CONSEQUENCES OF CULTURAL PRACTICES ON ADVERTISING: RETHINKING THE ROLE OF INDIVIDUAL'S VALUES VERSUS SOCIAL NORMS FOR CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCH

Salman Saleem *

* School of Business, JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Finland
Contact details: JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Rajakatu 35, 40200 Jyväskylä, Finland

OPEN ACCESS

How to cite this paper: Saleem, S. (2020). Consequences of cultural practices on advertising: Rethinking the role of individual's values versus social norms for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Governance & Regulation, 9*(2), 103-111. http://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv9i2art8

ISSN Print: 2220-9352
ISSN Online: 2306-6784

Received: 21.04.2020
Accepted: 19.06.2020

JEL Classification: M160, M300, M140
DOI: 10.22495/jgrv9i2art8

Abstract

The study has contributed to the current debate on the significance of cultural referenced practices over self-reported values in the identification of culture (e.g., Fischer & Schwartz, 2011; Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2017). The study has examined whether there is a difference in the self-reported values versus cultural-referenced practices concerning masculinity and power distance. Also, which facet of masculinity and power distance, i.e., self-referenced and/or cultural referenced ratings predict the manifestation of such values in the advertising. The study has used a survey method and ask 200 respondents to report masculinity and power distance in their individual behavioural preference, in their social context and the manifestation of masculinity and power distance in advertising. The results show that self-reported and cultural-referenced rating of masculinity and power distance differ significantly. Moreover, the regression analysis shows that the culture-referenced masculinity and power distance predicts the reflection of respective values in advertising, but no such effect of self-reported values are found. Obtained results strengthen the argument that self-reported values did not identify the culture, instead, the normative values did identify the culture. Future international business and cross-cultural corporate governance research should consider the cultural practices of masculinity and power in their cross-cultural investigation.

Keywords: Culture, Self-Referenced Values, Cultural-Referenced Values, Masculinity, Power Distance, Cross-Cultural Research

Authors' individual contribution: The Author is responsible for all the contributions to the paper according to CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) standards.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Scholars from several disciplines, such as management, cross-cultural psychology, marketing, to mention a few, have used various ways to conceptualize and operationalize the culture (Fischer, 2009; Kirkman et al., 2017; Zolfaghari, Möllering, Clark, & Dietz, 2016). For some scholar's culture is a multifaced variable and it can be tapped through social norms, individual values, practices at the cultural level to mention a few (for example see Fischer, 2008). Nevertheless, still, there are disagreements among scholars about what is culture, its self-reported values of individuals or cultural practices, or social norms, to mention a few (Taras, Steel, & Kirkman, 2010). Recently

Kirkman et al. (2017) have said "that the field has a long way to go in fully understanding the complex construct that is culture" (p. 24). Perhaps a predominant approach to operationalize culture come from the cross-cultural psychology, where individual self-reported behavioural preferences are aggregated at country or cultural level and are regarded as cultural values (Fischer, 2006; Sun, D'Alessandro, Johnson, & Winzar, 2014). For example, Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov's (2010) six cultural dimensions, social axiom by Leung and Bond (2004), Markus and Kitayama (1991) self-construals, Triandis (1995) horizontal/vertical individualism and collectivism, to mention a few. In other words, several large-scale studies based on self-reported values assume that aggregated self-reference values are the core of culture (Sun et al., 2014). Some scholars called these aggregated self-reported values as "the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another" (Hofstede, 2000, p. 9). However, another approach namely group-referenced approach, where instead of asking individual values people are asked to report on the behaviour of other members in their society' also have gained the popularity to measure the culture (Fischer, 2009) to mention a few. In doing so, respondents have reported on the descriptive norm of society. For instance, procedural justice by Naumann and Bennett (2000), connectedness versus separateness by Wan, Chiu, Peng, and Tam (2007), individualism-collectivism as descriptive norms by Fischer et al. (2009). Also, a recent massive cross-cultural project namely GLOBE by House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) have measured culture by asking respondents to report their social practical concerning nine values. In describing social value, the respondents have described the gestalt of their culture (Javidan, House, Dorfman, Hanges, & Luque, 2006). To sum up, the group-referenced approach also emerges as an alternative to self-referenced approach and scholars have demonstrated that the former approach captures unique insights into the culture by measuring individual perception of their societies and cultures.

