RESEARCH DIALOGUE

The Horizontal/Vertical Distinction in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research

Sharon Shavitt

University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign

Ashok K. Lalwani

University of Texas—San Antonio

Jing Zhang

University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

Carlos J. Torelli

University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign

We argue for the importance of a relatively new cultural distinction in the *horizontal* (valuing equality) or *vertical* (emphasizing hierarchy) nature of cultures and cultural orientations. A review of the existing cross-cultural literature is presented suggesting that, although the contribution of the horizontal/vertical distinction is sometimes obscured by methods that conflate it with other dimensions, its impact is distinct from that associated with individualism–collectivism. We present studies that highlight several sources of value for the horizontal/vertical distinction—as a predictor of new consumer psychology phenomena and as a basis for refining the understanding of known phenomena. Results support the utility of examining this distinction for the understanding of personal values, advertising and consumer persuasion, self-presentational patterns, and gender differences. Methodological issues in studying the horizontal/vertical distinction are also discussed.

The bottom line for those at the top.

——Headline of advertisement for the *Financial Times*.

In this recent ad appearing in the United States, a well-dressed businessman stands on a helipad atop a city sky-scraper, reading the *Financial Times.* The ad boasts that readers of this paper are mostly, "CEOs, CFOs, COOs, and the like," and the depiction appears to confirm this claim. Ads such as this one, and many others like it, appeal to hierarchy and status values. Indeed, manifestations of such values are commonplace in much of our social and consumer landscape. What do they reveal about culture?

In this article, we address the importance of such values in the cultural patterning of consumer judgments and behaviors. Our argument links to a relatively new distinction in the study of culture between horizontal (valuing equality) and vertical (emphasizing hierarchy) cultures or cultural orientations. We present evidence that highlights several sources of value for a vertical/horizontal distinction—as a predictor of new consumer psychology phenomena not anticipated by a broader focus on individualism–collectivism, and as a basis for refining the understanding of existing phenomena linked to individualism–collectivism. Finally, we propose several future research questions stimulated by a consideration of this distinction, and discuss some conceptual and methodological challenges entailed in their pursuit.

Correspondence should be addressed to Sharon Shavitt, Department of Business Administration, University of Illinois, 350 Wohlers Hall, Champaign, IL 61820. E-mail: shavitt@uiuc.edu

A great deal has been learned in recent years about the role of culture in consumer psychology. For instance, in the persuasion domain, extensive research has clearly established that the content of and responses to advertising appeals are culturally influenced. Some cultures are more likely to use certain kinds of ad appeals than are other cultures (e.g., Alden, Hoyer, & Lee, 1993; Choi & Miracle, 2004; Han & Shavitt, 1994; Hong, Muderrisoglu, & Zinkhan, 1987; Kim & Markus, 1999). Culturally matched ad appeals are more likely to be effective than mismatched appeals (e.g., Aaker & Maheswaran, 1997; Han & Shavitt, 1994; Zhang & Gelb, 1996). A consumer's culture or cultural orientation also influences the nature of information processing that accompanies a message (Aaker & Maheswaran, 1997; Aaker & Sengupta, 2000; Alden, Stayman, & Hoyer, 1994; Shavitt, Nelson, & Yuan, 1997), the role of affect in that processing (Aaker & Williams, 1998), as well as the types of goals that motivate consumers (Aaker & Lee, 2001). Moreover, studies have established that national culture (e.g., United States compared to Hong Kong), individual differences in cultural orientation (e.g., individualistic compared to collectivistic), and salient self-construal (e.g., independent compared to interdependent) yield parallel effects on salient goals, information processing, and persuasion (Aaker & Lee, 2001; Gardner, Gabriel, & Lee, 1999; Lee, Aaker, & Gardner, 2000; Wang, Bristol, Mowen, & Chakraborty, 2000).

However, despite the rapidly accumulating evidence about the role of culture in consumer psychological phenomena, nearly all of the evidence has dealt with a broad-based cultural distinction—the distinction between *individualist* (IND) and *collectivist* (COL), or *independent* and *interdependent,* cultural classifications. In individualistic cultures, people tend to have independent self-construals. They prefer independent relationships with others and subordinate the goals of their in-groups to their own personal goals. In collectivistic cultures, in contrast, people tend to have interdependent self-construals. They prefer interdependent relationships to others and subordinate their personal goals to those of their in-groups (Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995).

This distinction is profoundly important, and thus represents the most broadly used dimension of cultural variability for cross-cultural comparison (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). However, there are limitations on the insights afforded by any broad dimension. Further refinement can stimulate new insights and afford a more nuanced understanding of the link between culture and consumer phenomena (Maheswaran & Shavitt, 2000).

HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM

Describing a delineation of different "species" of individualism and collectivism (INDCOL), Triandis and his colleagues

(Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis, 1995; Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) recently proposed that, nested within each INDCOL category, some societies are *horizontal* (valuing equality) whereas others are *vertical* (emphasizing hierarchy). This distinction resembles the *power distance* continuum at the national level (Hofstede, 1980, 2001), although as we will discuss later, there are important conceptual and structural distinctions. The horizontal/vertical distinction is also conceptually related to personal values such as power, achievement, self-direction, and conformity (e.g., Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990). The horizontal/vertical distinction emerges from the observation that American or British individualism differs from, say, Swedish or Danish individualism in much the same way that Korean or Japanese collectivism differs from the collectivism of the Israeli kibbutz.

In vertical, individualist societies or cultural contexts (VI; e.g., United States, Great Britain, France), people tend to be concerned with improving their individual status and standing out—distinguishing themselves from others via competition, achievement, and power. In contrast, in horizontal, individualist societies or cultural contexts (HI; e.g., Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Australia), people prefer to view themselves as equal to others in status. Rather than standing out, the focus is on expressing one's uniqueness and establishing one's capability to be successfully self-reliant (Triandis & Singelis, 1998). In vertical, collectivist societies or cultural contexts (VC; e.g., Korea, Japan, India), people focus on complying with authorities and on enhancing the cohesion and status of their in-groups, even when that entails sacrificing their own personal goals. In horizontal, collectivist societies or cultural contexts (HC; exemplified historically by the Israeli kibbutz), the focus is on sociability and interdependence with others within an egalitarian framework (see Erez & Earley, 1987).

Thus, although individualist societies share a focus on self-reliance, independence, and hedonism, Scandinavians and Australians (societies characterized as HI) show aversion to conspicuously successful persons and to braggarts, emphasizing instead the virtues of modesty (e.g., Askgaard, 1992; Daun, 1991, 1992; Feather, 1994; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). In contrast, people in the United States (VI) have been shown to aspire to distinction, achievement, success, and being or having "the best" (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Weldon, 1984). In fact, in the United States, "success is communicated, shared and displayed because it is natural to show off" (de Mooij, 1998, p. 195).

