile in quadrant four will be highly unlikely. The cross-cultural literature indicates that sub-cultures exist within the broad national values (Cooper et al., 2020; Richter et al., 2016; Jackson et al., 2006; Venaik & Midgley, 2015; Akoto & Taras, *in-press*). Recent research on micro-level cultural profiles using a multi-cultural sample of students revealed that sub-cultural orientations could be prevalent in culturally dominant societies (Akoto & Taras, *in-press*). Therefore, we expect the profiles in the second (individualistic-high-power distance) and the third (collectivist-low-power distance) quadrants to be plausible in the emerging Ghanaian setting, though not the dominant value profiles. The following are hypothesized based on this discussion.

H1: The collectivist and high-power distance profile represents a dominant and prevalent profile in the Ghanaian emerging economic context.

H2: The collectivist-low-power distance and individualistic-high-power distance represent sub-cultural profiles in the Ghanaian emerging economic context.

Reported in Table 2 are the profile combinations and the associated interpersonal bonds with implications for performance. The profile derivation based on the collectivist and power distance cultural orientations suggests that a strong bond will characterize the collectivists and the high-power distance profile to the supervisor and the workgroup. The bond to these targets will lead to the high performance of activities on the job. Commitment research has shown that interpersonal bonds have greater predictive power in affecting performance (Akoto & Akoto, 2019; Akoto et al., 2020; Becker & Kernan, 2003; Chen et al., 2002; Siders et al., 2001; Vandenberghe et al., 2014), and the bonds to the supervisor and team targets will generate the performance of activities relevant to these targets. The individualistic and low power distance profile, which is less likely in Ghana, will demonstrate a moderate bond to the supervisor but a weak bond to the team with associated performance. Although this profile is characterized by low power distance orientation, loyalty to the leader or supervisor is expected in this setting. Therefore, those with LPD orientations may still demonstrate a moderate bond to the supervisor. However, the same kind of loyalty will not be accorded to the workgroup as the power of the group is limited or dispersed.

Research on culture at the psychological level suggests that the perception of culture in western and non-western settings is not monolithic. Therefore, sub-cultures exist within the broad national cultural classifications (Jackson et al., 2004; Akoto & Taras, in-press). Hence, the sub-cultural combination of individualistic and high-power distance profiles will be characterized by a strong bond to the supervisor and a weak bond to the workgroup, with the associated performance, respectively, including both prescribed and non-prescribed activities relevant to the target. Likewise, the collectivist and low power distance profile will associate with a strong bond to the workgroup and a moderate bond to the supervisor, as well as the performance of both prescribed and non-prescribed activities relevant to the targets. The following are hypothesized:

H3: Profiles with collectivist and high-power distance values will be characterized by a strong bond to the supervisor and workgroup and the performance of prescribed and non-prescribed activities relevant to both targets.

H4: Profiles with individualistic and high-power distance values will be characterized by a high bond to the supervisor and a weak bond to the team and the performance of non-prescribed activities relevant to the supervisor.

H5: Profiles with collectivist and low-power distance values will be characterized by a high bond to the workgroup and a weak bond to the supervisor and the performance of both prescribed tasks and workgroup-related non-prescribed activities.

H6: Profiles with individualistic and low-power distance values will be characterized by a weak bond to the supervisor and workgroup and low performance of prescribed tasks and non-prescribed activities.

Table 2

Profiles and Associated Commitment and Performance Outcomes

<p><i>COL/HPD Profile</i></p> <p>-Strong bond to the supervisor</p> <p>-Strong bond to the workgroup</p> <p>-Performance of assigned tasks and 'targets' related activities</p> <p><i>Supervisor-oriented, group-involved profile</i></p>	<p><i>IND/HPD Profile</i></p> <p>-Strong bond to supervisor</p> <p>- Weak bond to the workgroup</p> <p>-Performance of assigned tasks and supervisor-related activities</p> <p><i>Supervisor-oriented, group-alienated profile</i></p>
<p><i>COL/LPD Profile</i></p> <p>-Strong bond to the workgroup</p> <p>-Moderate bond to supervisor</p> <p>-Performance of assigned tasks and workgroup-related activities</p> <p><i>Group-oriented, supervisor-alienated profile</i></p>	<p><i>IND/LPD Profile</i></p> <p>-Moderate bond to supervisor</p> <p>-Weak bond to the workgroup</p> <p>-Performance of assigned tasks but not related activities</p> <p><i>Supervisor- and group-alienated profile</i></p>

Method

Participants and Procedure

Data was collected from various industries and public and private organizations (banking, manufacturing, education, and local government) in Ghana. With each participating organization's help, the data is sourced from employees through onsite administration. The researchers delivered the questionnaires to employees on the job and were given one week to complete the survey at their own leisure and return the surveys to their supervisors for collection by the researchers. The data collection was part of a comprehensive project on work attitudes between June and August 2021.

