

**Running Head: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AS PROPOSED FACTORS**

**INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AS PROPOSED FACTORS OF  
EMPLOYEE ACCEPTANCE OF GOAL SETTING AND NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**

**MICHAEL G. BROWN**

**Regent University**

**School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship**

**1000 Regent University Drive**

**Virginia Beach, Virginia 23464**

**Tel: (510) 453-0070**

***e-mail: michbr7@regent.edu***

### ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper addresses certain inconsistencies in the goal setting literature by reintroducing three of Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions (power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance) on an individual level for the purposes of testing their relationship to an employee's general acceptance of goal setting and attitude toward negative feedback. The proposed study presents a literature review of goal setting and offers theoretical grounds to conduct a cross-sectional study that utilizes an efficient online survey that will lead to analyses of instrument reliability and validity and a quantitative assessment of the interdependence of all five variables.

**Keywords:** goal acceptance, feedback, cultural values

## INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AS PROPOSED FACTORS OF EMPLOYEE ACCEPTANCE OF GOAL SETTING AND NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

Organizations are becoming increasingly complex and are characterized by heterogeneity; such a diverse composition leads to greater innovation and creative marketing techniques, but the increased diversity may cause communication breakdown and interpersonal conflict (Cox, 1991). Leaders have the somewhat daunting task of facilitating collaboration among organizational members to achieve a common goal; such procedures require goal setting and ongoing dialogue (i.e., feedback) to achieve optimal progress.

While goal-setting research has yielded substantial data that lead to pragmatic action; the literature is not immune to inconsistencies in the research findings (e.g., goal acceptance, attitudes toward feedback). Cultural differences demonstrated at the individual level may account for some of these inconsistencies, and Hofstede's (1980) seminal work on cultural dimensions may offer greater insight for goal-setting researchers and organizational practitioners (e.g., leaders, consultants). The purpose of this paper is to reintroduce three of Hofstede's (1980) values – power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance – as individual dimensions that influence an employee's acceptance of goal setting and negative feedback.

### LITERATURE REVIEW OF GOAL SETTING THEORY

#### Definition

A goal refers to the end that a person or group attempts to accomplish through appropriate behavior or actions (Ivancevich, 2005). Central to goal setting theory is the concept that *intention* is the primary factor of behavior, and consequently, performance (Locke, 1966; Locke, Bryan & Kendall, 1968). Locke (1966) posits that higher levels of intentions lead to higher levels (both quantity and quality) of performance through increased expenditure of effort (Dachler & Mobley, 1973; Locke, 1968; Ryan, 1958, 1970).

#### Task-Goal Attributes

An evaluation of the group-setting theory requires proper discussion of the various threads related to task-goal attributes (Steers & Porter, 1974), "a characteristic or dimension of an employee's task-goals" (p. 436). Six major task-goal attributes have dominated the goal-setting literature: *goal difficulty*, *goal specificity*, *goal acceptance and commitment*, *feedback* (knowledge of results), *participation* in the goal-setting process, and *peer/group involvement*.

**Goal Difficulty.** Mace (1935) discovered that workers had higher performance when goal difficulty levels were also higher; difficult goals, as opposed to simple or nebulous ("do your best") goals, relate to a higher performance level (Bryan & Locke, 1967b; Locke, 1966; Locke & Bryan, 1966b, 1967; Locke, Bryan & Kendall, 1968). Subjects who raised their own task goals over previous levels experienced higher performance levels compared to colleagues who settled for goals that resembled the status quo or were lesser in difficulty (Battle, 1966). However, overly-complex tasks may prevent employees from developing effective strategies that are equally complex and/or comprehensive (Locke & Latham, 1990).

Is there an optimal level for goal difficulty? Stedry and Kay (1966) posit that goals perceived as challenging (moderately difficult) result in significantly greater performance levels

than goals that are perceived as impossible. As a result, leaders must also consider situational constraints that may inhibit an individual or group's ability to meet a certain goal (Peters, Chassie, Lindholm, O'Connor & Kline, 1982).

**Goal Specificity.** The dominant task-goal attribute appears to be goal specificity, in which concrete, quantitative goals lead to higher performance levels over goals that are ambiguous or reflect a "do your best" approach (Bryan & Locke, 1967a; Ivancevich, 1976; Lee and Earley, 1992; Locke, 1967; Locke & Bryan, 1966a, 1966b, 1967; Locke, Bryan & Kendall, 1968; Locke & Latham, 1990; O'Leary-Kelly, Martocchio & Frink, 1994; Weldon & Weingart, 1993). Carroll and Tosi (1970) contend that clearly-articulated goals produce favorable results, particularly in combination with certain personality types, indicating that moderator variables exist within the construct of goal specificity and task performance.