Several scholars have highlighted the caveats of a self-referenced approach in the measurement of culture for cross-cultural research. For instance, social psychology scholars have demonstrated self-reported values vary more within a culture than across cultures (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011; Schwartz, 2014) and there is only very weak correspondence self-referenced and group-referenced (e.g., Fischer, 2006; Wan et al., 2007). For instance, Fischer and Schwartz's (2011) study shows that demonstrated only "modest proportion" of variance in value ratings attributable to country differences. Also, most of the self-reported values are not shared across culture as often claimed because self-referenced values show a greater variance within countries than between countries. Also, scholars have criticized that self-reported values are unlikely to tap certain aspect of culture. For example, Sun et al. (2014) have argued that for the constructs such as "social cynicism", measuring negative assessment of human behaviour, self-referenced cultural dimension might not give information about the culture. The reason is that individuals, regardless of the society in which they live, in their self-reported behaviour tend to disagree with the statements measuring social cynicism such as "I tend to exploit others" (Sun et al., 2014 p. 353). In the same vein, measuring cultural power distance using a self-referenced measure may not provide information about the culture. Because in their individual behavioural preferences people may endorse egalitarian value but such values do not overlap with the cultural practice (Fischer, 2006) and do not tap into social system and culture (Schwartz, 2004).

Thus, capturing certain cultural construct using a self-reported approach is insufficient. Recently, Schwartz (2014) has argued that societal culture is not an individual psychological variable, external to the individual, and cannot be measured by individual self-reported behaviour, instead it can be deduced by its expressions. For example, Gelfand et al. (2011) measured cultural tightness-looseness (CTL), refereeing how much a culture adheres to social norms and tolerates deviance, by asking the individual to report a variety of values and practices in their societies which is external to individuals. Thus, using the cultural-referenced approach to measure the culture, such as accepted rules in society and the general behaviour of society members, may capture the culture and social system (Cialdini & Trost 1998; Schwartz, 2014).

Based on the above discussion we can say that self-referenced values have a greater variation within societies (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011), do not overlap with cultural practices (Fischer, 2006), even individual values are negatively related to cultural practices (House et al., 2004; Javidan et al., 2006). Some cultural constructs cannot be measured by self-reported approach. Also, "most values are not part of the shared meaning systems that many presume to constitute culture" (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011, p. 1137). Therefore, researchers are called for "breaking out of this conventional culture paradigm" (Kirkman et al., 2017, p. 25). An impressive review of a quarter-century of Hofstede-inspired cross-cultural studies published in 40 business and psychology journals concludes that overwhelming majority studies lack in explaining the link between Hofstede's cultural values and organizational outcomes. Thus, an interesting and important question remains unanswered: a) whether self-reported values and culture-referenced practices are similar or different and b) whether self-reported values and/or cultural-referenced practices predict the culture phenomenon. Answering the above question would be of great significance for many domains of cross-cultural research.

The motivation for the present study stems from the belief that self-reported power distance and masculinity values may differ from cultural-referenced practices of respective values. Also, in case of power distance and masculinity self-reported values may not predict the culture instead of culture-referenced practices may predict manifestation of masculinity and power distance in the culture. The study will use a survey method to measure self-referenced and culturally referenced values of masculinity and power distance. Since "advertising is a conduit through which meaning constantly pours from the culturally constituted world to consumer goods" (McCracken, 1986 p. 75). Therefore, to measure the manifestations of masculinity and power distance in culture the

respondents will be asked to report what kind of advertising messages they are receiving concerning power distance and masculinity. Using this approach, the study measures the manifestations of masculinity and power distance in advertising and explore whether these manifestations are related to self-reported values and/or culture referenced practices of masculinity and power distance, respectively.

The study given above aims to make several contributions to the literature. First, the study adds to the current debate comparing self-reported versus cultural referenced as an indicator of the culture (e.g., Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Fischer, 2006; Fischer & Schwartz, 2011; Schwartz, 2014; Kirkman et al., 2017). Since culture-referenced rating, such as GLOBE nine culture dimension (House et al., 2004), cultural tightness-looseness (CTL) (Gelfand, Nishii, & Raver, 2006), emerged as an alternative to self-referenced approach. Therefore, examining whether self-referenced values and cultural referenced practices differ or not. Also examining the predictive value of self-referenced versus culture-referenced values in predicting the culture would strengthen the significance of a cultural-referenced approach. Lastly, previous studies have examined the overlap between cultural and self-referenced ratings (e.g., Oyserman et al., 2002; Fischer, 2006; Wan et al., 2007) and their relationship with self-reported behaviour (e.g., Fischer, 2006) and variability of self-reporting within the culture (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011). To author's best knowledge none of the previous studies has examined the difference in the self-reported versus cultural-referenced masculinity and power distance and their respective power to predict culture. Thus an understanding of the significance of self-reported values versus culture-referenced practices in predicting culture may benefit several cross-cultural research areas such as cross-cultural conflict management, cross-cultural marketing and advertising, international human resources management, cross-cultural corporate management, to mention a few. The paper is organized as follows. First, the study presents the literature review and builds the hypothesis. Second, the methodology section where method, measure, and reliability of measures are reported. This is followed by results and discussion about study hypotheses. Lastly, the study presents the conclusion, implications, limitations, and avenues for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