Measures

Interpersonal bonds. Supervisory commitment (SC) and workgroup commitment (WGC) were measured with the unidimensional target-free (KUT) measure of commitment bond by Klein et al. (2012). The phrasing of the items was interchanged with the supervisor or the workgroup to reflect each target. It was employed using a 5-point Likert scale of extremely committed (5) to not at all committed (1).

Cultural beliefs. Collectivism (individualism) and power distance cultural orientations were measured at the individual level with items developed by Yoo et al. (2011). All items were measured with a response option of 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Collectivism (CO) was measured with four items; a high score indicates collectivism, and a low score indicates individualism ("*Individuals should give up their personal goals to serve the interests of the group,*" "*Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer,*" "*Group success is more important than individual success,*" "*Group welfare is more important than individual reward*"). Power distance (PD) was also measured using five items, with a high score indicating high-power distance ("*Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates,*" "*Workers should not show disagreement with management decisions,*" "*In work-related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates,*" "*Workers should obey their managers without question*").

Performance. *Task performance* was measured with five items developed by William and Anderson (1991) and used recently by Rich et al. (2010). Task performance questions were prefixed with the stem: To what extent have you effectively fulfilled these job responsibilities with response choices ranging from (1) Never to (5) Always. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) was measured with six items adapted from the OCBI measure by Lee and Allen (2002) and used by Rich et al. (2010). *Supervisory citizenship behavior* (SCB) was measured with five items from the measure by Rupp and Cropanzano (2002), designed so that the supervisor was the beneficiary of the citizenship behavior (e.g., “Helps you when you have a heavy workload,” “Assists you with your work when not asked”). *Team citizenship behavior* (TCB) was also measured with the five items with the stem changed to reflect the team. The citizenship measures were prefixed with the stem “To what extent have you been performing extra-role activities beyond your normal duties that help your organization, supervisor or workgroup respectively.”

Analytical strategy. The measures were examined for construct validity via exploratory factor analysis, which was necessary to ensure the proper operationalization of the constructs in this setting. Following literature (Sinclair et al., 2005; Somers, 2009) and prior studies in Ghana (e.g., Akoto, 2018), the *k*-means cluster analytic procedure was used. The emerged clusters were examined using MANOVA to compare profile mean scores on the interpersonal bonds and the performance outcomes.

Results

Factor Analysis

The multi-dimensional and conceptually related constructs were subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to test the adequacy of the data. These include the commitment constructs, the culture constructs, and the outcomes. Principal component analysis using direct-Oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalization was used. The two factors that emerged for the commitment constructs (SC, WC) explained 68.7% of the total variance. The item factor loadings for both factors range from 0.65 to 0.88. For the cultural constructs, the two factors also emerged (PD, CO), explaining 61.9% of the total variance, after one item for collectivism was dropped for a low communality score (.28). The factor loadings for the two factors range from 0.50 to 0.85. For the outcome variables, a three-factor structure

emerged, explaining 55.9% of the total variance. The data fit was achieved after dropping one item each from task performance and OCB. The items for SCB and TCB were highly correlated and suffered from cross-loading; hence, they were combined to form interpersonal citizenship behavior (ICB). Therefore, this factor was formed with seven items after dropping three (2 SCB and 1TCB) with low corrected inter-item correlation and poor factor loadings. The ICB item loadings range from 0.42 to 0.76 (Table 3), with a corrected item-total correlation ranging from 0.35 to 0.52 and internal consistency reliability of 0.76.

