IMOLA CSEH PAPP – ZSUZSANNA SURINYANE KIS

CULTURAL ADAPTATION IN THE WORKPLACE: INTERPRETING HOFSTEDE'S DIMENSIONS IN A PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT

Cultural adaptation in the workplace plays a crucial role in the integration and productivity of international professionals. Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory provides a framework for analyzing how cultural differences influence professional behavior, leadership styles, and workplace dynamics. This study offers a secondary analysis of existing empirical findings, focusing on the implications of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs. collectivism, and long-term vs. short-term orientation in workplace adaptation. These dimensions shape communication styles, decision-making processes, and professional expectations, which can either facilitate or hinder cultural integration.

Existing research highlights key adaptation challenges: professionals from high power distance societies may struggle in low power distance workplaces, where employees are encouraged to challenge authority. Similarly, employees from high uncertainty avoidance cultures may find it difficult to adapt to flexible work environments. The review also explores individualistic versus collectivist workplace expectations and the role of long-term versus short-term orientation in professional goal setting.

This paper is limited to a review of the literature and an exploration of the theoretical background.

Introduction

Employers worldwide are facing growing challenges in filling vacancies, particularly in positions requiring high qualifications and specialized skills (Cseh Papp, & Keczer, 2019). This issue is especially evident in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), where demand for skilled professionals continue to rise (Cseh Papp et al., 2018). As local labor markets struggle to meet these needs, the recruitment of highly qualified international professionals has become essential for economic development and innovation.

Germany reflects this global trend, experiencing an increasing shortage of skilled workers, particularly in technical and IT-related sectors. In response, the German labor market has seen a steady rise in foreign professionals. As of 2023, 6.7 million men and 6.2 million women living in Germany held foreign citizenship. The number of foreign nationals of working age (15 to under 65 years) increased by 482,000 (+5.2%) compared to 2022, reaching a total of 9.83 million (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2025a). The employment rate for foreign nationals in Germany stood at 71%, reflecting their significant contribution to the workforce (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2025a).

Imola Cseh Papp, Ph.D., Associate professor, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary, Faculty of Education and Psychology Institute of Research on Adult Education and Knowledge Management, Hungary

Zsuzsanna Surinyane Kis, PhD Student, MATE Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Doctoral School of Economic and Regional Sciences, Hungary

Additionally, the German labor market is experiencing longer hiring times, suggesting that filling positions is becoming more challenging (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2025b). This trend further emphasizes the need for effective workplace integration strategies to ensure that international professionals not only fill vacancies but also adapt successfully to their work environments.

Cultural adaptation is a critical factor in the successful integration of international professionals. Differences in workplace expectations, communication styles, and professional norms often create barriers to smooth integration. Hofstede's cultural dimensions provide a valuable theoretical framework for analyzing these challenges, offering insights into how power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs. collectivism, and long-term vs. short-term orientation influence workplace behavior and professional interactions.

This study conducts a secondary analysis of existing empirical research to explore how international professionals in Germany navigate cultural differences and adapt to their work environments. By reviewing key literature, the study identifies the main factors influencing workplace integration and offers recommendations to enhance adaptation strategies. The findings aim to support organizations, HR professionals, and policymakers in fostering a more inclusive and effective work environment for international employees in Germany.

Hofstede's model

The framework developed by Dutch social psychologist Geert Hofstede provides a foundation for understanding cultural differences between countries (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede et al., 2010). This cultural framework shapes everyday life, behavioral norms, communication patterns, dietary habits, clothing choices, and national holidays. It also influences the business world and workplace dynamics. Workplace communication, management styles, the evaluation and prioritization of goals and tasks, as well as expectations and responsibilities, vary across countries.

Hofstede identified six cultural dimensions:

- Power Distance (PDI)
- Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)
- Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV)
- Long-Term vs. Short-Term Orientation (LTO)
- Masculinity vs. Femininity (MAS)
- Indulgence vs. Restraint (IND).

Among the cultural dimensions, only Power Distance (PDI), Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV), Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI), and Long-Term vs. Short-Term Orientation (LTO) are considered. The analysis of the Masculinity vs. Femininity (MAS) dimension is not emphasized in this study because in workplace contexts, Germany exhibits characteristics of both masculine and feminine cultures, making it less distinct in this regard compared to other dimensions such as power distance or uncertainty avoidance. Therefore, this study focuses on dimensions that have a more direct impact on workplace interactions and cultural adaptation. The Indulgence vs. Restraint (IND) dimension is not relevant in the workplace context, as German workplaces generally emphasize goal-oriented work, efficiency, and adherence to rules. The workplace culture tends to prioritize structured work and the fulfillment of professional expectations, rather than personal enjoyment or recreation.

Power Distance Index (PDI)

When foreign professionals work in a foreign country, they may encounter a fundamentally different hierarchical system, whose dynamics and communication patterns are often in stark contrast to those in their home country. According to Hofstede (2001), human inequality is an inherent phenomenon that is addressed in varying ways across different societies. Inequality within organizations is functional and inevitable. Societies significantly shape the power distance within them. The Power Distance Index (PDI) measures the extent to which individuals accept hierarchical inequality within organizations. The PDI influences leadership, communication, and decision-making across different societies (House et al., 2004).

Hofstede (2001) identifies the key differences between societies with varying PDI scores in relation to various aspects of work organization.