2.1. Self-referenced versus culture-referenced approach to culture

From several decades' culture as a variable has been topic of interest among scholars from various disciplines such marketing, consumer behaviour, international management, social psychology, and applied psychology (Sun et al., 2014; Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006; Kirkman et al., 2017; Zolfaghari et al., 2016). Consequently, the number of classification and frameworks have been developed to identify and classify culture (e.g., Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Hofstede, 2000; Hofstede et al., 2010; Schwartz, 2004; House et al., 2004). Among several cultural classifications, Hofstede's framework, which was developed to understand the cross-cultural differences of work-related values of IBM employees in various countries, has gained popularity among scholars from many disciplines. Hofstede measured culture using self-reported and then aggregate means scores of these self-reported values are used to compare different countries (Hofstede et al., 2010). Increasingly scholars have used the Hofstede cultural values in cross-cultural studies from several domains such as international management and business (Kirkman et al., 2006, Kirkman et al., 2017), cross-cultural and international advertising research (Saleem & Larimo, 2017) to mention a few. Scholars have emphasized that the self-referenced approach, such as Hofstede's, is simple, practical and offer parsimony to operationalize culture in cross-cultural research (Kirkman et al., 2006). Cross-cultural studies using a self-referenced approach assumes that such values are shared and represent the collective programming of the mind, therefore, affect all cultural manifestations such as cultural practices. If this is true then there should be a positive overlap between self-referenced values and culturally referenced practices (Taras et al., 2010; Fischer, 2006). However, a study by Fischer (2006) shows no relationship between seven out of ten Schwartz's (1992, 1994) self-referenced and culture-referenced values. One of the largest cross-cultural studies by GLOBE from 62 countries has measured culture using the culture-referenced approach. The GLOBE scholars have measured two unique aspects of culture by asking, how things are done to measure cultural practices, and how things should be done to measure the cultural values (House et al., 2004; Javidan et al., 2006). For keeping parsimony, and overview of GLOBE is beyond the scope of this study. The GLOBE study found that across nine dimensions there is a significant negative correlation ($\gamma = -.26$), between personal values and cultural referenced practices (House et al., 2004). Another large-scale study, coving 49 countries, by Terracciano et al. (2005) shows that there is no correlation between personality self-rating and other individual personality ratings. This indicates that self-reported values do not correspond with the cultural practices characterized by the same respondents.

To sum up, while criticizing and owning the limitations of self-referenced approach scholars (e.g., House et al., 2004; Wan et al., 2007; Fischer et al., 2009; Sun et al., 2014) emphasized the significance of culture-referenced approach as they are likely to provide insights into the societal cultural by asking respondents about the perception of society. Scholars from several domains of business have emphasized the significance of GLOBE group-reference approach over Hofstede's self-referenced approach in marketing and advertising research (House, Quigley, & de Luque, 2010). For instance, the GLOBE researcher did find that cultural-reference approach explains several of a social phenomenon such as economic development, competitiveness and social health (Javidan et al., 2006). Scholars from management and social psychology researchers have demonstrated the significance of cultural reference approach for understanding the manifestation of culture (e.g., Fischer, 2009; Wan et al., 2007). A recent impressive meta-analysis by Fischer, Karl, and Fischer (2019) shows that normative culture is better for predicting intentions and behaviours across

cultures. To sum up, the cultural-referenced approach is indeed appropriate for investigating cultural level issues such as communication (Sun et al., 2014).

2.2. Self-referenced and culture-referenced masculinity and its manifestation in culture

Masculinity versus femininity has been a construct of interest by scholars from sociology, psychology, anthropology, and cross-cultural psychology disciplines. Researchers in the sociology discipline have regarded masculinity as a social construct and have explored attributes, behaviours, and roles associated with women and men (Brod, 2018). The prominent cross-cultural scholar Hofstede (2000) has offered a more complex definition of masculinity where he combines gender equality, achievement, and assertiveness (Furrer, Liu, & Sudharshan, 2000; Sharma, 2010). Using the self-reported approach Hofstede asked respondents whether they are driven by competition, success, or caring for others and quality of life (Hofstede et al., 2010). In doing so, Hofstede described societies as masculine versus feminine. In the same vein, Schwartz's (1992) mastery versus harmony constructs measures society's preferences between achievement versus accepting others (Fischer, 2006; Sun et al., 2014). More recently the assertiveness by GLOBE measured "the degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in their relationships with others" (House et al 2004, p. 30). While comparing Hofstede's masculinity and GLOBE assertiveness dimension de Mooij (2017) categorized them as being conceptually similar. In summary, Hofstede's masculinity, GLOBE assertiveness orientation, and Schwartz's mastery versus harmony address the fundamental issues of achievement orientation and success over equality and harmony. The study by Fischer (2006) shows that self-referenced and cultural referenced rating of mastery and harmony values do not overlap. This suggests that self-reported mastery and harmony values are do not corresponds with cultural practices. For GLOBE assertiveness orientation "the values and practices at the societal level were found to be significantly negatively correlated ($\gamma = -0.26$, $p < 0.05$)" (Quigley, de Luque, & House, 2012, p. 74). This suggests that people across 62 countries consider cultural practices more assertive than individual values. Based on the above, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

H1a: Self-referenced masculinity ratings differ significantly from cultural-referenced masculinity ratings.