In addition to goal specificity's positive relationship to faster work pace (Locke & Bryan, 1969), the attribute increased task interest and motivation. Bryan & Locke's (1967a) experiment involving "high motivation" (HM) and "low motivation" (LM) groups revealed the impact of goal specificity. The researchers assigned a "do your best" approach to the high motivation group and specific goals to the low motivation group, the latter of which eventually caught up with the HM group in both performance and favorableness to the task.

**Goal Acceptance and Goal Commitment.** Regardless of the impact that goal specificity and difficulty have upon task performance, researchers admit that such attributes are inconsequential unless the subordinate accepts these goals with a high level of personal aspiration (Locke, 1968; Locke, Cartledge & Knerr, 1970; Mace, 1935).

Kanfer, Cox, Greiner and Karoly (1974) assert that a subordinate must (a) agree to the task and its related goal and (b) commit to the execution of the desired behavior that will result in success. Goal commitment is integral to higher levels of task performance (Erez & Zidon, 1984; Locke & Latham, 1990); however, commitment is higher when employees (a) believe that they can truly attain them and (b) value the goal attainment itself (Locke, Latham & Erez, 1988). Hollenbeck, Williams and Klein (1989) discovered that public commitment, or commitment that is knowledgeable outside the immediate supervisor-subordinate relationship, is more effective than private commitment.

**Feedback.** One of the most intriguing elements of goal-setting theory is the involvement of feedback, or knowledge of results (KR). Locke and Bryan (1966a) posit that feedback does not result in automatic increases in performance but rather what the person does with such knowledge of results. Particularly, they attribute increased output to the goal or intention; knowledge of results functions as a moderator of the performance level (Locke & Bryan, 1966b; Locke, Bryan & Kendall, 1968). Humans are selective with their respective use of knowledge. If a person appraises KR as significant, he will develop a subsequent psychological goal that extends upon the original goal (Locke & Bryan, 1969).

Cummings, Schwab and Rosen (1971) discovered that quality of feedback influences the subordinate's goal-setting process and task performance. Correct KR increased the goal level and performance more significantly than the absence of KR; even incomplete KR data actually resulted in higher performance levels. However, erroneous KR data decreased performance levels. In addition to feedback quality, the frequency of feedback is related to goal clarity, positive feelings of the goal setting process, favorable perceptions of and improved relationships with superiors, and achievement (Carroll & Tosi, 1971).

**Participative Goals versus Assigned Goals.** The determination of goals can be categorized into three main groups. *Self-generated* goals set by the subordinate himself

commonly stem from the superior's instruction to simply "do your best." However, these goals may not be demanding or be in the best interest of the group and commonly result in reduced performance. *Participative* goals arise from the collaboration between superior and subordinate. *Assigned* goals originate from the superior without subordinate input (time-efficiency); while it reduces the likelihood that the goal is too simple for the subordinate, the superior must also be able to convince the employee to accept the goal (Oldham, 1975).

A controversial component of goal-setting theory involves the debate centering on the superiority of assigned versus participative decision-making, or PDM. Coch and French (1948) argued that how a plan is created and implemented is vital to its success; subordinates will not embrace a plan as strongly if it was developed and imposed by management rather than a collection of peers. Additional studies echo the importance of participative goal setting or PDM and its relationship to higher performance and individual motivation (Argyris, 1955, 1964; Liem, 1975; Likert, 1967).

Nevertheless, participative goal setting is not immune to moderating factors that may limit its effectiveness within the process. Participation was not shown to lead to improved performance unless the goals were set during the superior-subordinate interview and subsequently resulted in the formation of higher goals (Chang & Lorenzi, 1983; Meyer, Kay & French, 1965). French, Kay and Meyer (1966) further discovered that participation positively correlates to performance only when the subordinate (a) perceives a low level of threat (to job security) or (b) experiences a history of high participation. Conversely, when a person perceives a high threat level or has experienced low participation, a PDM approach can result in a performance that is counterproductive.

Assigned goals, however, are just as effective as participative goals and can result in greater goal attainment (Dossett, Latham & Mitchell, 1979). Cummings and Earley (1992) contend that the impact rests with the manner in which the goal is communicated; they assert that assigned goals, when offered with a *valid rationale*, can prove to be motivating for the employee.

***Incentives/Rewards.*** Maehr and Stallings (1972) conclude that internal evaluations, not external rewards, produce greater motivation for difficult tasks. Deci (1971) discovered that the introduction of money as an extrinsic reward did result in a decrease of intrinsic motivation. However, when verbal reinforcements were implemented, intrinsic motivation increased. Furthermore, after extrinsic rewards were given, then subsequently removed, the level of intrinsic motivation dropped to a value lower than the original mark. Deci (1971) conjectured that money, due to its connotation and cultural use, causes the person to associate the task with financial gain. When the financial reward was removed, the interest or motivation in the task also decreased.