Similarly, although collectivists share an interdependent worldview, Koreans and other East Asians (VC) emphasize deference to authority and preservation of harmony in the context of hierarchical relations with others. Indeed, the status of one's family and other key in-groups establishes one's individual social standing in VC cultures. In contrast, in the Israeli kibbutz (HC), the emphasis is neither on har-

TABLE 1
Motives Characterizing Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism

	Horizontal (Self at the Same Level as Others)	Vertical (Self in a Hierarchy Relative to Others)
Individualism (independent self)	Being distinct and separate from others	Improving individual status via competition
	Being self-directed, self-reliant	Seeking achievement, power, prestige
	Modesty, not conspicuousness	Standing out
	Expressing uniqueness	Display of success, status
Collectivism (interdependent self)	Maintaining benevolent relationships	Maintaining and protecting in-group status
	Common goals with others	Deference to authorities and to in-groups
	Social appropriateness	Conformity
	Sociability	Harmony
	Cooperation	

mony nor status. Instead, honesty, directness, and cooperation are valued, within a framework of assumed equality (Gannon, 2001; Kurman & Sriram, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

This four-category typology fits with Fiske's (1992) categories of sociality, communal sharing (corresponding to collectivism), market pricing (corresponding to individualism), equality matching (horizontal relationships), and authority ranking (vertical relationships; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

The articulation of these horizontal and vertical categories, summarized in Table 1, adds an important degree of refinement to the broad individualism/collectivism cultural classifications. Research to date has developed methods for measuring the HI, VI, HC, and VC cultural orientations within culture, as well as explored the dimensionality and cross-cultural generality of these categories (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis et al., 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).[1] People with a VI orientation are more likely to agree with such items as "winning is everything" and "it is important that I do my job better than others," whereas people with an HI orientation are more likely to agree that "I'd rather depend on myself than others," and "my personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me." People with a VC orientation are more likely to agree with such items as "it is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want," and "it is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups," whereas people with an HC orientation are more likely to agree that "to me, pleasure is spending time with others," and "the well-being of my coworkers is important to me" (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

Triandis and Gelfand (1998) provided evidence for the convergent and divergent validity of these four constructs and reported interrelations between their 16-item cultural-orientation measure and other measures that fit the conceptual definitions of these categories. They also showed that

their cultural-orientation measure shares the same factor structure in Korea as was previously identified in the U.S. (see also Chiou, 2001; Soh & Leong, 2002, for additional evidence of cross-national structural equivalence). Robert, Lee, and Chan (2006) showed the robustness of the 32-item attitudinal measure (Singelis, et al., 1995) in tapping the same constructs across countries (see also Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003).

To date, however, little is known about the consequences of these specific cultural orientations and categories. For instance, do individualistic people with HI compared to VI orientations differ in their self-presentational styles? Do different persuasive messages appeal to collectivistic people who have a VC compared to an HC cultural orientation or background? More generally, how does consideration of the horizontal/vertical distinction enhance cultural theories or qualify past INDCOL conclusions? In this article, we address these questions through existing literature and new empirical evidence, to support the importance of the horizontal/vertical distinction for the study of cross-cultural consumer psychology.

REFINING THE INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM CONSTRUCTS

The conceptualizations of IND and COL have historically been broad and multidimensional, summarizing a host of differences in focus of attention, self-definitions, motivations, emotional connections to in-groups, as well as belief systems and behavioral patterns (Bond, 2002; Ho & Chiu, 1994; Hofstede, 1980; Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Triandis, 1995; Triandis et al., 1988; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985). The same is true for the parallel constructs of independent and interdependent self-concepts (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Although critiques of the multifaceted nature of these constructs are not hard to find (e.g., Briley & Wyer, 2001), the breadth of these constructs has helped to structure the discourse on the psychological impacts of culture across the last 20 years of cross-cultural research (Oyserman et al., 2002).

---

[1]It should be noted that, at the individual level, these four classifications are properly termed *horizontal and vertical allocentrism/ideocentrism* (see Triandis, 1995). However, we use the same HI, VI, HC, and VC terminology at the cultural and individual levels to maintain consistency with most of the literature.

Nevertheless, several recent studies have proposed useful refinements to the broader INDCOL or independent/interdependent cultural categories. For instance, Rhee, Uleman, and Lee (1996) distinguished between kin and nonkin versions of IND and COL and showed that Asians and European Americans manifested distinct patterns of relations between kin and nonkin IND.

Gelfand, Bhawuk, Nishii, and Bechtold (2004) distinguished between institutional and in-group collectivism, and showed that there can be substantial differences in the degree to which a society encourages institutional collective action versus interpersonal interdependence (e.g., Scandinavian societies emphasize the former but not the latter).

Gaines et al. (1997) distinguished between IND, COL, and *familism* (orientation toward the welfare of one's family), and showed that this delineation better captured the cultural orientations observed in racial minority respondents in the United States. IND, COL, and familism proved to be separate dimensions that differed in their ability to account for race/ethnicity differences in cultural values.

Cross, Bacon, and Morris (2000) demonstrated that a more relational version of interdependence applies in Western compared to Eastern societies, and provided a scale for its measurement (see also Kemmelmeier & Oyserman, 2001). Gabriel and Gardner (1999) examined this distinction in relational (dyadic) versus more group-oriented interdependence and reported gender differences indicating that women are more relational but less group-oriented than men in their patterns of interdependent judgments and behaviors. Theirs are among several studies pointing to gender differences in specific cultural orientations (see Cross & Madson, 1997; Kashima et al., 1995; Wang et al., 2000).

In sum, the nature and meaning of IND and COL (or of independent and interdependent self-construals) appear to vary across cultural, institutional, gender, and ethnic lines. Although the breadth of the INDCOL constructs lends integrative strengths, further refinement of these categories has the potential to enhance predictive validity and understanding.

CONSEQUENCES OF HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL FORMS OF INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM

Knowledge about the consequences of vertical and horizontal differences is limited by the fact that the bulk of cross-national comparisons in the literature contrasts people in the United States (VI) with those in East Asian countries (VC; see Oyserman et al., 2002, for a review). Therefore, established differences in consumer behavior between IND and COL societies may be more reflective of vertical forms of these syndromes and may not generalize to comparisons between horizontal cultures. As one example, conformity in product choice, as studied by Kim and Markus (1999), may

be a tendency specific to VC cultures, in which deference to authority figures and to in-group wishes is stressed. Much lower levels of conformity may be observed in HC cultural contexts, which emphasize sociability but not deference or hierarchy (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Thus, reported differences in consumer conformity between Korea (VC) and the United States (VI; Kim & Markus, 1999; see also Choi, Lee, & Kim, 2005) should not be ascribed solely to the role of INDCOL or independence/interdependence because such conformity might not be expected in more horizontal societies.

In studies that have compared across horizontal and vertical cultures, INDCOL and the horizontal/vertical distinction are sometimes conflated, so that their distinct effects cannot be determined. In this and subsequent sections, we review some of what is known or can be inferred about consequences of the horizontal/vertical distinction from both cross-national data and from within-culture comparisons across cultural orientations.

Some research has conflated INDCOL and hierarchy constructs. For instance, Alden et al. (1993) examined the effects of INDCOL and the cultural dimension of power distance on humor executions in ads. Power distance is a culture-level variable referring to the degree to which power hierarchies in organizations are expected and accepted. Alden et al. observed that ads in collectivistic countries (Korea and Thailand) featured more group-oriented situations than did ads in individualistic societies (Germany and the United States). Moreover, the relationships between central characters in ads in which humor is intended were more often unequal in the high power distance cultures (Korea and Thailand) than in what were considered to be the low power distance cultures (Germany and the United States). In other words, in cultures in which hierarchy was presumably more emphasized and tolerated, relationships between ad characters were less likely to be equal. Unfortunately, the choice of societies in this study, in which INDCOL is confounded with power distance classifications, makes it difficult to discern which distinction was responsible for the findings reported.