H1b: Self-referenced masculinity did not predict manifestation of masculinity in culture;

H1c: Instead cultural-referenced masculinity ratings predict the manifestation of masculinity in the culture.

2.3. Self-referenced and culture-referenced power distance and its manifestation in culture

According to Hofstede, power distance is the extent to which the less powerful members of society expect and accept that power is distributed unequally (Hofstede et al., 2010). However, Hofstede et al. (2010) have also reported a greater variance in self-reported power distance within countries than across countries. For instance, in low power distance countries, the respondents from lower socio-economic background rate power distance as high as respondents form similar backgrounds in high power distance countries. Perhaps this represents an important caveat of measuring the construct of power distance using self-referenced ratings. Chirkov, Ryan, and Willness (2005) have emphasized that power distance practices, such as obeying authority and undisputed adherence of customs, may not well internalize in individuals' because power distance practices are against the human basic values of freedom. In the same vain Schwartz (2004) have asserted that people from developed and democratic countries usually inclined to endorse equality values in their individual behavioural preferences but the endorsement of egalitarian values by individual may not represent the power distance in society in general. The study by Fischer (2006), confirms Schwartz's (2004) assertions, the study did find that there is no overlap between self-referenced and cultural referenced egalitarian values. Another large-scale study by GLOBE measuring power distance across 62 societies shows the power distance paradox. The GLOBE study has reported a strong negative correlation ($\gamma = -0.43$, $p < 0.01$) between self-referenced and cultural-referenced power distance (Quigley et al., 2012). These findings suggest that people in all societies found greater power distance in actual cultural practices and wish to have a lower power distance. Based on above the author proposes the following hypothesis:

H2a: Self-referenced power distance ratings differ significantly from cultural-referenced power distance ratings.

H2b: Self-referenced power distance did not predict manifestation of power distance in culture.

H2c: Instead cultural-referenced power distance ratings predict the manifestation of power distance in the culture.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Measures

A variety of ways can be used to investigate the phenomenon under investigation. A survey of opinion of cultural experts, who have a deeper understanding of the culture in which they live in and have close contact with the people of their society, can be done to collect the data. However, getting a good number of responses from such experts would be time-consuming and may raise the concern for the validity of data as such responded may be expert in culture but did not represent the society in general. The alternative way is to survey of opinions of general people on the focal subject. Therefore, the study has used the survey method and collected the data from professionals and students. In total 200 responses were collected after deleting sixteen incomplete responses the final number of responses was 184. For measuring culture, the study has used personal cultural value orientation (PCO) scale by Sharma (2010). He had reconceptualized "Hofstede's five cultural factors as ten personal cultural orientations and develops a new 40-item scale to measure them". Also, Sharma (2010) has established enough validity and reliability of the new scale and its cross-cultural equivalence.

Table 1. Self-referenced and cultural-referenced masculinity and power distance

Self-referenced power distance: I prefer to… *Culture-referenced power distance: In my country people in lower position…*
Conforming to the wishes of someone in a higher position than mine.
Follow orders without asking questions.
Not to refuse a request if someone senior asks me.
Not to disagree with authority figures/person.
Self-referenced masculinity: In my opinion... *Culture-referenced masculinity: In my country, it is generally believed that…*
Women are generally more caring than men.
Men are generally physically stronger than women.
Men are generally more ambitious than women.
Women are generally more modest than men.

For measuring the self-referenced values of masculinity and power distance the study has used the Sharma (2010) personal cultural orientation (PCO) scales. The Sharma (2010) PCO of masculinity and power distance was modified using the referent shift approach proposed by several scholars such as Fischer (2009) and Sun et al. (2014). Briefly the statements such as "I prefer" replaced with "In our society/country people tend to". One graduate student and university lectures have reviewed modification version Sharma PCO that examines the cultural-referenced masculinity and power distance. Also, while measuring self-referenced rating respondents were given clear instructions and asked to reflect on the statements concerning their personal view. In the same vein, while answering a cultural-referenced rating of masculinity and power distance, the respondents were asked to reflect upon these questions with a reference of existing practices in their society and country they live in. The study uses the 7-point Likert scale (i.e., "1" – strongly disagree, to "7" – strongly agree) for questions measuring self and cultural-referenced masculinity and power distance. Table 1 shows the questions used to measure self-reported and culture-referenced, masculinity and power distance.

To measure the manifestation of masculinity and power distance in culture the respondent were asked to rate the occurrence of Pollay's (1983) advertising appeals related to masculinity and power distance respectively on a scale of "1" (never) to "7" (very frequently). Table 2 shows the descriptions of these appeals and their links with masculinity and power distance. To ensure the accuracy and respondent's comprehension the survey was translated into the local language. A professional translation company has translated the survey. Some issues in translation were addressed during two meetings between translator and author.