Table 3

Items and their Loadings on the Interpersonal Citizenship Construct

Items	Loadings
Take a personal interest in the job activities of your workgroup	.764
Assist your workgroup with work activities when not asked	.689
Take a personal interest in the work of your supervisor	.683
Assist your supervisor with his/her work when not asked	.635
Pass along work-related information to your supervisor	.628
Pass along work-related information to your workgroup	.600
Help your workgroup when there is a heavy workload in your department	.426

Descriptive Statistics

Reported in Table 4 are the means, correlations, and reliability coefficients of the study constructs. The alpha coefficients reported in the diagonal range from 0.71 to 0.86, showing that all the study constructs demonstrate high internal consistency reliability. The means scores show that commitments to the interpersonal foci (supervisor, workgroup) are high, as expected in this setting. Similarly, the mean score for the outcome variables is high except for the ICB, which is only moderately

high. On the cultural variables, collectivism is high, in line with our expectations. However, the mean score for power distance shows unexpected outcomes; the mean (0.219) is low and is significantly below the scale mid-point (2.5, $t = 3.47$, $p < 0.001$). This outcome contrasts the generalized national frame of cultural values in this emerging market context. Thus, this sample may be an outlier or a sub-culture within the broad national frame. On correlations, the commitment constructs correlated positively with most constructs except power distance. Power distance did not significantly correlate with any study construct. However, collectivism correlated positively with the commitment and performance constructs, suggesting its relevance in this context.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Workgroup commitment (WC)	4.45	0.57	.86							
2. Supervisory commitment (SC)	4.55	0.64	0.54**	.86						
3. Power distance (PD)	2.19	1.05	-0.01	0.10	.82					
4. Collectivism (COL)	4.16	1.14	0.22**	0.21*	0.05	.81				
5. Task performance	4.47	0.50	0.35**	0.19*	-0.11	0.25**	.71			
6. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)	4.19	0.64	0.31**	0.22**	0.09	0.14	0.34**	.72		
7. Interpersonal citizenship behavior (ICB)	3.97	0.63	0.29**	0.26**	-0.08	0.19*	0.34**	0.30**	.76	

Significance level: * p-value < .05; ** p-value < .01

Profile Analysis

Reported in Table 5 are the cultural cluster outcomes comparing five, four, and three cluster outcomes. The k-means cluster analytic algorithm was used, which groups cases to maximize similarity within clusters and dissimilarity among cluster centers. The median scores for the two cultural constructs, collectivism (4.2) and power distance (2.0), were used as the cut-off point to judge whether a score was high or low. The four cluster-solution was deemed more acceptable, showing clear, distinct profiles with no overlaps. The comparative five-cluster solution had overlapping profiles – two individualist/low power distance (L-PD) profiles– and was rejected. Although the three-cluster is equally tenable, the four-cluster solution has an additional valid cluster and provides more information, aligns with prior theory and research (Akoto & Taras, *in press*), and was accepted as the best fit for the data.

Table 5

Comparison of Five-, Four- and Three-Cluster Outcomes

Cluster Solution	Profile	Collectivism	Power Distance	n
Five cluster solution	Collectivist /HPD	4.86	4.50	14
	Collectivist /LPD	5.37	1.78	45
	Individualist /LPD	1.74	2.22	19
	Individualist /LPD	3.96	1.60	42
	Individualist /HPD	3.49	2.89	28
Four cluster solution	Collectivist /HPD	5.04	4.08	20
	Collectivist /LPD	5.02	1.61	27
	Individualist /LPD	2.90	1.67	60
	Individualist /HPD	3.53	2.87	41
Three cluster solution	Collectivist /HPD	4.86	3.92	25
	Collectivist /LPD	5.04	1.61	59
	Individualist /HPD	3.08	2.05	64

Notes: HPD = high-power distance; LPD = low-power distance

Out of the total sample (n = 135), the cluster group comprising the collectivist and high-power distance culture (COL/HPD) cluster recorded a sub-group membership of 20. This does not support Hypothesis one, as the supervisor-oriented and team-

involved cluster is not the dominant profile of the membership. The membership of the remaining cluster groups, collectivist and low-power distance (COL/LPD), individualistic and low-power distance (IDV/LPD), and individualistic and high-power distance (IDV/HPD), are 27, 60, and 41, respectively. Also, contrary to our hypothesized effect, the dominant profile by membership is the individualistic-low-power distance profile. Similarly, the individualistic-high-power distance profile is not a sub-cultural group as expected but rather a major group among the sample.

Profiles on interpersonal bonds and performance outcomes. The mean differences among the four-cluster profiles on interpersonal commitments and performance outcomes were examined in a MANOVA analytic procedure. The estimated probability plots suggest that the data satisfy the normality and linearity assumption, and 'Levene's test shows equality in error variances for the outcome variables (all $p > .05$). Also, Box's plots show homogeneity of covariance matrices across clusters groups (F-test = 1.35, $p = .06$). Thus, the model for the study is robust since the observed covariance matrices of the variables are equal across groups.