In societies with a **high Power Distance Index** (PDI), such as Malaysia (104), Russia (93), the Philippines (94), and China (80), organizations are characterized by dominant hierarchical structures, centralized power, and widespread acceptance of unequal power distribution. In these cultures, the ideal leader is an autocratic decision-maker (Fikret Pasa, 2000) who strictly adheres to formal rules and regulations. Leaders are viewed as key figures for organizational outcomes and productivity (Rinne et al., 2012). Supervisors play a significant role in promoting innovations while providing clear instructions to subordinates. Although power distance negatively impacts the generation of innovative ideas, it has a positive effect on the implementation of such ideas (Luo et al., 2020). Subordinates generally avoid contradicting their leaders and are reluctant to challenge their opinions. In this context, innovation is facilitated through authoritarian leadership (Gallego-Álvarez, & Pucheta-Martínez, 2020). Subordinates are continuously monitored, expecting instructions and detailed guidance from their leaders.

Significant income distribution disparities can be observed between different levels within the organizational hierarchy. Leaders are often dissatisfied with their compensation and career opportunities. Bloom's (1999) research aligns with Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions, as it confirms that organizations in cultures with a high Power Distance Index tend to exhibit considerable income inequalities. These wage disparities are not only the result of hierarchical norms but also reflect the cultural acceptance of unequal power distribution.

The literature indicates a strong correlation between the Power Distance Index (PDI) and decision-making processes (Earley, 1999; Roozmand et al., 2011; Farzana, & Charoensukmongkol, 2023; Magee, & Smith, 2013; He, & Sun, 2018). In high PDI cultures, decision-making is concentrated at the top of the organization, without involving subordinates. While this approach enables quick decision-making and implementation, as lower-level employees exhibit less resistance, the absence of subordinate input and weak communication often detract from the quality of decisions. Furthermore, a centralized structure can foster unethical behavior, as senior leaders are not accountable to lower levels, leading to a lack of transparency and potential abuses (Khatri, 2009). House and their colleagues (2004) concluded that in high power distance societies, decision-making processes are predominantly centralized and autocratic, with leaders generally not involving subordinates in critical decisions.

Hofstede's cultural dimension of power distance also illustrates how this factor affects access to information within an organization. Hierarchical structures often hinder the flow of information by implementing access restrictions. An empirical analysis by Ni and their colleagues (2024), covering 22 countries, revealed that greater power distance increases information asymmetry between upper- and lower-level leaders. Their findings suggest that power distance limits vertical information exchange while also increasing the emotional distance between hierarchical levels within organizations.

Shahzad and their colleagues (2024) found that in cultures with a high power distance index, a despotic leadership style negatively impacts employee satisfaction and performance, while increasing turnover intention. The study further indicated that employees with a low power distance orientation amplify these negative effects, as they are more likely to expect consultative leadership. In contrast, employees with a high power distance orientation experience reduced negative effects, which suggests a greater acceptance of hierarchical authority and humility toward leadership decisions.

A common issue in organizational environments is the lack of clear guidance for employees in performing their tasks, often coupled with excessive workloads (Low et al., 2021). This situation can lead to overwhelming stress, confusion, and reduced performance levels. Moreover, white-collar positions are generally regarded as superior and more valuable as blue-collar roles (Hofstede, 2001), which can exacerbate hierarchical tensions. Merkin's (2006) analysis reveals that in high power distance cultures, individuals are more likely to employ indirect communication strategies when handling conflict situations, as opposed to low power distance cultures, where direct communication is more prevalent. This finding aligns with Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory, which posits that in hierarchy-focused societies, subordinates tend to avoid disagreements with leaders in order to maintain social order and respect. These findings reinforce Hofstede's framework, which underscores the significant impact of power distance on the interpersonal communication dynamics within organizational environments.

In societies with **low Power Distance Index** (PDI), such as Denmark (18), Israel (13), Sweden (31), New Zealand (22), and Germany (35), hierarchical structures are relatively flat, and organizations tend to have a horizontal structure. Decision-making is decentralized and involves a broader range of participants at various levels. Hierarchy is viewed as a product of role inequality, created for convenience, yet it is seen as flexible and open to questioning (Hofstede, 2001).

In low PDI societies, leadership styles are consultative (van Oudenhoven et al., 1998), and the ideal leader is seen as an "inventive democrat" who relies on both subordinates' opinions and their own experiences (Hofstede, 2001). Employees expect to be consulted and are willing to challenge their leaders' decisions when necessary (Hofstede, 2001). Subordinates are managed through logical reasoning, negotiations, and the setting of clear objectives, which leads to reduced anxiety levels and improved performance (Farh et al., 2007; Su et al., 2018).

Empirical studies (Yuan, & Zhou, 2015; Richardson, & Smith, 2007; Bjørge, 2007; Ghosh, 2011; Hauff, & Richter, 2015; Mathew, & Taylor, 2018) have shown that in societies with low PDI, minimizing hierarchical differences makes employees more sensitive to organizational support (Farh et al., 2007). This positively influences job performance and increases job satisfaction (Kirkman, & Shapiro, 2001). Power distance plays a significant role in how organizational support impacts employees' attitudes and behaviors (Taras et al., 2010).

Among the advantages of low power distance is the narrow pay gap between the lowest and highest levels of the hierarchy (Jittaruttha, 2015), which increases satisfaction for both leaders and employees. Leaders feel fairly compensated, contributing to their satisfaction with professional development. Additionally, the flow of information is open and accessible at all levels, which reduces anxiety due to workload and improves performance (Hofstede, 2001).

Low power distance (PDI) fosters equality among employees, where blue-collar and white-collar roles are considered on an equal footing. This contributes to a sense of workplace equality and reduces anxiety levels caused by hierarchical differences (Hofstede, 2001).

In an innovation-driven environment, low PDI facilitates the acceptance of creative solutions, as employees actively participate in decision-making. Successful innovations are built upon determined supporters who promote and implement those (Van der Vegt et al., 2005). Employees

can reach consensus through logical argumentation and negotiation, strengthening the transparency and effectiveness of work processes.