Table 2. Description of advertising appeals and their links with masculinity and power distance

Cultural dimension	*Advertising appeals*
	Convenient: The product is suggested to be convenient and easy to use.
Masculinity	Dear: This suggests that the product is highly regarded and luxurious.
Power distance	Effective: The product is suggested to be effective, powerful, and capable of producing desired results.
Masculinity	Health: It is emphasized that the product will enhance vigour, vitality, soundness, strength, and the robustness of the body.
Masculinity	Ornamental: Advertisement suggests that the product is decorative and provides aesthetic values.
Power distance	Productivity: The product's capacity to accomplish the goal for it is used.
Masculinity	Status: Using the product is associated with prestige and pride and self-satisfaction.
Power distance	Vain: This value emphasizes that the product provides you with a socially desirable image; for example, graceful, fashionable, and glamorous.

Source: Links between Pollay (1983) appeals and Hofstede cultural dimension adopted from Albers-Miller and Gelb (1996).

3.2. Reliability and validity

The Principle component analysis with varimax rotation was used to establish the dimensionality of manifestations of masculinity and power distance in culture. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.704, above the recommended value of 0.5, and *Bartlett's test of sphericity* was significant ($c2$ (28) = 303.24, $p < .05$). The factor analysis of 8 appeals by Pollay's (1983) have produced a two-factor solution with a total cumulative percentage of the variance of 53.80%. Thus, factor analysis has generated two dimensions namely "manifestation of masculinity in advertising", and "manifestation of power distance in advertising". The *Cronbach's alpha* was greater than 0.80 for all constructs except self-referenced masculinity. After deleting one item self-referenced masculinity Cronbach alpha value was 0.745 which falls within a good Cronbach alpha range. The study has applied two statistical techniques, namely dependent *t-test* and *linear regression*. Before performing the analysis, the several assumptions related to dependent t-test and linear regression checked. Briefly, the visual inspection of histograms and normal Q-Q plots *Shapiro-Wilk's test* ($p > 0.05$) test shows that data is normally distributed. Also, the assumption of the homogeneity of variance was met, as *Leven's test* for equality of variance is non-significant for all variables.

4. RESULTS

The author has proposed that for the masculinity, the self-referenced and culture-referenced masculinity differ significantly. As can be seen in Table 3, that the cultural-referenced masculinity rating is greater than the self-referenced masculinity rating, and the dependent t-test is significant t (184) = 5.71, p = 0.000; *H1a* was supported. Thus,

the data analysis shows that indeed these two facets (i.e., self-referenced and culture-references) masculinity differ significantly. This suggests that the respondents of the survey have experienced greater masculinity in the cultural practices than in their self-reported behaviour. It is noteworthy to mention that the survey was carried out in a country that is traditionally regarded feminine (based on Hofstede masculinity/femininity index). A simple linear regression model was run to predict the manifestation of masculinity based on self-referenced masculinity. A non-significant equation was found (F (1,182)) = 3.54, p = 0.061) with an R^2 of 0.019, thus accepting *H1b*. A simple linear regression model was run to predict the manifestation of masculinity based on cultural-referenced masculinity. A significant equation was found (F (1,182)) = 5.35, p = 0.022) with an R^2 of 0.029, thus accepting *H1c*. In other words, the culture-referenced masculinity predicts the manifestation of masculinity in advertising, and no such effects were found for self-referenced masculinity.

As can be seen in Table 3, the cultural-referenced power distance rating is greater than the self-reference power distance rating and the dependent t-test is significant t (184) = 2.31, p = 0.022, supporting *H2a*. According to obtained results, the respondents have experienced a greater power distance in their cultural practices than in their self-reported power distance rating. It is noteworthy to mention that the survey was carried in a country that is traditionally regarded as a low power distance (based on Hofstede power distance index). A simple linear regression model was run to predict the manifestation of power distance in advertising based on self-referenced power distance. A non-significant equation was found (F (1,182)) = 1.504, p = 0.222) with an R^2 of 0.008, thus accepting *H2b*. A simple linear regression model was run to calculate to predict manifestation of power distance based on self-referenced power distance. A non-significant equation was found (F (1,182)) = 8.843, p = 0.003) with an R^2 of 0.046, thus accepting *H2c*. To sum up consistent with the proposition the data analysis did show that culture-referenced ratings predict the culture and no such predictive value of self-reported power distance was found.