Oyserman et al. (2002), in their comprehensive meta-analysis and review of the psychological implications of INDCOL, suggested that values of hierarchy and competition function independently of IND and COL. They found that when measures of IND and COL cultural orientation included items tapping hierarchy and competition themes, cross-national patterns in INDCOL orientation changed. For example, "when competition was included in the scale, the difference between Americans and Japanese in IND disappeared, suggesting that competitiveness is a construct unrelated to IND" (p. 16). Such findings are consistent with a view of both the United States and Japan as vertical societies. According to this interpretation, when INDCOL cultural orientation scales emphasize themes relevant to vertical orientations, responses across these societies appear more similar. The findings also illustrate the aforemen-

tioned problem of studying IND and COL primarily within vertical cultural contexts. It is difficult to determine which differences are due to the broader INDCOL distinction and which reflect patterns of judgment or behavior mostly expected within VI versus VC contexts (rather than HI vs. HC contexts).

More generally, Oyserman et al.'s meta-analytic findings were consistent with the view that the vertical/horizontal categories represent distinct themes that may underlie or influence the observed effects of INDCOL. Accordingly, Oyserman et al. advocated narrower definitions and measurements of IND and COL that isolate their "active ingredients" rather than conflate them with themes of competition and hierarchy.

We now turn to several lines of research suggesting that effects attributed to the broader INDCOL distinction may in fact differ considerably depending on whether HI versus VI (or HC vs. VC) is considered. Such findings refine the understanding of known INDCOL effects, and offer insights into their motivational underpinnings. These include studies of personal values, self-presentations, advertising and persuasion, and gender differences.

PERSONAL VALUES

A number of studies have pointed to differences in hierarchical or status-oriented values within IND or COL categories. For instance, cross-national research in the United States (a VI society) and Denmark (an HI society) demonstrated differences in the importance that individuals place upon achievement, the display of success, and the gaining of influence (Nelson & Shavitt, 2002). Across open-ended responses and quantitative ratings, U.S. individuals discussed the importance of achievement to their happiness, whereas Danes did not (58% vs. 0%, respectively). U.S. individuals were also more likely than Danes to favorably evaluate achievement values (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990). Moreover, endorsement of these values was correlated with a VI cultural orientation in both countries.

The hierarchical nature of U.S. society rewards those who set goals and achieve them, whereas the same orientation is frowned upon in Denmark's HI society. As one informant, a Danish attorney, explained, "There's no incentive to achieve more or work harder here. My taxes are so high that it's actually cheaper for me to take the afternoon off work and go golfing" (Nelson & Shavitt, 2002, p. 445).

Research has also shown positive relationships between a VI cultural orientation and achievement and power values, as well as negative relationships between those values and an HC cultural orientation (Oishi, Schimmack, Diener, & Suh, 1998). Moreover, self-direction was positively correlated with HI orientation but negatively correlated with VI orientation. In contrast, a focus on social relationships correlated positively with HC orientation, but not VC orientation.

Along similar lines, Triandis and Gelfand (1998) reported that an HC orientation was predicted by interdependence and sociability. Confirming this cross-nationally, Nelson and Shavitt (2002) showed in both the United States and Denmark that HC (but not VC) orientation correlated with sociable and benevolent values. In line with this, Chen, Meindl, and Hunt (1997) found that, in China, those with an HC orientation preferred an egalitarian reward system, which fosters shared responsibility and interpersonal interdependence, whereas those with a VC orientation preferred a differential reward system, which fosters hierarchy. Soh and Leong (2002) reported in both the United States and Singapore that HC orientation was best predicted by benevolence values, VC by conformity values, VI by power values, and HI by self-direction values.

In sum, although the broad definition of COL has focused on interdependence and the maintenance of social relationships, several studies suggest that it is people with an HC orientation who are particularly oriented toward sociability and motivated to maintain benevolent relationships. Similarly, although independence and a focus upon self-direction and uniqueness have been key to the definition of IND, it appears that it is those with an HI orientation who are especially motivated to maintain their self-image as being separate from others and capable of self-reliance.

SELF-PRESENTATION
AND RESPONSE STYLES

What do these observations imply for self-presentational patterns across cultures? Lalwani, Shavitt, and Johnson (2006) argued that distinct patterns should emerge as a function of these cultural distinctions. The foregoing discussion suggests that the self-presentational tendencies of people with different cultural orientations or backgrounds should correspond to two distinct response styles associated with socially desirable responding—Impression Management (IM) and Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE) (Gur & Sackeim, 1979; Paulhus, 1991; Sackeim & Gur, 1979). Each of these response styles corresponds to different culturally relevant goals. Subscales measuring these dimensions compose the Paulhus Deception Scales (Paulhus, 1984, 1991, 1998b). IM refers to an attempt to present one's self-reported actions in the most positive manner to convey a favorable image (Paulhus, 1998a; Schlenker & Britt, 1999; Schlenker, Britt, & Pennington, 1996). It is an effort to control the images that one projects to others. This construct is often associated with dissimulation or deception (Mick, 1996), and is tapped by such items as "I have never dropped litter on the street" and "I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit" (reverse scored; Paulhus, 1998a). SDE refers to the tendency to describe oneself in inflated and overconfident terms. It is a predisposition to see one's skills in a positive light, and has been described as a form of "rigid overconfidence" (Paulhus, 1998a). SDE is

assessed by such items as "My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right" and "I am very confident of my judgments."

As already noted, people with an HI orientation are especially motivated to view themselves as separate from others, self-reliant, and unique. Thus, Lalwani et al. (2006) reasoned that this should foster a response style characterized by SDE because such responses help to establish a view of oneself as capable of being successfully self-reliant. Similarly, people with an HC orientation are highly motivated to maintain strong and benevolent social relations and, therefore, to appear socially appropriate in their responses. This should foster a response style characterized by IM because such responses help to maintain social relationships through conveying a socially appropriate image.

Lalwani et al. (2006) showed that U.S. respondents (IND), compared to those from Singapore (COL), scored higher in self-deceptive enhancement and lower in impression management. Similarly, European-American respondents (IND), compared to Korean-American respondents (COL), scored higher in self-deceptive enhancement and lower in impression management. However, when examined in the United States as a function of cultural orientation, the effects were contingent on the horizontal versus vertical distinction. In multiple studies with U.S. participants, the relations observed between cultural orientation and self-presentational patterns were indeed specific to HI and HC, as seen in the top panel of Table 2. HI (but not VI) reliably predicted SDE, whereas HC (but not VC) reliably predicted IM on the Paulhus Deception Scales (Paulhus, 1991, 1998b). These distinctions also emerged for responses to specific behavioral scenarios relevant either to motives of self-reliance or motives of image-protection. For instance, people high versus low in HI orientation expressed more confidence that they could make the right decision about whether to accept a future job, and were more likely to anticipate performing well on the job. People high versus low in HC orientation were more likely to deny that they would gossip about coworkers on a job, plagiarize a friend's paper for a course, or damage someone's furniture without telling him or her. Lalwani et al. (2006, Study 3) also reported that high HC individuals appeared more likely to engage in deceptive responding, as assessed by Eysenck's Lie Scale (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964; see top panel of Table 2).