In conclusion, power distance plays a crucial role in shaping leadership styles, decision-making mechanisms, and organizational communication. The differences between high and low PDI cultures influence employees' attitudes, organizational performance, and leadership effectiveness. Therefore, it is essential for leaders and professionals working in international environments to take cultural differences in power distance into account n order to create a more effective work environment and facilitate the achievement of organizational goals.

Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)

Foreign professionals working in a new cultural environment often face challenges related to uncertainty avoidance or risk at various levels and across different areas, which may differ from their experiences in their home countries. This experience can pertain to decision-making processes, workplace dynamics, and interpersonal relationships within the company. Kirkman and their colleagues (2006), referencing Hofstede (1980b, 45), define the concept of uncertainty avoidance (UA) as "the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and the measures it takes to avoid them, such as ensuring greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and seeking absolute truths and expertise".

The effects of differing uncertainty avoidance indexes between cultures are particularly significant in the globalized labor market (Amzaleg, & Masry-Herzallah, 2021), where multinational companies face challenges daily due to varying cultural norms. Differences between countries with low UAI not only affect organizational strategies and decision-making mechanisms (Podrug, 2011), but also directly impact the workplace environment (Draguns, 2007), employee behavior (Kong, & Jogaratnam, 2007), and adaptation processes (Baker, & Carson, 2011).

Hofstede (2001) summarized the differences between high and low uncertainty-avoiding societies in workplace situations.

Cultures with a **high Uncertainty Avoidance Index** (UAI), such as Greece (112), Portugal (104), Russia (95), and Japan (92), as well as moderately high UAI cultures like Germany (65), typically exhibit strong loyalty between employees and employers. This loyalty often leads to longer-term employment, as employees value stability. In these cultures, larger, well-established organizations are preferred, as they offer security. Interestingly, self-employment is also popular in these societies, as it provides an opportunity for creative flexibility within established rules (Hofstede, 2001).

In societies characterized by a high Uncertainty Avoidance Index, innovators often perceive stringent regulations as restrictive (Zhang et al., 2020). A structured approach to innovation and new ideas is prevalent (Ge, 2024; Toy, 2024), particularly in large organizations that typically maintain dedicated research and development departments (Espig et al., 2021), thus providing a framework for the organized processing of ideas. Leaders in these contexts are deeply involved in the day-to-day operations, exercising oversight and direction over the business. In such cultures, the authority of supervisors is derived from their capacity to exert control and manage uncertainties effectively (Hofstede, 2001).

Leadership styles within these cultures tend to be hierarchical, often operating within highly formalized structures. The strict regulation of business processes serves the dual purpose of ensuring organizational stability and facilitating smooth operational continuity. Research by Frijns and their colleagues (2013) demonstrates that high UAI significantly shapes corporate strategies. Their findings indicate that organizations in these contexts are more inclined to engage in cross-border, diversifying acquisitions as a means of mitigating risk, thereby establishing a more stable operational environment.

Companies in high Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) cultures prioritize precise and clear decision-making, avoiding uncertain situations such as conflicts. Standardization plays a crucial role in steering future developments; however, these strict regulations often hinder innovation and creativity (Reimer, 2005). Innovations are adopted at a slower pace, but once implemented, they are consistently applied (Frijns et al., 2013; Yıldırım et al., 2016).

In these societies, great emphasis is placed on accuracy and precision. Employees appreciate the opportunity for flexible working hours, which contributes to a balance between work and personal life. Employers, typically seeking specialists, place significant value on expertise acquired within a specific field (Ge, 2024). However, supervisors are often skeptical of employees' ambitions, creating an environment marked by pessimism and strong control.

In high uncertainty avoidance cultures, employees demand clear guidelines and predefined frameworks. This is evident in detailed job descriptions, strict regulations, and formalized procedures (Bogićević Milikić, 2009).

In cultures with a **low Uncertainty Avoidance Index** (UAI), such as Singapore (8), Denmark (23), Sweden (29), and China (30), employees are often less loyal to their employers, resulting in more frequent job changes and shorter average employment durations. In such societies, workplace behavior is characterized by lower levels of anxiety, allowing individuals to work hard when necessary, but without the constant internal pressure of continuous activity. In these cultures, the fast-paced lifestyle, relentless rush, or chronic stress due to time constraints does not dominate (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Smaller organizations and startups are preferred, although self-employment is not common. There is a tendency toward skepticism and hesitation in adopting new technological solutions, although innovators often feel more independent in questioning existing rules. These cultures are more open to unconventional ideas and appreciate that senior executives are more involved in high-level strategies than in day-to-day operations. In such environments, power is often linked to positions and relationships rather than to the control and management of uncertainty.

A transformational leadership style is favored, where leaders create a vision for the future and motivate employees' personal and professional development through alignment with the organization's mission and goals. Innovations are welcomed, though they may not always be taken seriously. Precision and accuracy require effort.

In cultures with a low Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI), personal relationships are highly valued in the workplace. Fixed working hours are preferred during work. Regarding job roles, generalists are favored over specialists. Supervisors and leaders are more supportive of employees' ambitions, development, and potential. Flexibility and adaptability are more prevalent (Su et al., 2011), where employees are more open to new situations and less reliant on rigid rules. As a result, low UAI societies often encourage innovation and creativity (Gallego-Álvarez, & Pucheta-Martínez, 2021), although the adoption of new ideas may take longer, and the implementation of related changes can be more cumbersome.

The dimension of uncertainty avoidance plays a particularly important role in managing multicultural teams (Mukherjee et al., 2012). Leaders must be aware of the extent to which team members tolerate uncertainty and accordingly design their communication strategies and decision-making processes. For instance, a low UAI employee group may benefit more from a flexible, open approach and continuous feedback.