Table 3. Dependent t-test examining the difference between self-referenced and cultural referenced masculinity and power distance

	Mean	*SD*	*Df*	*t-value*	*Sig*
Cultural-referenced masculinity	4.54	1.04	184	5.70	0.000***
Self-referenced masculinity	4.16	1.05			
Cultural-referenced power distance	4.09	0.95	184	2.31	0.022*
Self-referenced power distance	3.91	1.05			

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the current debate on the measurement of culture. Based on previous studies, the author has highlighted several caveats of self-reported values for identifying the culture. Briefly previous studies show that self-reported values have a greater variance within a culture than across culture (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011) and there is only very weak congruence self-reported values and culture-referenced practices (e.g., Fischer, 2006). Scholars have called to the researcher to challenge the conventional wisdom to operationalize the culture (e.g., Fischer, 2009; Fischer & Schwartz, 2011; Schwartz, 2014; Sun et al., 2014; Kirkman et al., 2017). The study has responded to the calls and has addressed an interesting and unexplored question of whether self-reported values differ from cultural practices. Also, which facet of culture self-referenced rating or culture referenced rating predicts the culture. More specifically the study has examined the above questions in the context of two important cultural constructs namely masculinity and power distance. Findings of this study add evidence to the literature that not only self-rating of such values do not overlap with the cultural-referenced rating (Fischer, 2006) but also cultural practices are better predicting the cultural phenomenon.

Some cross-cultural advertising studies have shown self-reported masculinity (e.g., Hofstede's masculinity-femininity cultural index) lack in predicting the gender portrayal across cultures (e.g., Paek, Nelson, & Vilela, 2011; Matthes, Prieler, & Adam, 2016). For example, Matthes et al.'s (2016) comparative analysis of TV commercial across thirteen countries shows that Hofstede's masculinity-femininity cultural index lack in predicting gender stereotype across cultures. Based on obtained results of this study, I can say that such lack of self-reported masculinity in predicting portrayal of gender role, may be due to that self-reported masculinity values are not a good measure to predict gender norms, actual cultural practices, and gender in culture. To sum up, findings of this study add further adds to the literature that cultural practices of masculinity differ significantly with self-reported masculinity values and cultural-referenced masculinity predict manifestation of masculinity in the culture. The implication here is that normative masculinity predicts the culture. More specifically, the advertising managers take into account masculinity practices instead of self-reported masculinity values in determining culturally appropriate advertising. Also, the cross-cultural researcher from other domains, such as management, marketing, international business, international human resource management, should consider normative masculinity in their cross-cultural investigation.

The second construct the study considered is power distance. The study found that the mean of cultural-referenced power distance was greater than self-reported power distance. These findings confirm Schwartz's (2004) assertions that individuals in developed and democratic countries are inclined to report low power distance in their self-report and this differs from the actual practices in society at large. Some advertising studies have shown that Hofstede's power distance cultural index (which are based on aggregate self-reports) did not predict the reflection of the culture in advertising and consumer

attitude towards advertising (e.g., Ji & McNeal, 2001; Gelbrich, Gäthke, & Westjohn, 2012). For instance, even though China is regarded as a high-power distance culture but Chinese children advertising lack in using power distance message (Ji & McNeal, 2001). In the same vein, the self-reported power distance lack in explaining the consumer attitude toward the absurdity in the advertising (Gelbrich et al., 2012). Also, the study responded to a recent call by Kirkman et al. (2017) for measuring the predictive values of power distance at several levels namely, individual and country/society level. The results of this study provided evidence that power distance practices predict the advertising practices. Also, findings add further evidence to the literature that cultural practices of power distance ratings differ significantly from self-reported power distance values, and also cultural-referenced rating of power distance predicts the culture. The implication here is that cultural practices concerning power distance predict the culture. More specifically, advertising manager relies upon power distance practices in determining culturally appropriate advertising. Also, the cross-cultural researcher from other domains such as management, marketing, international business, international human resource management should take into account normative power distance in their cross-cultural investigation.

To sum up, the cultural practices may produce a different picture of society than the self-reported values. Thus, measuring culture by asking people to report the behaviour of other members in society would capture the descriptive norms (Cialdini & Trost, 1998) and may provide better information about the society in general (House et al., 2004). The present study did show evidence of predictive values of a cultural-referenced approach, which measures the norms, in predicting the culture. In contract, the self-referenced approach not only differs from a culture-referenced approach but also lacks in predicting the culture. These findings are in line with the normative view of culture argued by several cross-cultural researchers (e.g., Oyserman et al., 2002; Fischer et al., 2009; Fischer et al., 2019; Wan et al., 2007; Schwartz, 2014). For instance, the study by Wan et al. (2007) shows that a group-referenced approach which measures norms or cultural practices better in taping the culture. Also, findings of this study confirm Kirkman et al.'s (2017) assertion "norms represent an alternative to values in capturing the role of culture" (p. 20). More recently impressive meta-analysis by Fischer et al. (2019) shows that the normative approach of culture is better in predicting intentions and behaviour across culture. More specifically, the above authors have proposed to consider the cross-cultural variability of norms in predicting culture. Lastly in this study, the conceptualization cultural-referenced approach is like that cultural practices by GLOBE's cultural practices. Thus, future cross-cultural studies may use GLOBE's cultural practices indices in their cross-cultural investigation. More specifically, based on obtained results, the author can say that cultural practices predict in determining the appropriateness of the advertising messages across cultures. Also, the cultural practice has been proved useful in a variety of cross-cultural organizational studies, for instance, cultural practices explain entrepreneurial behaviours (Autio, Pathak, & Wennberg, 2013). Based on these study findings and previous studies, the author recommends using cultural practices in the future cross-cultural investigation in a variety of disciplines such as conflict management, cross-cultural marketing, and advertising practices, international human resources management, cross-cultural corporate management, to mention a few.