What is the theoretical explanation behind the superior influence of intrinsic motivation over extrinsic rewards? According to deCharms (1968), people have a sense of personal causation (locus of causality) that strengthens intrinsic motivation. A person may view extrinsic rewards as a threat to personal power and causation (Deci, 1972). Internal and personal rewards, however, are not perceived as controlling; as a result, a person maintains a sense of competence and self-determination (Deci, Nezlek & Sheinman, 1981).

***Peer/Group Involvement.*** While goal setting frequently occurs in a superior-subordinate context, it is not immune to the dynamic influences of peer and organizational factors. Likert (1967) and Locke (1968) posit that peer competition prompts individuals to strive harder to achieve goals; however, this does not always result in greater productivity for the individual or group. Miller and Hamblin (1963) propose task interdependence among group members as a

valid determinant of productivity. Research has discovered that group goals *plus individual goals* lead to a higher level of performance when employees work *interdependently* (Locke & Latham, 1984; Mitchell & Silver, 1990). Conversely, Matsui, Kakuyama and Onglatco (1987) discovered that people who work independently contributed to greater group performance. The Matsui *et. al* study seems to contradict the belief that interdependence is superior. However, the study involved group goals that resulted in higher individual goals. The study by Mitchell and Silver (1980), for example, involved a group goal that was the sum of individual goals.

People find themselves in a social dilemma when they choose how to respond to individual and group goals simultaneously; the need to balance their concerns between the two domains is paramount to success (Latham & Seijts, 2000). Mitchell and Silver (1990) posit that the assignment of a goal to an individual resulted in lower group performance than simply the assignment of a group goal. They further contend that individual goal specificity directed toward an individual actually diverted attention away from certain strategies that enhance group performance. However, *groupcentric*, individual goals accomplished the opposite by focusing on the individual's contribution to the group (i.e., additivity) (Crown & Rosse, 1995).

Within the group structure, the level of cooperation declines as groups become larger (Liebrand, Messick & Wilke, 1992; Messick & Brewer, 1983). Group members feel less accountable for the group or responsible for the group goals as the group size increases. Smaller groups, on the other hand, tend to discover a level of collective-efficacy at an earlier point in the goal-setting and implementation processes (Latham & Seijts, 2000).

### **Goal Setting Issues That Prompt the Current Research**

Locke's (1968) goal-setting theory and subsequent, relevant studies have provided the organizational community with a wealth of information that offers feasible explanations to the increase of human motivation and task performance; however, additional research is necessary to fully understand the interaction of various task-goal attributes and moderating variables of the goal-setting phenomenon. Goal setting's multidimensionality has given rise to diverging results in the research literature, particularly as it relates to feedback, goal acceptance and participative versus assigned goal determination. The organizational "marketplace" is becoming more global, combining cultures with diverging values: some that cherish egalitarian, group-centric philosophy and others that continue to embrace individualistic approaches. As a result, goal-setting processes are increasingly complex, inviting the proposal of new variables that serve an explicable purpose for effective goal setting procedures.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Hofstede (1980) introduced four dimensions of national culture that explain an individual's proclivity to certain behavior within social and organizational contexts: *power distance*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *individualism-collectivism*, and *masculinity*. These indices merely describe the aggregate cultural values that are common to citizens of a particular nation; they are not to be regarded as prescriptive for all individuals of a particular culture. Nevertheless, Hofstede's work provides a feasible theoretical framework for such indices on an individual basis.

Meaningfulness appears to be a common motif that offers a plausible explanation for the gaps in the goal setting literature. Locke and associates posited that subordinates must accept goals with a high level of personal aspiration (Locke, 1968; Locke, Cartledge & Knerr, 1970)

and that one must attribute psychological value to the goal (Locke & Bryan, 1969). *Meaningfulness* can be defined as the level of agreement between one's personal beliefs or values and the attributed value of a particular task or the employee's general function (Brief & Nord, 1990; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). When people perceive high levels of meaningfulness, this can result in increased commitment and more concentration of energy on the task and/or function (Kanter, 1983).