It is also evident that the level of uncertainty avoidance influences the success of intercultural adaptation (Venaik, & Brewer, 2010). Employees from low UAI cultures often find hierarchical and bureaucratic systems associated with high uncertainty avoidance to be stressful.

Overall, Hofstede's UAI dimension provides a deeper understanding of behavioral patterns and preferences across different cultures. This knowledge is crucial for international companies to effectively manage the challenges arising from cultural differences, thereby facilitating collaboration within global teams and achieving organizational goals (Hofstede et al., 2002). Understanding and respecting diverse attitudes toward uncertainty management can contribute to more effective intercultural communication, increased organizational flexibility, and support for sustainable development.

Individualism vs. collectivism (IDV)

Individualism and collectivism (IDV) measure the extent to which individuals prioritize their own interests over those of the group, or vice versa. Individualistic cultures value personal freedom and performance, while collectivist cultures emphasize group harmony and cooperation.

Hofstede (2001) characterizes **collectivist** societies through examples such as Guatemala (6), Ecuador (8), Panama (11), and Venezuela (12), where workplace environments are dominated by intra-group relationships (Torres et al., 2023). In these cultures, companies often employ individuals whose family members also work within the organization, and family members or close friends enjoy significant advantages. The aim of employing candidates from the same family is to mitigate the risks associated with inappropriate behavior, as family members take responsibility for preserving the family's reputation. As a result, employees tend to be more committed to the collectivist organization (Wagner et al., 2011) and are more likely to remain with the company for a longer period (Triguero-Sánchez et al., 2022).

In collectivist cultures, the interests of the community and group cohesion take precedence, and individuals often define themselves as members of the community (Hofstede, 2001). They view the success of the group as their own personal success and are willing to make sacrifices to promote the well-being of the community (Basabe, & Ros, 2005). In such cultures, it is natural and essential for every group member's opinion to be considered in workplace decision-making. Leaders are not only responsible for directing the decision-making process but are also often tasked with maintaining group harmony (Yates, & de Oliveira, 2016). The leadership style is not only hierarchical but also consensual (Ali et al., 1997), where the opinions of all individuals are valued and personal interests are subordinated to the common goals. This leadership type fosters team spirit and promotes efforts aimed at collaboration and achieving shared objectives, thereby facilitating the development of trust (Huff, & Kelley, 2005).

In collectivist societies, teamwork plays a leading role (Zoltan et al., 2021), and group consensus is crucial in decision-making processes. In such cultures, it is believed that collective contributions lead to more comprehensive and sustainable outcomes. Decisions are shared among group members, and maintaining group harmony is always prioritized.

One of the key factors in the individualism-collectivism dimension is how individuals treat those they are closely connected with (members of their own group) versus those they have less connection to (members of external groups). In collectivist cultures, favoring in-group members and subordinating external groups is a common phenomenon.

Cross-cultural differences become particularly apparent when a group encounters an international context (Meyer, 2014). In such situations, different individual motivations and expectations can clash in workplace decision-making, often leading to tensions. For example, individuals who prioritize group work may tend to focus primarily on achieving consensus, which can generate tensions during decision-making when cultural differences between groups are present.

In **individualistic** environments, such as the United States (91), Australia (90), the United Kingdom (89), the Netherlands (80), and Germany (67), where individualism is strongly present, nepotism is typically rejected (Schilpzand et al., 2024) as it conflicts with personal interests and is considered undesirable. The relationship between employer and employee is based on the logic of business transactions. This relationship can be terminated by either party, for example, if the employee receives better conditions from another company or if the employer decides to dismiss the employee due to poor performance or business reasons.

In individualistic cultures, individual decision-making, personal autonomy (Husted, & Allen, 2008), and performance (Hung et al., 2022) play a central role. Personal success and career advancement (Garbin et al., 2025) are of significant importance, and individuals are often less inclined to cooperate if it conflicts with their own interests (Gorodnichenko, & Roland, 2012). In such societies, employees tend to compete with each other (Strese et al., 2016), as they may perceive each other as threats, distrust one another, and their workplace success largely depends on their personal achievements. Leaders' decisions are often influenced by the competitive spirit and individual ambitions, and since employees focus on their own careers, the team spirit is not as strong as in collectivist cultures (Triandis, 1995). In these cultures, workplace interactions and relationships are typically formal, and friendships or personal relationships do not dominate work life (Thomas, & Peterson, 2017).

In individualistic cultures, the relationships between individuals are dominated by equality and fairness among group members. Minkov and colleagues (2017) established new national scores for the IDV dimension, emphasizing that their research is based on self-assessment, which provides a broader understanding of the dimension, as respondents may not necessarily identify themselves as part of an in-group or out-group.

Innovation leaders in such cultures aim to support and involve group members, as resistance to change can be reduced through peer involvement and shared responsibility. In individualistic cultures, personal autonomy plays a decisive role (Tatliyer, & Gur, 2022; Legate, & Ryan, 2024). In these environments, individuals are more inclined to assert their own personal opinions and ideas. Managing such conflicts is crucial for effective performance and the success of global organizations.

In summary, the individualism-collectivism dimension examines cultural differences based on social relationships and the individual's relationship with the group. In individualistic cultures, personal freedom, autonomy, and individual success are central values, whereas in collectivist cultures, the interests of the community and group cohesion take precedence. In the former cultures, individual competition and performance drive decision-making, while in the latter, cooperation and consensus are key. The differences between these two dimensions also impact workplace interactions, leadership styles, and personal relationships.

Long-term vs. short-term orientation (LTO)

The Long-Term and Short-Term Orientation (LTO) dimension refers to how societies relate to time and manage traditions and future planning (Alipour, 2021). The differences between long-term and short-term orientations have significant implications for global business strategies and corporate decision-making (Lumpkin et al., 2010). In order for companies to succeed in the international market, it is crucial to appropriately manage the differences between these two orientations, as varying cultural and temporal perspectives may conflict.