Like any research, this study has limitations. The study was carried out in one country that is regarded are low power distance and feminine according to cultural index described by Hofstede et al. (2010). Thus, the future researcher may consider the countries that are regarded as high-power distance and masculine according to Hofstede's cultural index to validate the findings of this study. Also, it would be great to include a large number of countries for more valid and generalizable conclusions. Secondly, the study has focused on only two cultural constructs, namely masculinity and power distance. This represents an important void for future researchers to focus on the other cultural constructs such as uncertainty avoidance, future orientation, time orientation, individualism versus collectivism, to mention a few. The study has used the respondent perception of the presence of masculinity and femininity messages in advertising as the manifestation of masculinity and power distance in culture. This approach may have some limitation as the respondent have to rely on his/her memory to rate the occurrence of certain messages in popular media. Therefore, the future researcher may use aided recall method by using some stimuli ads. Also, the future researchers may use some other proxies to measure the manifestation of cultural constructs in culture, such as the visual and verbal manifestation of culture, emotions, expressions, motivations, to mention a few. Moreover, in this study, the consequences of cultural practices have been investigated on advertising. In future studies, the scholar may examine the consequence of cultural practices on a variety of cross-cultural contexts such as corporate governance, leadership, change management, international management, to mention a few. Finally, the findings of this study should be interpreted with caution, as the study has used a small sample and convenience sampling method. Several scholars have argued and demonstrated the effect of several demographical variables (e.g., age, gender, occupation, social class, to mention a few) did influence the culture orientation (for details see Kirkman et al., 2006; Taras et al., 2010). However, this study lacks in providing information if there is any influence of such variables on the findings. This limitation also represents an important void for future researchers, where they may explore if demographical variables influence or change the findings of this study.

REFERENCES

1. Albers-Miller, N. D., & Gelb, B. D. (1996). Business advertising appeals as a mirror of cultural dimensions: A study of eleven countries. *Journal of advertising, 25*(4), 57-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1996.10673512
2. Autio, E., Pathak, S., & Wennberg, K. (2013). Consequences of cultural practices for entrepreneurial behaviors. *Journal of International Business Studies, 44*(4), 334-362. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.15
3. Brod, H. (Ed.). (2018). *The making of masculinities (Routledge revivals): The new men's studies* (1st ed.). London, England: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315738505
4. Chirkov, V. I., Ryan, R. M., & Willness, C. (2005). Cultural context and psychological needs in Canada and Brazil: Testing a self-determination approach to the internalization of cultural practices, identity and well-being. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *36*(4), 423-443. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022105275960
5. Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 151-192). New York: McGraw-Hill.
6. de Mooij, M. (2017). Comparing dimensions of national culture for secondary analysis of consumer behavior data of different countries. *International Marketing Review, 34*(3), 444-456. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-02-2016-0047
7. Fischer, R. (2006). Congruence and functions of personal and cultural values: Do my values reflect my culture's values? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(11), 1419-1431. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167206291425
8. Fischer, R. (2008). Multilevel approaches in organizational settings: Opportunities, challenges and implications for cross-cultural research. In F. J. R. van de Vijver, D. A. van Hemert, & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Individuals and cultures in multi-level analysis* (pp. 173-196). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
9. Fischer, R. (2009). Where is culture in cross-cultural research? An outline of a multi-level research process for measuring culture as a shared meaning system. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 9*(1), 25-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808101154
10. Fischer, R., & Schwartz, S. (2011). Whence differences in value priorities? Individual, cultural, or artifactual sources. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *42*(7), 1127-1144. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022022110381429
11. Fischer, R., Ferreira, M., Assmar, E., Redford, P., Harb, C., Glazer, S. … Achoui, M. (2009). Individualism-collectivism as descriptive norms: Development of a subjective norm approach to culture measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*(2), 187-213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022109332738
12. Fischer, R., Karl, J., & Fischer, M. V. (2019). Norms across cultures: A cross-cultural meta-analysis of norms effects in the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *50*(10), 1112-1126 https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022119846409
13. Furrer, O., Liu, B. S.-C., & Sudharshan, D. (2000). The relationships between culture and service quality perceptions: Basis for cross-cultural market segmentation and resource allocation. *Journal of Service Research*, *2*(4), 355–371. https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050024004
14. Gelbrich, K., Gäthke, D., & Westjohn, S. A. (2012). Effectiveness of absurdity in advertising across cultures. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *18*(4), 393-413. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2012.693058
15. Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., & Raver, J. L. (2006). On the nature and importance of cultural tightness-looseness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(6), 1225-1244. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1225
16. Gelfand, M., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B., & Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, *332*(6033), 1100-1104. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1197754
17. Hofstede, G. (2000). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills. CA: Sage Publications.
18. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill. Retrieved from https://e-edu.nbu.bg/pluginfile.php/900222/mod_resource/content/1/G.Hofstede_G.J.Hofstede_M.Minkov%20-%20Cultures%20and%20Organizations%20-%20Software%20of%20the%20Mind%203rd_edition%202010.pdf
19. 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.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/21085408/Culture_Leadership_and_Organizations_The_GLOBE_Study_of_62_Societies
20. House, R. J., Quigley, N. R., & de Luque, M. S. (2010). Insights from Project GLOBE: Extending global advertising research through a contemporary framework. *International Journal of Advertising*, *29*(1), 111-139. https://doi.org/10.2501/S0265048709201051
21. Javidan, M., House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & de Luque, M. S. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *37*(6), 897-914. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400234
22. Ji, M. F., & McNeal, J. U. (2001). How Chinese children's commercials differ from those of the United States: A content analysis. *Journal of Advertising*, *30*(3), 79-92. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2001.10673647
23. 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
24. Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., & Gibson, C. B. (2017). A retrospective on Culture's Consequences: The 35-year journey. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *48*(1), 12-29. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-016-0037-9
25. Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.
26. Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (2004). Social axioms: A model for social beliefs in multicultural perspective. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 36, pp. 119-197). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(04)36003-X
27. Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224
28. Matthes, J., Prieler, M., & Adam, K. (2016). Gender-role portrayals in television advertising across the globe. *Sex Roles*, *75*(7-8), 314-327. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0617-y