The MANOVA outcome reported in Table 6 shows that the cluster group has a significant multivariate effect (Wilks' Lambda = .811; $F = 1.843$, $p = .028$) on supervisory commitment ($p < 0.05$), interpersonal citizenship ($p < 0.05$), and task performance ($p < 0.05$). However, the follow-up ANOVAs with Tukey *post hoc* multiple comparison tests supported the profile effect on supervisory commitment and task performance. The outcome shows that the supervisor-oriented and team-involved cluster (COL/HPD) demonstrates a significantly higher level of interpersonal commitment to the supervisor than the supervisor-oriented and team-alienated profile (IDV/HPD). This outcome partially supports hypothesis 3, which states that a strong bond to the supervisor and workgroup will characterize the collectivist and high-power distance cluster and the performance of acts related to these targets. Also, the team-oriented and supervisor-alienated cluster (COL/LPD) exhibits a significantly higher level of performance of task responsibilities than the supervisor-oriented and team-alienated profile (IDV/HPD). This outcome also partially supports hypothesis 5, which states that the collectivist/low power distance cluster will be characterized by a high bond to the workgroup but not the supervisor. However, hypotheses 4 and 6 are not supported. These outcomes suggest that power distance cultural orientation seems to have a negative psychological effect in this study context, while collectivism positively impacts the outcomes.

Table 6

MANOVA Outcome of Cultural Profiles on Commitment and Performance

	Cluster 1 <i>(COL/HPD)</i>	Cluster 2 <i>(IDV/HPD)</i>	Cluster 3 <i>(COL/LPD)</i>	Cluster 4 <i>(IDV/LPD)</i>	Post-Hoc Tests
Workgroup commitment (WGC) F (3, 131) = 2.00 ^{ns} Partial η^2 = .044	4.5789 (.43343)	4.2292 (.58475)	4.5231 (.59730)	4.3882 (.55354)	ns
Supervisory commitment (SC) F (3, 131) = 3.198* Partial η^2 = .068	4.8816 (.38522)	4.3750 (.56626)	4.5972 (.59561)	4.5132 (.54509)	1 > 2*
Interpersonal citizenship (ICB) F (3, 131) = 2.885* Partial η^2 = .062	4.0902 (.60085)	3.6310 (.66995)	4.0344 (.63582)	3.9812 (.53778)	ns
Organizational citizenship (OCB) F (3, 131) = 3.33* Partial η^2 = .027	4.4105 (.66824)	4.0833 (.55924)	4.1481 (.70490)	4.0842 (.63863)	ns
Task performance F (3, 135) = 4.498** Partial η^2 = .093	4.5000 (.47140)	4.1771 (.58272)	4.6157 (.43359)	4.4671 (.50394)	3 > 2*

N = 235 *p < .05, **p < .01

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the effect of cultural profiles on interpersonal bonds and related performance. Specifically, the study examines the emergence of profiles based on the individual level of psychological collectivism/individualism and power distance. The study further examined the effect of the emerged profiles on interpersonal bonds to the supervisor and the work group and the performance of activities relevant to the targets of the bond.

The results revealed four cultural profiles as expected; however, the high collectivist-high power distance profile was not dominant in this collectivist context. This outcome is not entirely unexpected since research has shown that the collectivist and power distance cultural orientations ascribed to this context are based on average national values. Hence, sub-cultural values exist within the national frame, as is the case here. Rather, the collectivist-low-power distance profile is the dominant profile based on membership. While the collectivist values may be desirable for this profile, the high-power orientation may not be in this context. Also, the individualistic-high power distance profile was the next dominant profile by the membership. These findings support the arguments for unearthing and understanding the sub-cultural orientations within the broad national culture frame. Our theorization that the individualistic-high power distance profile is characterized by a high bond to the supervisor and a weak bond to the workgroup and that the individualistic-low power distance profile is characterized by a weak bond to the supervisor and workgroup was not supported. Rather, the collectivist-low power distance profile demonstrates higher task performance than the individualistic-high power distance profiles. These outcomes suggest that the power distance value seems to have a negative psychological effect in this study context, while collectivism positively impacts the outcomes.