Cultures with a **long-term orientation**, such as China (87), Japan (88), South Korea (100), and Germany (83), place emphasis on perseverance (Venkateswaran et al., 2022), respect for traditions (He et al., 2020), and the ability to adapt traditions to changing environments (Pirlog,

2020). In these cultures, a focus on the future, patience, and endurance are considered key values. Employees and organizations prioritize long-term success, continuous development, and hard work in order to achieve results over time. Lifelong learning (Şchiopu, 2024) and ongoing improvement are highly valued. Workers are committed to building their careers in the long term, even if immediate rewards are not forthcoming, and they are willing to work long hours for their personal development. They seek growth opportunities based on the knowledge and experience accumulated throughout their lives, with individual development seen as an integral part of achieving long-term goals (Merkin, 2018).

In cultures with a long-term orientation, workplace relationships are also built with a long-term perspective, and companies focus on employee retention (Aksoy, 2024) and their long-term development. Strategic planning (Rosecká et al., 2021) and investments (Arpaci et al., 2024) that promise long-term returns are preferred. Decisions are made after carefully considering long-term consequences. Business strategies often look ahead decades, and the allocation of time and resources is focused on sustainability in the long term (Sternad et al., 2017). Decision-makers strive to be as well-prepared as possible for future challenges.

In societies with a long-term orientation, respect for traditions and their adaptation play a central role. Traditions are not only values to be preserved but also the foundations that ensure the functioning and stability of society (Hofstede, 2001). As societies evolve dynamically, adapting traditions is crucial in responding to new challenges (Kale, 2006). Therefore, cultures with a long-term orientation look to the future and plan long-term, while continuously adapting to the changing environment.

Cultures with a **short-term orientation**, such as the United States (26), Mexico (24), the Philippines (27), and the United Kingdom (25), focus on immediate results, achieving short-term goals (monthly, quarterly), valuing traditions (Lukacs et al., 2020), and emphasizing instant gratification. In these cultures, workplace decision-making is fast, with the primary concern being that current decisions bring quick gains for companies or individuals. People tend to focus on immediate outcomes, often overlooking long-term consequences if they do not align with short-term goals. Decision-makers concentrate on addressing immediate needs and are prone to rejecting changes that contradict existing traditions or current norms (Harzing, & Hofstede, 1996).

In short-term oriented societies, business practices are often built around short cycles, where success is based on quick feedback and immediate recognition. For companies and employees, it is crucial to achieve results quickly and see the fruits of their labor as soon as possible. Business strategies often focus on short-term profits (Hofstede et al., 2008), and decisions are not always based on long-term considerations. Employee motivation is typically driven by immediate rewards, bonuses, or recognition (Gerlich, 2023), which often diminishes commitment to long-term goals. Rapid decision-making and quick responses to changes characterize these cultures, but such decisions are not always aligned with sustainable development (Tata, & Prasad, 2015).

In short-term oriented cultures, business and societal values concentrate on the present. Society often focuses on fulfilling immediate needs, and traditions are seen more as cultural memories rather than active shaping factors (Lukacs et al., 2020). The emphasis on rapid changes and dynamic decision-making requires continuous adaptation and quick responses from both employees and companies. According to Kolev and their colleagues (2025), decision-making processes in such cultures are swift, with the goal of achieving immediate results, typically through short-term plans and rapid reactions. In these cultures, quick success and immediate results often override long-term sustainability, and decision-makers are prone to overlooking future consequences if they do not align with short-term objectives.

In summary, the dimension of long-term versus short-term orientation pertains to how different cultures relate to time, the future, and change. Cultures with a long-term orientation focus on the future, emphasizing sustainable development, perseverance, and the adaptation of traditions. Decision-making generally takes into account long-term goals and outcomes, with primary considerations given to stability and continuous growth. In contrast, cultures with a short-term orientation concentrate on immediate results, making quick decisions that address present needs and desires. These cultures often exhibit resistance to change, with long-term impacts being less of a priority. The differences between these orientations significantly influence how societies approach goal achievement, decision-making, and development.

Summary&Conslusion

Germany's growing dependence on international professionals is essential to addressing the country's skilled labor shortage (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2024). However, beyond technical qualifications, cultural adaptation is a key factor in successful workplace integration. Hofstede's cultural dimensions provide a framework regarding the main challenges international employees may face and offer guidance for organizations seeking to improve their adaptation strategies.

One challenge stems from power distance. Germany's moderately low PDI (35) fosters flat hierarchies and direct communication, which may be unfamiliar to professionals from high PDI cultures (e.g., India, China, Russia), where leadership is more hierarchical. Employers can ease this transition by offering leadership coaching and mentorship programs that clarify workplace expectations.

Germany's moderately high uncertainty avoidance (65) reflects a preference for structured processes and clear regulations. Employees from low UAI cultures (e.g., the US, Denmark) may struggle with perceived bureaucracy, while those from high UAI cultures (e.g., Japan, Greece) may find stability reassuring. Onboarding programs and intercultural training can help professionals adjust to Germany's mix of structure and innovation.

The moderately high individualism score (67) highlights a work culture centered on personal accountability and direct feedback. Professionals from collectivist cultures (e.g., Turkey, Brazil) may need support in adapting to independent work expectations. Encouraging collaboration-focused initiatives and cultural sensitivity training can bridge this gap.

Germany's long-term orientation (83) emphasizes career stability, strategic planning, and gradual advancement. Employees from short-term-oriented cultures (e.g., the US, Mexico) may need guidance in adjusting to long-term career development expectations. Structured mentorship programs can provide support.