29. McCracken, G. (1986). Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *13*(1), 71-84. https://doi.org/10.1086/209048
30. Naumann, S. E., & Bennett, N. (2000). A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*(5), 881-889. https://doi.org/10.5465/1556416
31. Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 3-72. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3
32. Paek, H.-J., Nelson, M. R., & Vilela, A. M. (2011). Examination of gender-role portrayals in television advertising across seven countries. *Sex Roles*, *64*(3-4), 192-207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9850-y
33. Pollay, R. W. (1983). Measuring the cultural values manifest in advertising. *Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, *6*(1), 71-92. Retrieved from https://works.bepress.com/richard_pollay/25/
34. Quigley, N. R., de Luque, M. S., & House, R. J. (2012). Project GLOBE and cross-cultural advertising research: Developing a theory-driven approach. In S. Okazaki (Ed.), *Handbook of research on international advertising* (pp. 61-87). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781001042.00013
35. Saleem, S., & Larimo, J. (2017). Hofstede cultural framework and advertising research: An assessment of the literature. In G. Christodoulides, A. Stathopoulou, & M. Eisend (Eds.), *Advances in advertising research* (Vol. 3, pp. 247-263). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Gabler. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-15220-8_18
36. Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6
37. Schwartz, S. H. (2004). Mapping and interpreting cultural differences around the world. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, & P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures, dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
38. Schwartz, S. H. (2014). Rethinking the concept and measurement of societal culture in light of empirical findings. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *45*(1), 5-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113490830
39. Sharma, P. (2010). Measuring personal cultural orientations: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *38*(6), 787-806. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-009-0184-7
40. Sun, G., D'Alessandro, S., Johnson, L. W., & Winzar, H. (2014). Do we measure what we expect to measure? Some issues in the measurement of culture in consumer research. *International Marketing Review*, *31*(4), 338-362. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-03-2012-0055
41. Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B. L. (2010). Negative practice-value correlations in the GLOBE data: Unexpected findings, questionnaire limitations and research directions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *41*(8), 1330-1338. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2010.30
42. Terlutter, R., Diehl, S., & Mueller, B. (2012). Typologies of cultural dimensions and their applicability to international advertising. In S. Okazaki (Ed.), *Handbook of research on international advertising* (pp. 88-108). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781001042.00014
43. Terracciano, A., Abdel-Khalek, N. Ádám, L., Adamovová, C. K., Ahn, H. N., Ahn, B. … McCrae, R. R. (2005). National character does not reflect mean personality trait levels in 49 cultures. *Science*, *310*(5745), 96-100. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1117199
44. Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
45. Wan, C., Chiu, C. Y., Peng, S., & Tam, K. P. (2007). Measuring cultures through intersubjective cultural norms: Implications for predicting relative identification with two or more cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *38*(2), 213-226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022106297300
46. Zolfaghari, B., Möllering, G., Clark, T., & Dietz, G. (2016). How do we adopt multiple cultural identities? A multidimensional operationalization of the sources of culture. *European Management Journal*, *34*(2), 102-113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.01.003