A sense of meaningfulness, along with individual values and behaviors, finds its context within cultural norms (Cross & Markus, 1999; Cushman, 1990). Furthermore, individual differences related to values and appropriate interpersonal behavior may influence goal acceptance and commitment (Locke, Shaw, Saari & Latham, 1981). Consequently, cultural differences may provide an explanation for goal setting inconsistencies (Locke, Latham and Erez, 1988). For example, feedback has been used as a tool for employee motivation and performance, but such interventions have not always resulted in improvements (Balcazar, Hopkins, & Suarez, 1985; Earley, 1986, 1989; Goltz, Citera, Jensen, Favero, & Komaki, 1989; Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; Waldersee & Luthans, 1994). These inconsistencies point to the complexity of goal setting and feedback and hint toward individual differences (Arvey & Ivancevich, 1980). It is important to note that this proposed study restricts its scope to individual-level behavior (Earley, 1997; Peterson & Smith, 1997; Schwartz, 1992; Sully de Luque & Sommer, 2000).

### **Power Distance**

Erez and Earley (1987) examined the effects of cultural differences on goal acceptance; one of the cultural variables was power distance. Individuals with a high power distance orientation accept the existence of unequal power distribution and believe it is acceptable for superiors to have a great degree of power over subordinates (Hofstede, 1980). Conversely, employees with low power distance orientations have a tendency to develop a strong, personal connection with their superiors (Tyler, Lind & Huo, 1995); this type of relationship may blur the lines of authority because the subordinate may be somewhat dependent on positive feedback that enhances the relationship. James (1993) suggests that individuals with low power distance orientation will demonstrate less deference to authority and will react poorly to feedback that dwells on areas that need improvement.

Bond, Wan, Leung and Giacalone (1985) posit that Chinese – a culture with a high power distance index – were more willing to accept negative feedback from a superior; such high power distance orientations serve to validate the legitimacy of inequitable power distributions among members.

In a high power distance orientation, learning involves receiving wisdom from teacher or mentor (i.e., guru) whose methods are unquestioned; leaders are prescriptive in style and subordinates are expected to perform based on these instructions (Buckley & Ghauri, 1999). Hofstede (1984) asserts that, in a low power distance context, people with formal authority are “not supposed to look powerful”; in other words, they are perceived more as colleagues on a virtually equal footing as the subordinate.

While it is safe to assume that individuals prefer positive feedback, certain people have a higher tolerance for negative feedback. A high power distance context accepts the inequitable distribution of authority within an organization, and such members recognize that negative feedback from a superior is virtually inevitable (Bond *et al.*, 1985; Hofstede, 1980); the superior

functions as a mentor that imparts wise counsel (Buckley & Ghauri, 1999); as a result, subordinates are to receive any feedback – positive or negative – as helpful and unquestionably productive.

*Hypothesis 1a: Power distance in individuals positively relates to attitudes toward negative feedback.*

*Hypothesis 1b: Power distance in individuals positively relates to attitudes toward goal acceptance.*

### **Individualism versus Collectivism**

Individualism is characterized by the prioritization of personal interests over the needs of the group (Wagner & Moch, 1986). According to Weber (1958), the Protestant work ethic fueled individualism in western Europe through self-reliance and the pursuit of individual goals. At the same time, individualism is not necessarily insidious; Waterman (1984) proposes that it encompasses four psychological domains: a sense of personal identity (Erikson, 1968), self-actualization (Maslow, 1943), internal locus of control (Rotter, 1975), and principled moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1981). Additionally, Fenz & Arkoff (1962) suggest autonomy as a major trait of individualism.

Conversely, collectivism is the condition whereby group interests are given consideration over individual preferences (Hofstede, 1980). Wagner (1995) asserts that collectivism is a permanent trait that should be distinguished from temporary and context-dependent qualities, such as cohesiveness. Adler (1964) employed the term *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* (i.e., sense of community) to express a selfless identification with the interests of others. Hui and Triandis (1986) articulated seven behaviors that indicate collectivism: (a) consideration of a decision's effect upon others, (b) sharing of material resources, (c) sharing of nonmaterial resources, (d) susceptibility to social influence, (e) self-presentation and loss of face, (f) sharing of outcomes, and (g) feeling of involvement in others' lives. Hui and Triandis (1986) further employ the term "concern" to summarize these collectivistic traits – "that we are walking on the same path, sharing the same fate, and affecting one another" (pp. 231-232).

*Hypothesis 2a: Collectivism orientation in individuals positively relates to goal acceptance.*

However, those with collectivism orientation need time to foster relationships and behave in ways to preserve those relationships and prevent losing face (Earley, 1997), frequently resorting to non-confrontational strategies (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Sully de Luque and Sommer (2000) refer to collectivism as "holistic orientation," whereby individuals do not compartmentalize life's facets but rather blend them as interdependent and harmonious elements. One area inevitably affects the others; business is environmental and personal: task failure is personal failure, which is also collective. Consequently, to the collectivist, negative feedback can be devastating because it disrupts the harmony of the relationship between individual and that of superiors and the group.