To facilitate successful integration and retention of international professionals, organizations should implement:

- Cultural onboarding & training – Pre-arrival orientation and intercultural workshops for both employees and managers.
- Language & communication support – Workplace-specific German language courses and training on Germany's direct feedback culture.
- Mentorship & networking initiatives – Pairing international hires with experienced colleagues and encouraging participation in professional networks.
- Flexible workplace policies – Adapting work structures to accommodate diverse work styles and easing transitions with hybrid work options.

Cultural adaptation is critical for the long-term success of international IT professionals in Germany. Hofstede's dimensions reveal key cultural differences that influence workplace

behavior, from hierarchical expectations to communication styles and decision-making processes. By implementing structured adaptation programs, German employers can foster an inclusive and productive work environment while maximizing the potential of international talent. Future research should focus on industry-specific adaptation challenges and evaluating the effectiveness of integration programs in the German job market.

References

Aksoy, E. (2024). Investigating the effects of organizational long-term orientation and employees' pay satisfaction on turnover intentions. *Business and Economics Research Journal, 15*(3), 277–290.

Ali, A. J., Taqi, A. A., & Krishnan, K. (1997). Individualism, collectivism, and decision styles of managers in Kuwait. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 137*(5), 629–637. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224549709595484

Alipour, A. (2021). What matters for the future? Comparing Globe's future orientation with Hofstede's long-term orientation. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 28*(4), 734–759. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-08-2020-0163

Amzaleg, M., & Masry-Herzallah, A. (2021). Cultural dimensions and skills in the 21st century: The Israeli education system as a case study. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 30*(5), 765–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2021.1873170

Arpaci, I., Aslan, O., & Kevser, M. (2024). Evaluating short- and long-term investment strategies: Development and validation of the investment strategies scale (ISS). *Financial Innovation, 10*, 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-023-00573-4

Baker, D. S., & Carson, K. D. (2011). The two faces of uncertainty avoidance: Attachment and adaptation. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*. Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management. Retrieved from https://jbam.scholasticahq.com

Basabe, N., & Ros, M. (2005). Cultural dimensions and social behavior correlates: Individualism-collectivism and power distance. *International Review of Social Psychology, 18*(1), 189–225. Retrieved from https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=5e4921b650bf7fbbd7a6476e082afcfd150a4ddb

Bjørge, A. (2007). Power distance in English lingua franca email communication. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 60–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00133.x

Bloom, M. (1999). The performance effects of pay dispersion on individuals and organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 42(1), 25–40. https://doi.org/10.2307/256872

Bogićević Milikić, B. (2009). The influence of culture on human resource management processes and practices: The propositions for Serbia. *Economic Annals, 54*(181), 93–110. https://doi.org/10.2298/EKA0981093B

Bundesagentur für Arbeit. (2024, October 14). Statistik der Bundesagentur für Arbeit: Beschäftigte nach Staatsangehörigkeiten (Quartalszahlen). Retrieved from http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de

Bundesagentur für Arbeit. (2025a, January). Statistik der Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Berichte: Analyse Arbeitsmarkt, Arbeitsmarkt für Ausländer. Retrieved from https://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/SiteGlobals/Forms/Suche/Einzelheftsuche_Formular.html?topic_f=analyse-d-arbeitsmarkt-auslaender

Bundesagentur für Arbeit. (2025b, January). Statistik der Bundesagentur für Arbeit, Berichte: Analyse Arbeitsmarkt, Gemeldete Arbeitsstellen nach Berufen (Engpassanalyse). Retrieved from https://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de

Cseh Papp I., Bilan, S., & Dajnoki K. (2018). *Globalization of the labour market – Circular migration in Hungary.* Journal of International Studies, 12(2), 182-200. https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2019/12-2/11

Cseh Papp I., & Keczer G. (2019*). Management challenges imposed by the ongoing economic changes. Taylor: Gazdálkodás- És Szervezéstudományi Folyóirat: A Virtuális Intézet Közép-Európa Kutatására Közleménye*, 2(36), 24-35. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352258755

Draguns, J. G. (2007). Culture's impact at the workplace and beyond. *Reviews in Anthropology, 36*(1), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/00938150601177579

Earley, P. C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 80*(3), 192–212. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2863

Espig, A., Mazzini, I. T., Zimmermann, C., & de Carvalho, L. C. (2021). National culture and innovation: a multidimensional analysis. *Innovation & management review*, *19*(4), 322-338.

Farh, J.-L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). "Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China and the United States." *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 715–729.

Farzana, S., & Charoensukmongkol, P. (2023). Using approach-inhibition theory of power to explain how participative decision-making enhances innovative work behavior of high power distance-oriented employees. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance.* https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-10-2022-0304

Fikret Pasa, S. (2000). Leadership influence in a high power distance and collectivist culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *21*(8), 414-426.

Frijns, B., Gilbert, A., Lehnert, T., & Tourani-Rad, A. (2013). Uncertainty avoidance, risk tolerance, and corporate takeover decisions. *Journal of Banking & Finance, 37*(7), 2457-2471. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2013.02.010

Gallego-Álvarez, I., & Pucheta-Martínez, M. (2021). Hofstede's cultural dimensions and R&D intensity as an innovation strategy: a view from different institutional contexts. *Eurasian Business Review*, 11, 191 – 220. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40821-020-00168-4.

Garbin, L., Leandro, A., Gomes, D., & Ribeiro, N. (2025). The impact of culture on career management. In *Resiliency strategies for long-term business success* (pp. 26). https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9168-6.ch010

Ge, J. (2024). The Influence of Uncertainty Avoidance on Cultures and Business Practices. *Research and Commentary on Humanities and Arts*, *2*(2).

Gerlich, M. (2023). How short-term orientation dominates western businesses and the challenges they face—An example using Germany, the UK, and the USA. *Administrative Sciences, 13*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13010025

Ghosh, A. (2011). Power distance in organizational contexts: A review of collectivist cultures. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 47*(1), 89.