Theoretical implications. This study makes two contributions to this research stream. First, theoretically, the hypothesized four cultural clusters emerged as the most plausible cluster when compared with others. Thus, the outcome with regard to the profile emergence aligns with recent research on cultural profiles (Akoto & Taras, *in press*) that demonstrates that taking the profile approach to the study of the effect of culture on work outcomes yields additional valuable information. However, the finding regarding the prevalence of the profiles was not in line with our hypothesized effect and contradicted the assertion and the body of knowledge

on cross-cultural research, including some macro-level seminal work on the subject which has documented, for instance, the collectivism and high power distance are prominent in the non-western settings based on the variable-centered research approach (e.g., Hofstede, 2001). The prevalence of profiles with non-dominant cultural values at the micro-level adds to the current knowledge. This aligns with findings by Akoto and Taras (*in press*), who examined micro-level cultural profiles on teams and reported the prevalence of profiles with non-dominant cultural values among a multi-country (multi-cultural) sample. Our study, therefore, extends the literature on cultural profiles with a single country (mono-cultural) sample from an emerging economic setting. These outcomes could be due to generational differences, as research has shown cultural differences between younger and older generations (Tung, Worm, and Fang, 2008). These outcomes affirm the importance of sub-cultures within the broad national frame.

The second contribution of this study regards the effect of the profiles on commitment and performance outcomes. The two but distinct profile impacts are that the collectivist high-power distance profile, though not prevalent, reports a higher interpersonal bond to the supervisor suggesting the importance of interpersonal influences are important in this setting, especially among those with a high collectivist orientation, while the collectivist low-power distance exhibit a significantly higher-level performance of task responsibilities. The collectivist value, though not prevalent in this sample, is relevant in the two key outcomes of this study, but the power distance value seems to have a negating moderated influence on the outcomes. While power distance is instrumental to interpersonal relations with the supervisor, its cohesive nature does not automatically lead to relevant outcomes; and may be detrimental to the performance of assigned responsibilities. Rather, the collectivist value in a weak power distance context predicts the performance outcome.

Practical implications. This study offers important implications for employee selection and performance management within organizations. Organizational leaders or managers could benefit by understanding how the different subsets of cultural profiles could shape the development of a committed and high-performance workforce. Although previous studies (e.g., Clugston et al., 2000) examining the effect of culture on organizational commitment and performance have argued that the ability of managers to influence the commitment and performance of employees may be limited, our results, however, suggest that

profiles with a combination of collectivist cultural values are more likely to show high levels of interpersonal commitment and performance. Assessing the effect of cultural values at individual/psychological levels and through profiling allows a holistic view of ‘employees’ values on outcomes and informs practitioners. Focusing on profiles that have the greatest predictive influence on work outcomes will be beneficial to organizations. Managers may also benefit from paying special attention to individuals with sub-cultural profiles during the employee selection process. Measuring ‘applicants’ collectivist orientation during the selection process may assist managers in identifying employees who have the greatest likelihood of developing commitment given certain workplace characteristics.

Limitations and implications for further research. This study certainly is not without limitations that are addressed to provide a context for interpreting results, which is the overall small sample size reflected in the profile sizes. The ratio of the smallest profile group by membership is three times the membership of the largest profile group. Although the variance of the groups was equal (via the Levine test), the small group membership could have potentially impacted the power of the MANOVA analysis; hence, only two significant effects were observed.

Future research may replicate this study for two reasons. The prevalent profiles in this study were those with non-dominant cultural values. These profiles, therefore, exhibit sub-cultural values; hence, further study is warranted to validate the finding in this context. It has been noted that profile membership can be stable over time (Kam *et al.*, 2013); hence, future studies may also examine the temporal stability of the emerged profile as this will provide validated knowledge for the applicability of the theory for practice. The non-significant differences among profiles in most outcomes are another reason for further study. Thus, future research with larger samples will also provide enough power to test the effect of profiles on interpersonal bonds and performance outcomes.

Conclusion. The limitations notwithstanding, the limited significant outcomes provide further evidence of the usefulness of the person-centered approach to the study of culture and the applicability of cultural profiles at the micro-level. This is the first step toward testing the profile approach and its generalizability to the emerging economic setting of Ghana. The outcome suggests that profiles of non-dominant cultural values are plausible, supporting the argument for sub-cultures within the national cultural frame. However, profiles of the dominant cultural

values were the most predictive of the task outcome. Researchers interested in examining the effect of culture on work outcomes in Ghana or other African contexts may employ the profile approach.