*Hypothesis 2b: Collectivism orientation in individuals negatively relates to attitudes toward negative feedback.*

### **Uncertainty (Ambiguity) Avoidance**

High uncertainty avoidance equates to unwillingness to both risk-taking and the demonstration of personal initiative outside of predictable, prescribed roles (Mendonca & Kanungo, 1996). Individuals with high uncertainty avoidance have a proclivity to external locus of control; Storms and Spector (1987) posit that individuals with external locus of control (that believe that external forces determine the outcome of events) are more likely to respond with frustration and counterproductive behavior than those with internal locus of control.

With uncertainty avoidance, conflict and hardship bring uncertainty, risk, and ambiguity, and is therefore viewed unfavorably (Johnson & Cullen, 2002). Mendonca and Kanungo (1990) further assert that uncertainty avoidance can permeate the work culture to the extent that managers feel uncomfortable with articulating expectations because they themselves have not received well-defined objectives. High uncertainty avoidance orientation creates an environment that is more rigid, less delegating and less approachable (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003).

Rational processing leads to high uncertainty avoidance (Alves, Lovelace, Manz, Matsypura, Toyasaki, & Ke, 2006); ironically, one of the characteristics of uncertainty avoidance is the somewhat irrational notion that “what is different, is dangerous” (Hofstede, 2005, p. 109). Nevertheless, organizations with a high uncertainty avoidance orientation strive to minimize ambiguity by establishing formal procedures, policies and feedback structures (Sully de Luque & Sommer, 2000). Conversely, those tolerant of ambiguity (possibly those with low uncertainty avoidance) are comfortable with undetermined conditions and are not threatened by perspectives that vastly differ from their own (Earley & Stubblebine, 1989; Berger, 1979).

*Hypothesis 3a: High uncertainty avoidance negatively relates to goal acceptance.*

*Hypothesis 3b: High uncertainty avoidance negatively relates to attitudes toward negative feedback.*

## **METHOD**

I propose a cross-sectional study to observe comparable quantitative data that are not affected by changes over time (Bailey, 2007). Six weeks will be required to complete the study, two weeks each for (a) survey preparation and approval, (b) survey distribution and data collection, and (c) data analysis to adequately report the findings.

### **Population and Sampling**

Random sampling or purposeful sampling is suitable for this study with a focus at the individual-level dimensions rather than societal norms that require quota sampling. The sampling method is preferred also due to the complexity of comparing data based on orientations of power distance, individualism versus collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance, hopefully analyzing data

from participants across multiple employment sectors and hierarchical levels. The proposed study intends to invite 300 prospective participants and accept 120-140 for the actual research.

### **Instrumentation, Variables and Data Collection**

All measures can be implemented using a 27-item instrument with a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strong agree). I propose the 5-item, *power distance* scale of Yoo, Donthu and Tomasz's (2001) Cultural Value Scale (CVSCALE) as it measures values at the individual level as opposed to Hofstede's (1980) original, aggregate cultural level. Sample item-statements include "People in higher position should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions" and "People in higher position should not ask the opinions of people in lower position." Asgari, Silong, Ahmad and Samah (2008) utilized the CVSCALE to test relationships with organizational citizenship behaviors, and the measure yielded a Cronbach's alpha value of ( $\alpha = .74$ ). The measure yielded a higher value ( $\alpha = .86$ ) when two of the measure's creators tested the proposed relationship of values to ethical behavior (Yoo & Donthu, 2002).

I propose using Yoo and Donthu's (2002) 6-item *collectivism* scale that included such item statements as "Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group that they belong to" and "Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties." Yoo and Donthu's (2002) 5-item *uncertainty avoidance* scale would also be appropriate for the study. Sample statements include "It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures" and "Standardized work procedures are helpful." Both scales achieved Cronbach alpha levels of  $\alpha = .83$  and  $\alpha = .88$ , respectively.

*Goal acceptance* measures are typically situated in the context of a particular task, and, consequently, are limited in their immediate applicability in other contexts. This study proposes the utilization of a modified, 8-item version of Hollenbeck, Williams and Klein's (1989) 9-item goal commitment scale that originally assessed acceptance of goals related to academic grade point average. Hollenbeck *et al.* (1989) truncated two items that appeared to have loaded on a different factor, resulting in Cronbach's alpha reliability value of ( $\alpha = .88$ ) for the revised 7-item scale. The measure would include item statements such as "Since it's not always possible to tell how tough tasks are until you've worked on them a while, it's hard to take such a goal seriously."