Gorodnichenko, Y., & Roland, G. (2012). Understanding the individualism-collectivism cleavage and its effects: Lessons from cultural psychology. In M. Aoki, T. Kuran, & G. Roland (Eds.), *Institutions and comparative economic development* (International Economic Association Series, pp. 213–236). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137034014_12

Harzing, A., & Hofstede, G. (1996). Planned change in organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 14*, 297-340. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Anne-Wil-Harzing/publication/282577802_Planned_Change_in_Organizations_The_Influence_of_National_Culture/links/585e495d08ae329d61f70ac2/Planned-Change-in-Organizations-The-Influence-of-National-Culture.pdf

Hauff, S., & Richter, N. (2015). Power distance and its moderating role in the relationship between situational job characteristics and job satisfaction: An empirical analysis using different cultural measures. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 22*(1), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCM-11-2013-0164

He, Q., Sun, Q., Shi, Z., Zhang, X., & Hu, F. (2018). Effect of social distance on outcome evaluation in self–other decision-making: Evidence from event-related potentials. *NeuroReport, 29*(18), 1499–1503. https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0000000000001141

He, J., & Sun, L. (2020). Does continuity matter? Developing a new long-term orientation structure in a cross-cultural context: A study on supply chain relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management, 88*, 186–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.05.003

Hofstede, G. (1980b). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics, 9*(1), 42–63.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. SAGE.

Hofstede, G., Van Deusen, C., Mueller, C., et al. (2002). What goals do business leaders pursue? A study in fifteen countries. *Journal of International Business Studies, 33*(6), 785–803. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8491044

Hofstede, G. J., Jonker, C. M., & Verwaart, T. (2008). Long-term orientation in trade. In *Complexity and Artificial Markets* (pp. 107-119). Springer.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (1st ed.). SAGE Publications.

Huff, L., & Kelley, L. (2005). Is collectivism a liability? The impact of culture on organizational trust and customer orientation: A seven-nation study. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(1), 96–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00478-2

Hung, Y.-C., Su, T.-C., & Lou, K.-R. (2022). Impact of organizational culture on individual work performance with national culture of cross-strait enterprises as a moderator. *Sustainability, 14*(11), 6897. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116897

Husted, B. W., & Allen, D. B. (2008). Toward a model of cross-cultural business ethics: The impact of individualism and collectivism on the ethical decision-making process. *Journal of Business Ethics, 82*(2), 293–305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9888-8

Jittaruttha, C. (2015). Pyramid Culture and Power Distance: Intangible Barriers Restricting Democratization. *China-USA Business Review*, 229.

Kale, S. H. (2006). Designing culturally compatible internet gaming sites. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal, 10*(1). Retrieved from https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/grrj/vol10/iss1/5

Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organizations. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 13*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/097226290901300101

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The Impact of Cultural Values on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Self-Managing Work Teams: The Mediating Role of Employee Resistance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(3), 557–569. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069370

Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., & Gibson, C. B. (2006). A quarter century of culture's consequences: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(3), 285 – 320. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400202

Kolev, K. D., Dykes, B. J., Kang, S. (Sam), Hughes-Morgan, M., & Ferrier, W. J. (2025). Fast or slow? A meta-analysis on the performance implications of decision, implementation, and response speed. *Journal of Management Scientific Reports, 3*(1), 40-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/27550311241291976

Kong, M., & Jogaratnam, G. (2007). The influence of culture on perceptions of service employee behavior. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 17*(3), 275–297. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520710744308

Legate, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2024). Individual autonomy. In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69909-7_1507-2

Low, Y. M., Sambasivan, M., & Ho, J. A. (2021). Impact of abusive supervision on counterproductive work behaviors of nurses. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *59*(2), 250-278.

Lukacs, E., Lovin, D., & Stefan, R. (2020). Empirical study regarding long-term versus short-term orientation in Romania. *Proceedings of the International Conference*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu

Lumpkin, G. T., Brigham, K. H., & Moss, T. W. (2010). Long-term orientation: Implications for the entrepreneurial orientation and performance of family businesses. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 22*(3–4), 241–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985621003726218

Luo, S., Wang, J., & Tong, D. Y. K. (2020). Does power distance necessarily hinder individual innovation? A moderated-mediation model. *Sustainability*, *12*(6), 2526.

Magee, J., & Smith, P. (2013). The Social Distance Theory of Power. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17, 158 – 186. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868312472732.

Mathew, S., & Taylor, G. (2018). Power distance in India. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management.* https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-02-2018-0035

Merkin, R. S. (2006). Power Distance and Facework Strategies. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *35*(2), 139–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475750600909303

Merkin, R. S. (2018). Long/short-term orientation, facework, and organizational relationships. In *Saving Face in Business*(pp. 121-137). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59174-6_9

Meyer, E. (2014). *The culture map: Breaking through the invisible boundaries of global business*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Minkov, M., Dutt, P., Schachner, M., Morales, O., Sanchez, C., Jandosova, J., Khassenbekov, Y., & Mudd, B. (2017). A revision of Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimension: A new national index from a 56-country study. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 24*(3), 386–404. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-11-2016-0197

Mukherjee, D., Hanlon, S. C., Kedia, B. L., & Srivastava, P. (2012). Organizational identification among global virtual team members: The role of individualism-collectivism and uncertainty avoidance. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 19*(4), 526–545. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527601211270002

Ni, Y., Ding, W., Li, D., & Xing, L. (2024). Internal information asymmetry and power distance. *Research in International Business and Finance, 64,* 102477. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2024.102477

Pirlog, A. (2020). Intercultural "diagnosis" of management in the Republic of Moldova according to Geert Hofstede model: Comparative analysis. *Centre for Studies in European Integration Working Paper*. Retrieved from https://ceeol.com

Podrug, N. (2011). Influence of national culture on decision-making style. *The South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, *6*(1), 37–44. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10033-011-0004-0

Reimer, A. (2005). *Die Bedeutung der Kulturtheorie von Geert Hofstede für das internationale Management* (Wismarer Diskussionspapiere, No. 20/2005). Hochschule Wismar, Fachbereich Wirtschaft, Wismar.