Triandis (1995) proposed that honesty in interactions with strangers is a characteristic that is valued less by collectivists than individualists, and several studies have supported this assertion (e.g., Triandis et al., 2001; Triandis & Suh, 2002; Trilling, 1972; van Hemert, van de Vijver, Poortinga, & Georgas, 2002). However, consideration of the horizontal/vertical distinction suggests an important refinement: The reported tendency to give deceptive responses in order to manage social impressions appears to be driven specifically by cultural values that stress sociability and benevolence (HC),

rather than by values that emphasize hierarchy or deference to the in-group (VC).

As shown in the bottom panel of Table 2, the relations between HC or HI and distinct forms of socially desirable responding have emerged across numerous additional U.S. samples (Lalwani & Shavitt, 2006a), and on another index of impression management, the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD, Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Consistent with the IM findings based on the Paulus Deception Scales, people high versus low in HC orientation were more likely to engage in impression management as measured by the MCSD scale.

The bottom panel of Table 2 also shows a robust negative relation between VI and indices of impression management. Although at first it may seem surprising that people who are highly oriented toward individual competition and winning (high VI) self-report more socially inappropriate behavior (low IM), a look at the individual scale items provides an explanation: Those who endorse such statements on the VI subscale as "winning is everything" and "competition is the law of nature" may in fact be expected to describe themselves as willing to break rules and take advantage of others (e.g., from the IM scale: "There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone," "I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget," and, "I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back."). In other data, not reported here, we have observed that VI correlates strongly with narcissism (Raskin & Terry, 1988) and moderately with public self-consciousness (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975; see also Oyserman, 1993). Although pending replication, these interrelations suggest that the pattern of values linked to VI emphasizes a public appearance that projects power through attractiveness, status, and an avowed disregard for social norms.

Overall, these studies converge on the conclusion that people with an HC cultural orientation, who emphasize sociability, benevolence, and cooperation, are characterized by a tendency to engage in impression management, regardless of how this self-presentational response style is assessed. However, people with a VC orientation, who emphasize stature, duty, and conformity, are not especially likely to be concerned with impression management. One might speculate that the VC orientation would instead be more predictive of desirable self-presentations concerning one's deference, sense of duty, and fulfillment of obligations.

The studies also establish that people with an HI orientation, who emphasize self-competence, self-direction, and independence, have a tendency to engage in SDE. On the other hand, those with a VI orientation, who put emphasis on status, power, and achievement, are not likely to exhibit SDE. Instead, one may speculate that the VI orientation would be more predictive of desirable self-presentations concerning one's achievements and competitive success.

The observed response styles thus appear to reflect distinct self-presentational goals—to be seen as sociable and

Cultural Orientation	SDE	IM (PDS)	DR	Self-Reliance Scenarios	Image-Protection Scenarios
Study 1					
(N = 65)					
HI	.25*	.15	—	—	—
VI	.15	−.24#	—	—	—
HC	.02	.25*	—	—	—
VC	.23#	.27*	—	—	—
Study 2					
(N = 124)					
HI	.31***	−.03	—	—	—
VI	−.25**	−.18*	—	—	—
HC	−.02	.18*	—	—	—
VC	−.14	.12	—	—	—
Study 3					
(N= 192)					
HI	.25***	.04	.01	—	—
VI	.08	−.15*	−.06	—	—
HC	−.05	.36***	.26**	—	—
VC	.03	.02	.12	—	—
Study 4					
(N = 76)					
HI	.22*	−.01	—	.20*	.00
VI	−.07	−.27*	—	.18	.02
HC	.22#	.34*	—	.08	.30*
VC	−.01	.29*	—	−.09	−.05

Cultural Orientation	SDE	IM (PDS)	IM (MCSD)
Study 5			
(N = 141)			
HI	.14#	−.05	—
VI	.06	−.27**	—
HC	.09	.19*	—
VC	.06	.04	—
Study 6			
(N = 94)			
HI	.19#	.03	.11
VI	.00	−.28**	−.23*
HC	.04	.27**	.26*
VC	.21*	.04	.06
Study 7			
(N = 205)			
HI	.22**	.02	—
VI	.10	−.20**	—
HC	.10	.18**	—
VC	.02	.11	—
Study 8			
(N = 91)			
HI	.27**	.07	.12
VI	.11	−.44**	−.37***
HC	.16	.34**	.44***
VC	−.03	.07	.14
Study 9			
(N= 93)			
HI	.26	.19#	.03
VI	.07	−.22*	−.12
HC	.20*	.19*	.25*
VC	.13	.13	.13

Note. HI = horizontal individualism; VI = vertical individualism; HC = horizontal collectivism; VC = vertical collectivism, as measured by 16-item attitudinal scale (Traindis & Gelfand, 1998); SDE = self-deceptive enhancement; IM (PDS): Impression Management, as measured by Paulhus Deception Scales; IM (MCSD) = impression management, as measured by Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; DR = propensity to respond deceptively. Correlations for Studies 1–4 come from data reported in Lalwani et al. (2006). Those for studies 5 to 9 come from Lalwani and Shavitt (2006a). Study 1 is based on two samples of Champaign, Illinois residents: members of a Korean–American church and students at the University of Illinois. The remaining studies are based on student samples at the University of Illinois.

#$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < 001$.

benevolent (HC orientation) versus self-reliant and capable (HI orientation). This underscores the value of the horizontal/vertical distinction for delineating styles of self-presentation and predicting cultural differences in the tendencies to engage in them.

In the consumer context, these findings offer implications for understanding how cultural orientation influences the way consumers respond to marketing surveys, as well as the way they view and present themselves to consumers and marketers more generally. These patterns of self-presentational styles may lead those with an HI cultural orientation to express relatively inflated levels of confidence in their own consumer skills and to view themselves as unrealistically capable of making good choices in the marketplace. On the other hand, those with an HC cultural orientation may be more likely to distort their previous purchases and marketplace behaviors in a manner designed to appear normatively appropriate and sociable. Such implications await further research.

GENDER DIFFERENCES

The relationship between gender and cultural orientation may also depend on whether VI or HI (or VC or HC) is considered. Males are generally seen as more IND or independent than females, whereas females are seen as more COL or interdependent than males (e.g., Cross & Madson, 1997; Gilligan, 1982, 1986; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Wood & Eagly, 2002). Several studies have pointed to such gender differences, although the specific nature of these differences varies across studies (see Cross & Madson, 1997; Kashima et al., 1995). Some research has shown no differences on broad INDCOL indicators. For instance, Gabriel and Gardner (1999) reported that whereas women are more relational and less group-oriented than men in their patterns of interdependent judgments and behaviors, there were no gender differences on behaviors relating to independent ones (see also Baumeister & Sommer, 1997; Kashima et al., 1995).

The literature on gender and cultural values is voluminous, and it is beyond our scope to review it here (for reviews, see Cross & Madson, 1997; Schwartz & Rubel, 2005). The issue here is whether taking the horizontal/vertical distinction into account sheds new light on the nature of the gender differences to be expected. Table 3 presents the results of multiple studies examining the relations between gender and VI, HI, VC, and HC with U.S. participants (see Lalwani & Shavitt, 2006b). Across 10 U.S. samples, men scored consistently higher in VI than women. The pattern for HI is much less consistent, with females sometimes scoring directionally higher than males. In other words, there are robust gender differences in IND in these data, but only for the vertical form.