To gauge *acceptance of negative feedback*, I propose a modified version of Jaworski and Kohli's (1991) 4-item Negative Feedback Acceptance Scale that originally involved sales. Item statements would reflect general attitudes concerning negative feedback (e.g., "When my manager points out a deficiency in my performance, I try to correct it"). Jaworski and Kohli's (1991) use of the measure resulted in a Cronbach's alpha reliability of ( $\alpha = .80$ ). Two of the four items are reverse-scored and perhaps aided the reliability coefficient.

### **Data Analysis**

The study will control for gender, age, organizational size and type, tenure, and job level. Quantitative analyses will include descriptive statistics, measurement reliability (Cronbach's alpha), Pearson product-moment correlations, and multiple linear regression, to test all six hypotheses that propose a relationship between individual differences and acceptance of goal setting and negative feedback.

## DISCUSSION

### Limitations and Delimitations

One area of limitation involves the sampling size, which theoretically may not accurately reflect the composition of the population. Poststratification (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991) was considered, however, the approach is not time-effective for the study, but more importantly, it resembles post hoc sampling and is, at the minimum, somewhat dubious (Rosenberger & Lachin, 2002). Additionally, while effective for one or two independent variables, poststratification based on multiple variables may alter the optimal sampling size and require the prioritization of certain independent variables, an approach not suitable for the proposed study.

Goal-setting theory is multidimensional, involving the presence of primary determinants (e.g., goal specificity, difficulty). These elements are not addressed in the proposed study; it is the researcher's intent to first test the relationship of individual-cultural values upon goal acceptance and attitudes toward negative feedback before proposing the feasibility of such as moderating variables in a goal-setting model. At the same time, there is a legitimate need for a true experimental design that also considers cultural and individual as possible moderators between major goal-task attributes (e.g., difficulty, specificity) and dependent variables.

### Conclusion

Individual values and behaviors are rooted in cultural contexts, and such idiosyncrasies may serve an explicable purpose related to goal-setting inconsistencies. Leaders must recognize that the articulation of organizational goals also necessitates some consideration for the individual proclivities toward goal valence and acceptance, and greater clarity of individuals' values may bolster the effectiveness of goal setting and feedback as a motivation tool that leads to productivity, employee satisfaction and organizational success. Consequently, a well-informed leader may opt to further clarify and even alter the elements of a particular goal or feedback approach to empower the recipient, and thus achieve optimal motivation and performance that lead to an organization's effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1964). *Social interest: a challenge to mankind*. New York: Capricorn Books.
- Alves, J. C., Lovelace, K. J., Manz, C. C., Matsypura, D., Toyasaki, F., & Ke, K. (2006). A cross-cultural perspective of self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 338-359.
- Argyris, C. (1964). *Integrating the individual and the organization*. New York: Wiley.
- Argyris, C. (1955). Organizational leadership and participative management. *The Journal of Business*, 1-7.
- Arvey, R. D., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1980). Punishment in organizations: a review, propositions, and research suggestions. *Journal of Management Review*, 123-132.
- Asgari, A., Silong, A. D., Ahmad, A., & Samah, B. A. (2008). The relationship between organizational characteristics, task characteristics, cultural context and organizational citizenship behaviors [Electronic Version]. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*.
- Bailey, K. (2007). *Methods of social research* (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Balcazar, F., Hopkins, B. L., & Suarez, Y. (1985). A critical, objective review of performance feedback. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 65-89.
- Battle, E. S. (1966). Motivational determinants of academic competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 634-642.
- Berger, C. R. (1979). Beyond initial understanding: uncertainty, understanding, and the development of interpersonal relationships. In H. Giles, & R. N. St. Clair, *Language and social psychology* (pp. 122-144). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bond, M. H., Wan, K. C., Leung, K., & Giacalone, R. (1985). How are responses to verbal insults related to cultural collectivism and power-distance? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 111-127.
- Brief, A. P., & Nord, W. R. (1990). *Meanings of occupational work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Press.
- Bryan, J. F., & Locke, E. A. (1967a). Goal-setting as a means of increasing motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 274-277.
- Bryan, J. F., & Locke, E. A. (1967b). Parkinson's law as a goal-setting phenomenon. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 258-275.
- Buckley, P. J., & Ghauri, P. N. (1999). *The internationalization of the firm* (2nd ed.). London: Thomson Learning.