References

- Akoto, E. O., & Akoto, E. V. (2019). Why interpersonal bonds may supersede organizational commitment on performance: An integrative motivational view. *International Journal of Applied Management Science*, 11(3), 210-223. <https://doi.org>
- Akoto, E. O., & Taras, V (in press). Micro-level cultural profiles on teamwork orientation and contribution. *European Journal International Management*. <https://www.inderscience.com>
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 232-244. <https://psycnet.apa.org>
- Becker, T. E. (2009). *Interpersonal commitments*. In H. J. Klein, T. E. Becker, & J. P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions* (pp. 137-78). New York, NY: Routledge. <https://doi.org>
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org>
- Becker, T. E., & Kernan, M. C. (2003). Matching commitment to supervisors and organizations to focal and extra-role performance. *Human Performance*, 16, 327-348. <https://doi.org>
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. W. (1996). Foci and bases of commitment: Implications for performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 464-482. <https://www.scirp.org>
- Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., & Burroughs, S. M. (2000). Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management*, 26(6), 1113-1132. <https://doi.org>

- Chen Z. X, Tsui A. S., & Farh J. L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment; Relationship to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 339-56. <https://doi.org>
- Clugston, M., Howell, J.P., & Dorfman, P.W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management*, 26, 1–30. <https://doi.org>
- Cooper, J.T., Stanley, L.J., Stevens, C.E., Shenkar, O. and Kausch, C. (2020). Switching analytical mindsets: a person-centered approach to the analysis of cultural values, *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 20(2), 223–247. <https://doi.org>
- Fang, T., Worm, V., & Tung, R. L. (2008). Changing success and failure factors in business negotiations with the PRC. *International Business Review*, 17(2), 159-169. <https://doi.org>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultural consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (n.d). The 6-D model of national culture. Accessed on June 30th, 2021 at: <https://geerthofstede.com>
- House, R.I., Hanges, P.I., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.I., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The globe study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Jackson, C. L., Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: A measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 884–899. <https://doi.org>
- Jackson, T.A., Meyer, J. P., & Wang, X-H. (2013). Leadership, Commitment, and Culture: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 20(1) 84–106. <https://doi.org>
- Klein, H. J., Molloy, J. C., & Brinsfield, C. T. (2012). Reconceptualizing workplace commitment to redress a stretched construct: Revisiting assumptions and

- removing confounds. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 130-151. <https://doi.org>
- Klein, H.J., Molloy, J.C., & Cooper, J.T. (2009). Conceptual foundations: Construct definition and theoretical representations of workplace commitments. In H.J. Klein, T.E. Becker, & J.P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions* (pp. 3–36). New York, NY: Routledge. <https://doi.org>
- Marique, G., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). Identification of proximal targets and affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 10(3), 107-117. <https://doi.org>
- Redman, T., & Snape, E. (2005). Unpacking commitment: multiple loyalties and employee behavior. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 301-328. <https://doi.org>
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. <https://doi.org>
- Richter, N.F., Hauff, S., Schlägel, C., Gudergan, S.P., Ringle, C.M. and Gunkel, M. (2016). Using cultural archetypes in cross-cultural management studies. *Journal of International Management*, 22(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org>
- Riketta, M., & Van Dick, R. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(3), 490-510. <https://doi.org>
- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 925-946. <https://doi.org>
- Siders, M. A., George, G., & Dharwadkar, R. (2001). The relationship of internal and external commitment foci to objective job performance measures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 570-579. <https://psycnet.apa.org>

- Sinclair, R. R., Tucker, J., Cullen, J., & Wright, C. (2005). Performance differences among four organizational commitment profiles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1280-1287. <https://doi.org>
- Somers, M. J. (2009). The combined influence of affective, continuance, and normative commitment on employee withdrawal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 75-81. <https://doi.org>
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview. <https://doi.org>
- Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., & Panaccio, A. (2014). Affective commitment to organizations and supervisors and turnover: A role theory perspective. *Journal of Management*, 43(7), 2090-2117. <https://doi.org>
- Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., & Stinglhamber, F. (2004). Affective commitment to the organization, supervisor, and workgroup: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64: 47-71. <https://doi.org>
- Venaik, S. and Midgley, D.F. (2015). Mindscapes across landscapes: archetypes of transnational and subnational culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(9),1051–1079. <https://doi.org>
- Wasti, S. A., & Önder, Ç. (2012). Commitment across cultures: Progress, pitfalls, and propositions. In *Commitment in organizations*, Routledge, 326-360. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com>
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617. <https://doi.org>
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(3-4), 193-210. <https://www.researchgate.net>