The results also show that women score consistently higher in HC than men, with effects at or near significance in most samples. However, women are not broadly more collectivistic than men. If anything, men score higher in VC

TABLE 3
Cultural Orientation Scores as a Function of Gender

Sample	Cultural Orientation	M_{males}	$M_{females}$	p
1 (N = 76)				
	HI	5.15	5.42	.14
	VI	4.92	4.50	.06
	HC	5.28	5.46	.32
	VC	5.37	5.64	.24
2 (N = 120)				
	HI	5.13	5.40	.11
	VI	4.83	4.43	.04
	HC	5.27	5.29	.89
	VC	5.65	5.34	.09
3 (N = 134)				
	HI	5.60	5.25	.02
	VI	5.24	4.52	.00
	HC	5.30	5.54	.08
	VC	5.43	5.65	.22
4 (N = 164)				
	HI	5.60	5.60	.97
	VI	5.07	4.21	.00
	HC	5.10	5.45	.02
	VC	5.43	5.11	.05
5 (N = 78)				
	HI	5.67	5.31	.08
	VI	5.23	4.04	.00
	HC	5.28	5.59	.04
	VC	5.93	5.36	.02
6 (N = 110)				
	HI	5.53	5.46	.70
	VI	5.13	4.15	.00
	HC	5.30	5.56	.14
	VC	5.48	5.61	.49
7 (N = 87)				
	HI	5.63	5.13	.02
	VI	5.03	4.40	.02
	HC	4.99	5.40	.05
	VC	5.67	5.51	.40
8 (N = 121)				
	HI	5.29	5.35	.71
	VI	5.19	4.73	.03
	HC	5.07	5.32	.12
	VC	5.46	5.16	.16
9 (N = 141)				
	HI	5.53	5.33	.06
	VI	5.19	4.37	.00
	HC	5.33	5.53	.04
	VC	5.63	5.47	.18
10 (N = 94)				
	HI	5.50	5.37	.50
	VI	5.20	4.28	.00
	HC	5.07	5.42	.04
	VC	5.67	5.22	.02

Note. HI = horizontal individualism; VI = vertical individualism; HC = horizontal collectivism; VC = vertical collectivism, as measured by 16-item attitudinal scale (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). All samples are comprised of students at the University of Illinois.

than women do. Thus, gender differences in collectivism in these results appear specific to HC.

These data offer support for the value of the horizontal/vertical distinction by revealing patterns not anticipated in the literature on gender and cultural self-construal. For instance, whereas some have concluded that men and women do not differ in dimensions of self-construal relevant to IND (Baumeister & Sommer, 1997; Gabriel & Gardner, 1999), we find that males consistently score higher than females on one type of IND. That is, IND in males appears especially focused on status, power, and achievement through competition (VI). Traditional masculine social roles that emphasize achievement and power gained through work outside the home may contribute to the robust gender difference observed here.

Results also shed light on the motivational underpinnings of gender differences that have been proposed and observed by numerous researchers. Specifically, COL in females appears to emphasize benevolence, sociability, common goals, and cooperation (HC). This may parallel the relational interdependence identified in previous studies (Cross et al., 2000; Gabriel & Gardner, 1999; Kashima et al., 1995; see also Wang et al., 2000). However, women do not always appear to be higher in COL or interdependence. If anything, men report a somewhat greater emphasis on familial duties and obligations and on deference to authority (VC). That is, they are more likely to endorse the values of family integrity and of in-group deference. These findings for VC deserve greater attention and replication because gender differences in related value priorities (e.g., for conformity and tradition values) are not generally observed (Schwartz & Rubel, 2005).

Future research could examine the degree to which these patterns predict a broader set of judgments and behaviors as a function of gender, as well as the role that qualities of the various orientation scales play in the patterns that have been observed. Overall, broad gender differences in INDCOL may differ depending on whether one is considering the horizontal or vertical variety. That is, the horizontal/vertical distinction appears to be important in predicting or qualifying the nature of gender differences in cultural orientation.

ADVERTISING AND CONSUMER PERSUASION

What does the distinction in horizontal/vertical cultural values imply for advertising and consumer persuasion phenomena? Previous research has established that cultural values are often reflected in cultural artifacts such as advertisements (e.g., Han & Shavitt, 1994; Kim & Markus, 1999) and that the persuasiveness of culturally relevant ad themes varies across cultures (e.g., Han & Shavitt, 1994; Zhang & Gelb, 1996). Thus, one might expect to observe differences in ad content and consumer persuasion patterns in horizontal versus vertical cultural contexts.

Existing studies on advertising and consumer persuasion have primarily examined effects relevant to the broad INDCOL distinction. These studies have established that ad appeals emphasizing independence, uniqueness, and personal rewards and goals are more prevalent and more persuasive in IND cultures and contexts, whereas appeals emphasizing group goals, interdependent relationships, harmony, and consensus are more prevalent and persuasive in COL cultures and contexts (see Shavitt, Lee, & Johnson, in press for a review).

What distinct implications for ad content and consumer persuasion are implied by the horizontal/vertical distinction? Because this distinction focuses in part on the emphasis placed on hierarchy and status, it stands to reason that content reflecting hierarchy and status should be more prevalent in advertisements in vertical compared to horizontal cultures. Moreover, there should be a greater tendency to evaluate products based on characteristics reflecting hierarchy, and to be persuaded by ads emphasizing status, in vertical compared to horizontal cultural contexts. We turn now to evidence on these points.

Product Evaluations Based on Country of Origin

Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran (2000) found that the tendency to favor products from one's own country over foreign products (a country-of-origin effect) emerged more strongly in Japan (a VC culture) than in the United States (a VI culture). This fits well with a conceptualization of collectivists as being oriented toward their in-groups.

However, mediational analyses using cultural orientation measures indicated that this cross-national difference was accounted for by the vertical aspect of INDCOL, and not by the horizontal one. This is consistent with the description of vertical collectivism as emphasizing deference to authority and the social standing of one's group relative to others. In other words, the presumably collectivistic tendency to favor one's own country's products over those of other countries is driven specifically by cultural values that stress hierarchy and respect for the in-group and its authorities and institutions (VC), not by values that stress interdependence and group goals more generally. One might therefore speculate that these country-of-origin effects would be less likely to emerge in comparisons of HC versus HI cultural contexts.

Whereas the Japanese evaluated a product based on its in-group origin, U.S. participants evaluated the product based on its competitive superiority. This effect, in turn, was mediated by respondents' VI orientation. In other words, the tendency of U.S. participants to prefer products with superior attributes is driven by values that emphasize achieving status through competition (VI), not by values that emphasize personal goals and independence more generally.

In sum, cultural differences in the tendency to view products in hierarchical terms, reflecting either the perceived superiority of the in-group (in a VC culture) or of product at-

tributes (in a VI culture), appear to be driven by vertical and not by horizontal cultural orientation.

Hierarchy Versus Equality as Depicted in Advertisements

Wiles, Wiles, and Tjernlund's (1996) analysis of magazine advertising in the United States (VI) and Sweden (HI) focused upon the depiction of IND values. Not surprisingly, it thus revealed strong similarities in the values depicted in advertising across these two societies, with predominating themes of leisure, youthfulness, private life, and ideal body shape. However, Nelson (1997) observed that differences in the gender roles depicted by male versus female models in this same dataset were consistent with U.S–Swedish differences in equality of the sexes and, in turn, with cultural differences relevant to the horizontal/vertical distinction. In U.S. ads, women were more likely than men to be portrayed engaging in housework and child care, whereas the reverse was true in Swedish ads. Nelson concluded that, rather than depicting uniformity in the values of these two cultures, the observed differences in gender roles in the advertisements pointed to distinct vertical versus horizontal patterns of individualism, respectively.