- Carroll Jr., S. J., & Tosi, H. L. (1970). Goal characteristics and personality factors in a management-by-objectives program. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 295-305.
- Carroll Jr., S. J., & Tosi, H. L. (1971). The relationship of characteristics of the review process to the success of the "management by objectives" approach. *The Journal of Business*, 299-305.
- Chang, G. S.-Y., & Lorenzi, P. (1983). The effects of participative versus assigned goal setting on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Management*, 55-64.
- Coch, L., & French, J. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 512-532.
- Cox Jr., T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 34-47.
- Cross, S. E., & Marcus, H. R. (2001). The cultural constitution of personality. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John, *Handbook of personality: theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 378-396). New York: Guilford Press.
- Crown, D. F., & Rosse, J. G. (1995). Yours, mine, and ours: facilitating group productivity through the integration of individual and group goals. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 138-150.
- Cummings, L. E., & Earley, P. C. (1992). Comments on the Latham/Erez/Locke study. In P. Frost, & R. Stablein, *Doing exemplary research* (pp. 167-172). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cummings, L. L., Schwab, D. P., & Rosen, M. (1971). Performance and knowledge of results as determinants of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 526-530.
- Cushman, P. (1990). Why the self is empty: toward a historically situated psychology. *American Psychologist*, 599-611.
- Dachler, H. P., & Mobley, W. H. (1973). Construct validation of an instrumentality--expectancy--task-goal model of work motivation: some theoretical boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 397-418.
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: the internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academy Press.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105-115.
- Deci, E. L. (1972). Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113-120.
- Deci, E. L., Nezlek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and intrinsic motivation of the rewardee. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1-10.

- Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: making progress, and raising new questions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 729-768.
- Dossett, D. L., Latham, G. P., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Effects of assigned versus participatively set goals, knowledge of results, and individual differences on employee behavior when goal difficulty is held constant. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 291-298.
- Earley, P. C. (1997). *Face, harmony, and social structure*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 565-581.
- Earley, P. C. (1986). Trust, perceived importance of praise and criticism, and work performance: an examination of feedback in the United States and England. *Journal of Management*, 457-473.
- Earley, P. C., & Stubblebine, P. (1989). Intercultural assessment of performance feedback. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 161-181.
- Erez, M., & Earley, P. C. (1987). Comparative analysis of goal-setting strategies across cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 658-665.
- Erez, M., & Zidon, I. (1984). Effect of goal acceptance on the relationship of goal difficulty to performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69-78.
- Erickson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Fenz, W. D., & Arkoff, A. (1962). Comparative need patterns of five ancestry groups in Hawaii. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 67-89.
- French Jr., J. R., Kay, E., & Meyer, H. H. (1966). Participation and the appraisal system. *Human Relations*, 3-20.
- Goltz, S. M., Citera, M., Jensen, M., Favero, J., & Komaki, J. L. (1989). Individual feedback: does it enhance effects of group feedback? *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 77-92.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 42-63.

- Hollenbeck, J. R., Williams, C. R., & Klein, H. J. (1989). An empirical examination of the antecedents of commitment to difficult goals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 18-23.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-Collectivism: a study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 225-248.
- Ivancevich, J. M. (1976). Effects of goal setting on performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 605-612.
- Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2005). *Organizational behavior and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- James, K. (1993). The social context of organizational justice: Cultural, intergroup, and structural effects on justice behaviors and perceptions. In R. Cropanzano, *Justice in the workplace: approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 21-50). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1991). Supervisory feedback: alternative types and their impact on salespeople's performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 190-201.
- Johnson, J. L., & Cullen, J. B. (2002). Trust in cross-cultural relationships. In M. J. Gannon, & K. L. Newman, *The Blackwell handbook of cross-cultural management* (pp. 335-360). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kanfer, F. H., Cox, L. E., Greiner, J. R., & Karoly, P. (1974). Contracts, demand characteristics, and self-control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 605-619.
- Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: a historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 254-284.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development. Vol. 1: The philosophy of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Latham, G. P., & Seijts, G. H. (2000). The effects of goal setting and group size on performance in a social dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 104-116.
- Lee, C., & Earley, C. (1992). Comparative peer evaluations of organizational behavior theories. *Organizational Development Journal*, 37-42.
- Liebrand, W. B., Messick, D. M., & Wilke, H. A. (1992). *Social dilemmas: theoretical issues and research findings*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Liem, G. R. (1975). Performance and satisfaction as affected by personal control over salient decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 232-240.

- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Locke, E. A. (1967). Relationship of success and expectation to affect on goal-seeking tasks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125-134.
- Locke, E. A. (1966). The relationship of intentions to level of performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60-66.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 157-189.
- Locke, E. A., & Bryan, J. F. (1966a). Cognitive aspects of psychomotor performance: the effects of performance goals on level of performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 286-291.
- Locke, E. A., & Bryan, J. F. (1969). Knowledge of score and goal level as determinants of work rate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59-65.
- Locke, E. A., & Bryan, J. F. (1967). Performance goals as determinants of level of performance and boredom. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 120-130.
- Locke, E. A., & Bryan, J. F. (1966). The effects of goal-setting, rule-learning, and knowledge of score on performance. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 451-457.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1984). *Goal setting: a motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science*, 240-246.
- Locke, E. A., Bryan, J. F., & Kendall, L. M. (1968). Goals and intentions as mediators of the effects of monetary incentives on behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104-121.
- Locke, E. A., Cartledge, N., & Knerr, C. (1970). Studies of the relationship between satisfaction, goal setting and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 135-158.
- Locke, E. A., Latham, G. P., & Erez, M. (1988). The determinants of goal commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 23-39.
- Locke, E. A., Shaw, K. N., Saari, L. M., & Latham, G. P. (1981). Goal setting and task performance: 1969-1980. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125-152.
- MacDonald Jr., A. P. (1970). Revised scale for ambiguity tolerance: reliability and validity. *Psychological Reports*, 791-798.
- Mace, C. A. (1935). *Incentives: some experimental studies*. London: Industrial Health Research Board.

- Maehr, M. L., & Stallings, W. M. (1972). Freedom from external evaluation. *Child Development*, 177-185.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 370-396.
- Matsui, T., Kakuyama, T., & Onglatco, M. L. (1987). Effects of goals and feedback on performance in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 407-415.
- Mendonca, M., & Kanungo, R. N. (1996). Impact of culture on performance management in developing countries. *International Journal of Manpower*, 65-75.
- Mendonca, M., & N., K. R. (1990). Performance management in developing countries. In A. M. Jaeger, & R. N. Kanungo, *Management in developing countries* (pp. 223-251). London: Routledge.
- Messick, D. M., & Brewer, M. B. (1983). Solving social dilemmas: a review. In L. Wheeler, *Review of personality and social psychology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, H. H., Kay, E., & French Jr., J. R. (1965). Split roles in performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*, 123-129.
- Miller, L. K., & Hamblin, R. L. (1963). Interdependence, differential rewarding, and productivity. *American Sociological Review*, 768-777.
- Mitchell, T. R., & Silver, W. S. (1990). Individual and group goals when workers are interdependent: effects on task strategies and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 185-193.
- Oldham, G. R. (1975). The impact of supervisory characteristics on goal acceptance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 461-475.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Martocchio, J. J., & Frink, D. D. (1994). A review of the influence of group goals on group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1285-1301.
- Pedhazur, E., & Schmelkin, L. (1991). *Measurement design and analysis: an integrated approach*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Peter, L. H., Chassie, M. B., Lindholm, H. R., O'Connor, E. J., & Kline, C. R. (1982). The joint influence of situational constraints and goal setting on performance and affective outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 7-20.
- Peterson, M. F., & Smith, P. B. (1997). Does national culture or ambient temperature explain cross-national differences in role stress? *Academy of Management Journal*, 930-946.
- Rosenberger, W. F., & Lachin, J. M. (2002). *Randomization in clinical trials: theory and practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Rotter, J. B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56-67.
- Ryan, T. A. (1958). Drives, tasks, and the initiation of behavior. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 74-93.
- Ryan, T. A. (1970). *Intentional behavior: an approach to human motivation*. New York: Ronald.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in two countries. In L. Berkowitz, *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-65). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Stedry, A. C., & Kay, E. (1966). The effect of goal difficulty on performance: a field experiment. *Behavioral Science*, 459-470.
- Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1974). The role of task-goal attributes in employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 434-452.
- Sully de Luque, M. F., & Sommer, S. M. (2000). The impact of culture on feedback-seeking behavior: an integrated model and propositions. *Academy of Management Review*, 829-849.
- Triandis, H. C., & Singelis, T. M. (1998). Training to recognize individual differences in collectivism and individualism within culture. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35-47.
- Trompenaars, A., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: understanding cultural diversity in global business* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tyler, T. R., Lind, E. A., & Huo, Y. (1995). *Culture, ethnicity, and authority: social categorization and social orientation effects on the psychology of legitimacy*. Working paper, University of California.
- Wagner III, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 152-172.
- Wagner III, J. A., & Moch, M. K. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: concept and measure. *Group and Organization Studies*, 280-303.
- Waldersee, R., & Luthans, F. (1994). The impact of positive and corrective feedback on customer service performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 83-95.
- Waterman, A. S. (1984). *The psychology of individualism*. New York: Praeger.
- Weber, M. (1958). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Scribners.

Weldon, E., & Weingart, L. R. (1993). Group goals and group performance. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 307-334.

Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2002). The effects of marketing education and individual cultural values on marketing ethics of students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 92-103.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Tomasz, L. (2001). *Measuring cultural values: development and validation of the CVSCALE*, working paper. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.