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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual level</th>
<th>Group/organization level</th>
<th>Country level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture as a main effect</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture as a moderator</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Often single dimensions are focused on!
Most commonly applied dimension is collectivism!

Often country is used as a proxy of culture!
Reviews point to up to 79% of studies!

Oversimplification!

Recommendations for Cross-Cultural Researchers

Consider the group property of culture

- Considerable within-nation variation of many culture dimensions
- Focus on the variance of culture held by the individuals in a nation!

Consolidate cultural values: a configuration approach

- "Culture is a latent construct, and most definitions refer to culture as a pattern. It is not a list of independent dimensions but is the integrated complex set of interrelated and potentially interactive characteristics of a group of people."
- Future research should develop patterns that may describe a particular nation or groups of nations!


The Idea of Cultural Archetypes

Cultural Archetypes
(following a nation-independent gestalt perspective):

- configurations of multiple cultural dimensions
- defined by the magnitude of as well as the interrelationships between cultural dimensions


Hypotheses

**H1:** There are cultural archetypes representing specific configurations of cultural dimensions which are independent of national boundaries.

**H2:** The use of cultural archetypes allows better to capture the complex and multifaceted nature of culture when measuring its impact in cause-effect-relations compared to either using single cultural value dimensions or countries as proxies.

Research Design (1/2)

1. Measuring Cultural Dimensions
2. Develop cultural archetypes
3. Illustrate predictive validity of archetypes

THE SAMPLE (n=2175):
Survey of business students (in classroom), in 10 countries (in 8 cultural clusters)

Factor analysis
Hofstede's concept
COL, MAS,
PD, UA, LTO
*as extraction communalities and factor loadings for some items were low some were excluded
**we assessed measurement invariance employing multi-group confirmatory factor analysis

Cluster analysis
a] Hierarchical clustering (Ward)
b] Centroid-based clustering (k-means)

Illustrative Example: Entrepreneurial Intent (PLS-SEM)
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Innovativeness
Risk Taking
Proactiveness
Entrepreneurial Intention (EI)

Multi-Group Analyses: Cultural Archetypes
Cultural Archetypes
CA1 CA2 CA3 CAi

Multi-Group Analyses: Countries
Countries
RUSSIA... CHINA

Innovativeness
Risk Taking
Proactiveness
Entrepreneurial Intention

Moderation Analyses: Cultural Dimensions
Cultural Dimensions
PD Col UA MAS LTO

Description of Cultural Archetypes (k-means)

Archetype 1 (n=314)
Archetype 2 (n=482)
Archetype 3 (n=475)
Archetype 4 (n=363)
Archetype 5 (n=223)
Archetype 6 (n=318)

A1: 'Masculine Individualists'
A2: 'Masculine Collectivists'
A3: 'Risk Takers'
A4: 'Low Power Distant Feminines'
A5: 'Short Term Oriented'
A6: 'Power Distants'

H1: We can reveal cultural archetypes that do not correspond to national cultures which provides support to our first hypothesis!
Results of the EI-Model

Moderated by formal and informal context
(Aggregate psychological traits; social legitimation; dissatisfaction approach)


### Results of the Multi-Group Analyses using Archetypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Innovative ness</th>
<th>Proactive- ness</th>
<th>Risk Taking</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>R-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full set of data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 2175)</td>
<td>0.185***</td>
<td>0.132***</td>
<td>0.120***</td>
<td>-0.047**</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.156***</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1: Masculine Indiv.</strong> (n = 382)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.271***</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td><strong>0.132</strong>*</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td><strong>-0.137</strong>*</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2: Masculine Coll.</strong> (n = 446)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.234***</td>
<td>0.141***</td>
<td><strong>0.100</strong></td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td><strong>-0.147</strong></td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3: Risk Takers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 255)</td>
<td><strong>0.157</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.039</strong></td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td><strong>-0.197</strong></td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4: Low PD Fem.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 537)</td>
<td><strong>0.225</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.225</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.139</strong></td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td><strong>-0.070</strong></td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5: Short Term Or.</strong> (n = 286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.146</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.154</strong></td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A6: Power Dists.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 269)</td>
<td><strong>0.207</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.052</strong></td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td><strong>-0.190</strong></td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.01; **p<0.05; *p<0.10; significance determined using clustered regressions which produces robust standard errors.

Findings about Cross-Cultural Entrepreneurial Intentions

**Proposition 1:** Innovativeness has a positive and significant effect on EI for all cultural archetypes.

**Proposition 2:** Proactiveness has a positive and significant effect on EI which is contingent on cultural archetypes.

For archetypes with a rather high collectivism, an average uncertainty avoidance and a rather low power distance (A2, 4, 5), proactiveness is comparably more important to EI.

**Proposition 3:** Risk taking has a positive and significant effect on EI which is contingent on cultural archetypes.

For archetypes with a rather high long-term orientation and a rather low power distance (A1, 2, 4), risk-taking is comparably more important to EI.

Findings about Cross-Cultural Measurement

Moderation of single cultural dimensions:
- innovativeness has a higher effect on EI in LTO cultures (e.g. A6)
- innovativeness and proactiveness have a lower effect on EI in high PD cultures (e.g. A6)
- proactiveness has a lower effect on EI in masculine cultures (e.g. A2)

Interrelationships of culture, e.g. LTOxPD?

Multi-group analyses: Russia (A1: 45%; A6: 21%)
- proactiveness by far most important determinant of EI
- risk taking also significant determinant of EI
- innovativeness no significant determinant of EI

Is this country effect really due to culture?

H2: Cultural archetypes offer a more realistic picture of cultural configurations and the complex sub-national configurations involved in any measurement of culture on the national level; they are superior when assessing the strengths of culture’s moderating effects on cause-and-effect relationships.

Limitations: 5 dimensions of Hofstede, simple EI model, student sample, 8 cultural clusters, cluster analyses.
Thank you!
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