This observation appears consistent with results reviewed earlier on inequality in the relationships depicted in humorous ads across cultures (Alden et al., 1993). Although the findings are indirect, they converge on the notion that ads in vertical versus horizontal cultural contexts will depict relations that are more hierarchical.

Prevalence and Persuasiveness of Status Themes

Many ads depict and advocate values of status and power. Based on the conceptualization of vertical cultural values we have described, one would expect the prevalence and persuasiveness of status themes to be greater in vertical compared to horizontal cultural contexts. This prediction has received support in studies by Shavitt, Zhang, and Johnson (2006). In one study, a content analysis was conducted of 1,200 magazine advertisements from several countries, representing VI (United States), HI (Denmark), and VC (Korea, Russia, Poland) cultural contexts. Ads were coded as status appeals if they included depictions of luxury, or references to prestige, impressing others, prominence, membership in high status groups (e.g., ivy league graduates), endorsements by high-status persons (e.g., celebrities), or other distinctions (e.g., "award-winning"). The observed emphasis on status in advertisements generally corresponded to the cultural profiles of the countries. Results revealed that ads in all three VC societies (Korea, Russia, Poland) had a greater prevalence of status appeals than did ads in the HI society (Denmark). Ads in the VI society (United States), which also emphasized sta-

tus, were intermediate in prevalence between the VC and HI societies.[2]

In additional studies, Shavitt et al. (2006) asked participants to write appeals that they personally would find persuasive. The degree to which participants' measured cultural orientations predicted their spontaneous use of status appeals in advertisements was assessed. Specifically, participants in several U.S. samples were asked to consider a given fictitious product brand, such as a brand of furniture, and to write an ad for it. For this task, participants were instructed that they could "make whatever assumptions you want about the brand and make any statements that seem reasonable to make. Imagine that you are writing an ad designed to appeal to yourself, not an ad designed to appeal to other consumers. What would you want the ad to say?" The ads that they wrote were later coded for a variety of themes, including an emphasis on social status, using the same coding definitions used in the content analysis.

As shown in Table 4, in three out of four samples, respondents' vertical or horizontal cultural orientation predicted the degree to which the ads they wrote emphasized status themes. Although the results emerged for different orientation measures or subscales across samples, they showed a pattern generally consistent with this point. People high in vertical orientation were more likely to spontaneously write ads focused on status, whereas those high in horizontal orientation were less likely to write such ads. No robust relations emerged involving cultural orientation and any other types of content in the ads written.

In other studies, similar effects emerged for participants' attitudinal responses to status-themed ads that were pretested and shown to them. However, these attitudinal patterns were less robust, considering that these ads were not tailored to participants' idiosyncratic preferences. When respondents were asked to design their own ads, the role of cultural orientation in the spontaneous use of status themes emerged more clearly (Shavitt et al., 2006).

In sum, advertising messages with themes that emphasize status, prestige, hierarchy, and distinction may be culturally appropriate and prevalent in vertical cultural contexts. Such ads appear also to be generally more persuasive for those with a vertical cultural orientation, and inappropriate for those with a horizontal one. Although themes of prestige or distinction may be relevant to a vertical orientation in general, one could speculate that themes specific to achievement and competition would appeal more to those high in VI whereas themes of stature and respect would appeal more to

---

[2]This finding is consistent with other comparisons of U.S. and Korean advertisements, in which Korean ads show a greater use of celebrities or status themes (e.g., Choi, Lee, & Kim, 2005; Paek, Nelson, & McLeod, 2004; see also Belk, 1985, for an early U.S.–Japan longitudinal comparison with similar results). This result may reflect Triandis's (1995) point that COL societies tend to be more vertical than do IND societies. Thus, ads in VC societies may reflect more status-oriented values than do ads in VI societies.

TABLE 4
Correlation Between Cultural Orientation and Emphasis on Status in Ad Writing

	Scenario Orientation Subscale								Attitudinal Orientation Subscale							
	HI	HC	VI	VC	Horiz	Vert	IND	COL	HI	HC	VI	VC	Horiz	Vert	IND	COL
Sample 1 (N = 198) (furniture; website)	−.16*	−.02	.03	.20**	−.15*	.16*	−.12	.13*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sample 2 (N = 98) (cell phone)	.10	−.02	−.06	.01	.07	−.04	.04	−.01	.09	−.03	.21*	.20*	.04	.28**	.21*	.12
Sample 3 (N = 85) (digital camera)	.03	−.10	.00	−.09	−.05	−.07	.03	−.14	−.05	−.06	.03	−.02	−.07	.01	.00	−.04
Sample 4 (N= 115) (digital camera)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	−.19*	−.14	−.10	−.03	−.22*	−.09	−.18*	−.10

Note. HI = horizontal individualism; VI = vertical individualism; HC = horizontal collectivism; VC = vertical collectivism, as measured by 16-item scenario scale (Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998) or by 16-item attitudinal scale (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Products for which participants wrote ads are listed in parentheses. Samples 1–3 are comprised of students at the University of Illinois. Sample 4 is comprised of students at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee. Ads were coded by independent judges on a 0–2 scale, where 0 indicated no substantial emphasis on status, 1 indicated some emphasis, and 2 indicated a predominant emphasis on status. Status appeals were those that included depictions of luxury or of impressing others, references to prestige, prominence, or other distinctions and awards, or that depicted the product as being associated with high-status groups or individuals (celebrities, award winners).

$*p < .05.$ $**p < .01.$

those high in VC. This would be congruent with findings indicating that in the United States (VI) celebrity endorsers are frequently identified by name or profession and their credentials are used to pitch the product directly to the audience, whereas in Korea (VC), celebrities are not often identified by name and they frequently play a character embodying a family or traditional role (Choi et al., 2005).

Interestingly, status and hierarchy appeals have not been a significant focus of research on persuasion and/or culture, despite their prevalence in modern advertising. Indeed, a broad INDCOL cultural framework does not lend itself to predictions about the prevalence or persuasiveness of such appeals. However, the content analyses and persuasion results reviewed here suggest differences across cultural contexts and orientations. In this regard, a focus on the horizontal/vertical distinction has the potential both to expand understanding of cultural correlates and to broaden theorizing on advertising and consumer persuasion.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

The evidence reviewed here suggests that investigating the horizontal/vertical distinction in cross-cultural research holds multiple sources of value. However, this effort is not without its challenges. In particular, one challenge faced by researchers seeking to test the sorts of hypotheses described above is the task of operationalizing vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism.

Priming

In current cross-cultural research on INDCOL, the typical approach incorporates multiple methods in order to provide converging evidence for the operation of this basic cultural distinction. One such method involves manipulating the salience of independent versus interdependent self-construals via priming procedures. To our knowledge, however, no parallel procedures for priming horizontal/vertical constructs or self-construals have been reported. It is worth considering that the priming approach relies on the assumption that people hold both sorts of self-construals in memory, so that different contexts can readily activate different "selves." This assumption is well supported for independent and interdependent self-construals (e.g., Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000; Mandel, 2003). It is relatively easy to activate distinct independent versus interdependent self-knowledge (for instance, by asking people to circle singular vs. plural first-person pronouns in a one-paragraph essay; Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Indeed, people in general, and especially bicultural people, can readily switch back and forth between independent and interdependent cultural frames in response to their contexts (Fu, Chiu, Morris, & Young, 2006).