Richardson, R., & Smith, S. (2007). The influence of high/low-context culture and power distance on choice of communication media: Students' media choice to communicate with Professors in Japan and America. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*(4), 479–501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.01.002

Rinne, T., Steel, G. D., & Fairweather, J. (2012). Hofstede and Shane revisited: The role of power distance and individualism in national-level innovation success. *Cross-cultural research*, *46*(2), 91-108.

Rosecká, N., Machek, O., Stasa, M., & Kubíček, A. (2021). The role of long-term orientation, strategic planning, and family involvement in CSR policies: A conceptual framework. *European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship.* https://doi.org/10.34190/EIE.21.015

Roozmand, O., Ghasem-Aghaee, N., Hofstede, G. J., Nematbakhsh, M. A., Baraani-Dastjerdi, A., & Verwaart, T. (2011). Agent-based modeling of consumer decision-making process based on power distance and personality. *Knowledge-Based Systems, 24*(7), 1075–1095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2011.05.001

Schilpzand, P., Lagios, C., & others. (2024). Family first: An integrative conceptual review of nepotism in organizations. *Human Resource Management.* Wiley Online Library. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22194

Şchiopu, L. (2024). The potential of higher education institution in promoting life long learning. *Science and Education: New Approaches and Perspectives, 26*(3). https://doi.org/10.46727/c.v3.21-22-03-2024.p341-346

Shahzad, K., Naz, F., Iqbal, R., & Chaudhary, R. (2024). When despotic leadership is more detrimental for employee job outcomes? Role of individual-level power distance orientation. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-12-2023-0547

Sternad, D., & Kennelly, J. J. (2017). The sustainable executive: Antecedents of managerial long-term orientation. *Journal of Global Responsibility, 8*(2), 179–195. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-04-2017-0026

Strese, S., Adams, D. R., Flatten, T. C., & Brettel, M. (2016). Corporate culture and absorptive capacity: The moderating role of national culture dimensions on innovation management. *International Business Review, 25*(5), 1149–1168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2016.02.002

Su, Z., Yang, D., & Yang, J. (2011). The match between efficiency/flexibility strategy and organisational culture. *International Journal of Production Research, 50*(19), 5317–5329. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.618149

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of *Culture's consequences*: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 405–439. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018938

Tata, J., & Prasad, S. (2015). National cultural values, sustainability beliefs, and organizational initiatives. *Cross Cultural Management, 22*(2), 278-296. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCM-10-2013-0154

Tatliyer, M., & Gur, N. (2022). Individualism and working hours: Macro-level evidence. *Social Indicators Research.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-022-02921-1

Thomas, D. C., & Peterson, M. F. (2017). *Cross-cultural management: Essential concepts.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Torres, P., Augusto, M., & Quaresma, R. (2023). The influence of institutional and in-group collectivism practices on next-generation engagement in the family business. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research.* https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-02-2022-0123

Toy, R. J. (2024). *Exploring the Benefits of Correlating Leadership Traits With Hofstede's Cultural Dimensional Theory to Increase Leadership's Communication Strategies* (Master's thesis, Tiffin University).

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triguero-Sánchez, R., Peña-Vinces, J., & Matos Ferreira, J. J. (2022). The effect of collectivism-based organisational culture on employee commitment in public organisations. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 83*, 101335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2022.101335

Van der Vegt, G. S., Van de Vliert, E., & Huang, X. (2005). Location-level links between diversity and innovative climate depend on national power distance. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(6), 1171–1182. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.19573116

van Oudenhoven, J. P., Mechelse, L., & De Dreu, C. K. (1998). Managerial conflict management in five European countries: The importance of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity. *Applied psychology, 47*(3), 439-455.

Venaik, S., & Brewer, P. (2010). Avoiding uncertainty in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(8), 1294–1315. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2009.96

Venkateswaran, R. T., Vadivelu, S., & Krishnan, S. (2022). Long-term orientation of South Asian leadership and organizational competitiveness and survival of Sasken Technologies Limited. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies, 11*(4), 385–396. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-11-2019-0208

Wagner, J. A., Humphrey, S. E., Meyer, C. J., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2011). Individualism-collectivism and team member performance: Another look. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(7), 946–963. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.781

Yates, J. F., & de Oliveira, S. (2016). Culture and decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 136,* 106–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.05.003

Yıldırım, E., Arslan, Y., & Türkmen Barutçu, M. (2016). The role of uncertainty avoidance and indulgence as cultural dimensions on online shopping expenditure. *Eurasian Academy of Sciences Journal of Economics, 4*(4). http://dx.doi.org/10.17740/eas.econ.2016.V4-04

Yuan, F., & Zhou, J. (2015). Effects of cultural power distance on group creativity and individual group member creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(7), 990–1007. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2022

Zhang, H., Tian, M., & Hung, T. K. (2020). Cultural distance and cross-border diffusion of innovation: A literature review. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, *33*(2), 241-260.

Zoltan, R., State, M., & Vancea, R. (2021). The two facets of collectivism and preference for teamwork: An empirical research. In *Proceedings of the International Conference "Information Society and Sustainable Development" (ISSD 2021)* (VIIIth Edition, September 10-11, 2021, Targu-Jiu, Gorj County, Romania).