However, this is not necessarily a reasonable assumption in the case of horizontal and vertical constructs. People may not carry around distinct horizontal and vertical "selves" that they have learned to express in different contexts. Rather than a flexible source of self-knowledge from which one can sample, the horizontal/vertical distinction may instead center on one's relatively stable endorsement/rejection of a value system. It may also link to one's *schematicity* to think in particular terms (see Bem, 1981). For instance, someone who is "hierarchy–schematic" may spontaneously classify stimuli in hierarchical terms, and evaluate them accordingly, whereas others may not do so unless prompted by contextual stimuli. Research suggests that power concepts can be directly primed, and that for some this automatically increases the salience of other concepts linked to hierarchy (e.g., sex; Bargh, Raymond, Pryor, & Strack, 1995). Determining how notions of hierarchy and power are structured and activated in memory, and how they link to culturally based self-concepts, may be a necessary first step in developing ways to heighten the salience of horizontal and vertical concepts, and in anticipating the effects of those manipulations.

National Culture: Cross-Country Differences

Another approach to operationalizing the horizontal/vertical classification is via identifying national or subcultural proxies of horizontal/vertical societies. Here the knowledge base is also in need of development. Indeed, several of the cross-national studies reviewed earlier are based on yet-to-be-tested assumptions about the horizontal/vertical status of the societies under consideration. Apart from studies aimed at establishing predictive validity of horizontal/vertical orientation scales using profiles from selected societies (see Triandis et al., 1998, and Singelis et al., 1995), there are no large-scale studies establishing nation-level horizontal or vertical scores.

As a consequence, researchers sometimes make inferences about vertical and horizontal cultural classifications from a nation's score on the related culture-level dimension of power distance (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). The underlying assumption is that countries high in PDI represent hierarchical cultures (i.e., vertical cultures), whereas countries low in PDI are egalitarian cultures (i.e., horizontal cultures). However, several caveats are in order with this approach. First, one should be aware of conceptual and structural differences between the horizontal/vertical distinction and power distance. From a conceptual standpoint, the horizontal/vertical distinction refers to differences in the acceptance of hierarchies as being valid or important in one's society. Power distance reflects the degree to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions in a society perceive and accept inequalities in power (Hofstede, 2001). From a structural standpoint, power distance is conceptualized as a single dimension (from high to low PDI; Hofstede, 1980, 2001). The horizontal/vertical classification represents distinct categories that are conceptualized as nested within collectivism and individualism classifications, and that have divergent va-

lidity (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Although Hofstede (1980) conceptualized IND and power distance as distinct dimensions, data do not appear to support the independence of these dimensions at the national level. The high correlation between power distance and IND, before controlling for country wealth, obtained with his operationalization suggests that there may be overlap between these two constructs (e.g., Earley & Gibson, 1998; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996), leading to an association of high-PDI societies with VC and low-PDI societies with HI (Singelis et al., 1995). Consistent with this, Triandis (1995) suggested that COL societies tend to be more vertical than IND societies. In other words, VI societies may be less vertical than VC societies, and national exemplars of HC may be particularly difficult to find. All of this complicates efforts to identify distinct VI, VC, HI, and HC societal categories, or to map PDI findings onto those categories.

Generally, researchers have relied on Hofstede's (1980, 2001) ratings of power distance, as they have done for individualism (Oyserman et al., 2002), with either the explicit purpose of studying the horizontal/vertical classification or analyzing the broader impact of social hierarchies on variables of interest. Analyses are often performed through statistical comparisons of responses of participants from high-PDI countries with those from low-PDI countries (e.g., Blodgett, Lu, Rose, & Vitell, 2001; Earley, 1999; Spencer-Oatey, 1997), or by appending Hofstede's PDI scores to the data set for more complex statistical analysis (e.g., Dwyer, Mesak, & Hsu, 2005; Johnson, Kulesa, Cho, & Shavitt, 2005). This has been done in organizational contexts (Earley, 1999; Earley & Erez, 1997; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1994; Trompenaars, 1994), marketing contexts (Alden et al., 1993; Blodgett et al., 2001; Dwyer et al., 2005; Roth, 1995), and sociological or psychological domains (Bond, Wan, Leong, & Giacalone, 1985; Brockner et al., 2001; Johnson et al., 2005; Spencer-Oatey, 1997). In other cases, researchers have suggested inferring the vertical or horizontal cultural values of a society from indexes of social stratification, such as the income ratio of the top and bottom 20% of the population (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

In using nation-level scores, such as PDI, to predict individuals' behaviors as a function of national culture, one should be aware of the ecological fallacy inherent in confusing the cultural and individual levels of analysis (Bond, 2002). Triandis and colleagues (Triandis et al., 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) point out that, because these two levels are statistically independent, it is possible to have different patterns at each level (see, for example, Johnson et al., 2005).

One should therefore also be cautious when inferring culture-level patterns from individual-level data. For instance, the fact that the HC (but not the VC) orientation predicts impression management in the studies reviewed earlier does not mean that such response styles would not be expected in VC societies, or in high PDI cultures. Indeed, they have been observed in such societies (Singapore; Lalwani et al., 2006).

Any given society comprises VC, VI, HC, and HI cultural orientations (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), and measures at the orientation level may capture different processes than those revealed by patterns at the societal level. Isomorphism between the cultural and societal levels should not be assumed.

Orientation Measures

Much of the literature on the horizontal/vertical distinction uses measurements of individual differences in HI, VI, HC, and VC orientations as an operationalization. Scores on orientation measures can be used to determine cultural orientation at either the cultural level or at the individual level, though preferred measures and tabulation methods may differ across these levels (Triandis, 1995). Two measures are most commonly used to capture HI, VI, HC, and VC orientations: an attitudinal measure (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) and a scenario measure (Triandis et al., 1998).

The 32-item attitudinal scale developed by Singelis et al. (1995) and refined into a 16-item scale by Triandis and Gelfand (1998) assesses HI, VI, HC, and VC with four 7-point Likert-type items ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). Examples include "I often 'do my own thing'" (HI); "When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused" (VI); "If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud" (HC); and "Parents and children must stay together as much as possible" (VC). Although evidence supports the four-factor structure of this attitudinal scale and the reliability of its subscales (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; see also Chiou, 2001; Soh & Leong, 2002), concerns about socially desirable responding associated with this measure led to the development of a second scale. That scenario measure developed by Triandis et al. (1998) assesses HI, VI, HC, and VC using 16 forced-choice scenario questions (e.g., "You are buying a piece of art for your office. Which one factor is most important in deciding whether to buy it?"). Each of four choices provided for each item corresponds to a different orientation (e.g., the HC response to the above item would be "your coworkers will like it" and the HI response would be "you just like it").

Unlike for the attitudinal measure, reliabilities for the scenario subscales are often very low (see Lalwani et al., 2006; but note that when scenarios are customized to specific domains relevant for the population under study, high reliabilities can be achieved, see Chirkov, Lynch, & Niwa, 2005). Although the scenario scale is a broad measure and as such may not be expected to generate highly coherent responses, the very low reliabilities make it unlikely that high correlations would emerge between the scenario measure and other constructs. Despite this, some parallels emerged across scenario and attitudinal scales in the prediction of status themes in ad writing (as reported in Table 4). Further research is needed to establish the conditions under which the scenario versus attitudinal measure yields more valid predic-

tions of judgments and behavior, and the degree to which cultural classifications across these measures converge (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We have argued for the utility of a relatively new distinction in the nature of cultures and cultural orientations. A review of research on horizontal and vertical forms of individualism and collectivism highlighted the potential importance of this distinction in the prediction of culture's consequences. Studies suggest that the impact of horizontal/vertical cultural values is distinct from the impact associated with individualism-collectivism. Thus, its consideration enhances understanding of the links between culture and personal values, advertising and consumer persuasion, self-presentational patterns, and gender differences. In sum, we argue that examination of this distinction offers several sources of value—as a predictor of new consumer psychology phenomena and as a basis for refining the understanding of known phenomena. Another key source of value for the horizontal/vertical distinction is its potential to enhance theorizing across multiple domains. Future research could be directed at several issues.

Power

A focus on the horizontal/vertical distinction has the potential to illuminate issues relating to power and to the mental representations and sociocultural values that foster power differences across cultures. Findings reported earlier indicating that status appeals are more persuasive for individuals with a vertical cultural orientation parallel those reported in the literature as characteristic of individuals with chronic needs for power (Winter, 1973, 1988). Such individuals tend to construe the world in terms of power and to use power concepts for categorizing human interactions (Winter, 1973). Thus, one might expect, as suggested earlier, that individuals with a vertical versus a horizontal cultural orientation will be more likely to spontaneously use hierarchy and status categories in organizing information in memory. Examining how mental representations structure hierarchy-relevant information, and how this differs as a function of cultural variables, is a worthy area for future research.

A focus on hierarchy and status values also implicates interpersonal perceptions and processes. Indeed, organizational research has already suggested implications of HC, VC, HI, and VI categories for leadership (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), minority influence effects (Ng & Van Dyne, 2001), and cooperative behavior in social dilemmas (Probst, Carnevale, & Triandis, 1999). Future research could examine how one's perceived position relative to others in the social hierarchy influences the kinds of outcomes discussed earlier. For instance, status appeals may have a greater impact on those persons who are higher as opposed to lower in the

power hierarchy. This would be congruent with findings suggesting that older siblings (who are presumably more powerful) have greater potential than younger siblings for learning power strategies and for using their power (Winter, 1973).

Vertical cultural values emphasize distinguishing between people in terms of their hierarchy and status. A related construct, social dominance orientation, reflects acceptance of inequalities at the societal level. Extensive research indicates that people high in social dominance orientation tend to support ideologies relating to societal inequalities, such as racism, nationalism, and meritocracy (e.g., Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). A belief in the validity of hierarchies at the societal level is conceptually distinct from personal status seeking (VI) or from an emphasis on family integrity and in-group harmony (VC). However, future research could examine the conditions under which they interrelate. For instance, a VI value system emphasizes the seeking of privilege and status—qualities that, by definition, are obtained at the expense of others. Findings reviewed earlier suggesting that people high in VI view the self in inflated terms and express disregard for social norms (Lalwani et al., 2006; Lalwani & Shavitt, 2006a) suggest a particular disregard for the outcomes of those lower in the social hierarchy. In line with these notions, initial evidence suggests that VI and social dominance orientation are correlated (Strunk & Chang, 1999). How such qualities at the level of personal values implicate support for hierarchies at the societal level is another worthy area for further research.

VI Versus VC Orientations

It is also important to differentiate VI motives relating to competition and achievement (achieved hierarchy) from VC motives relating to familial obligations and deference to authority (ascribed hierarchy). Individuals who are high in VI versus VC orientation might differ on the external symbols they associate with power and status. The tendency of individualists to focus upon interactions with strangers (Oyserman et al., 2002) should make people high in VI orientation more likely to value symbols designed to convey status to a broad, undifferentiated audience (e.g., prestige, possessions, and wealth; Winter, 1973, 1988; Hofstede 2001). By comparison, the tendency of collectivists to prefer interactions with in-group members (Hofstede 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Oyserman et al., 2002) should make people high in VC orientation more likely to value ascribed positions in a hierarchy and symbols that convey concern for others' needs (e.g., symbols of traditional authority and of paternalistic leaders; Hofstede, 2001; Wade-Benzoni et al., 2002). Cross-cultural research describing how position in a social hierarchy are obtained (Smith et al., 1996; Trompenaars, 1994) reinforces the notion that people high in VI orientation gain status on the basis of their ability and effort when com-

peting with (and outperforming) others, whereas for those high in VC orientation, their positions in the social hierarchy are more a consequence of who they are (e.g., the Indian caste system; Smith et al., 1996).

In this sense, a consideration of the horizontal/vertical distinction offers new implications for studying status symbols across cultures. Individuals high in VI orientation may be expected to pursue, and be influenced by, symbols of status (such as prestige and possessions) achieved by outperforming others. By comparison, individuals high in VC orientation may be expected to pursue, and be influenced by, symbols of ascribed status based on their position within the structure of the groups to which they belong (e.g., rank, class, and title). Moreover, status brands, to the extent they are valued by members of VI versus VC societies, may serve different symbolic purposes for different cultural orientations or societies—conveying characteristics of one's distinct, achieved status in VI contexts (Berger & Heath, 2006) versus conforming to in-group expectations and reducing social risks in VC contexts. Finally, consumers with a VC orientation or background may be more likely to defer to the opinions of endorsers who are respected for their ascribed status. On the other hand, those with a VI orientation or background may emulate those with high achieved status.

A focus on the horizontal/vertical distinction also has the potential to broaden our understanding of leadership styles and the ways in which individuals exercise power and leverage their status to influence others. According to the logic described earlier, individuals with a VI orientation who desire to influence others would likely attempt to target a broad audience, to be conspicuous, and to compete with others when exercising power. Indeed, people with a VI orientation like to lead, and see themselves as having leadership qualities (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Thus, one might expect them to take undifferentiated actions to accomplish their goals. This is consistent with a characterization of individualists as promotion focused (Aaker & Lee, 2001). Moreover, the findings presented earlier that VI orientation is negatively associated with impression management suggest that such individuals should be relatively disinterested in others' perspectives and willing to take advantage of others to achieve personal goals. Consistent with this, U. S. participants who exercise power have been found to be conspicuous to others (Winter, 1973), to show little concern for others (Winter, 1988), and to exhibit an action orientation (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003).

In contrast, individuals with a VC orientation should be more likely to deliberate carefully about the views of their in-group members and about the potential impact of their power-related attempts on others (see Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001). This is consistent with a characterization of collectivists as prevention focused (Aaker & Lee, 2001), with findings suggesting inhibition in power-related behaviors among individuals trained to take responsibility for others

(Winter, 1988), and with the reported tendency of Japanese (VC) decision makers to assume greater burdens for the sake of others (Wade-Benzoni et al., 2002). In sum, VC and VI cultural orientations implicate distinct leadership styles and persuasive approaches, and this is another area deserving greater research attention.

Horizontal Orientations

The horizontal/vertical distinction may offer insights not only into cultural differences in status/hierarchy motives. Examining the correlates of horizontal orientation measures in greater detail would enhance understanding of broader INDCOL effects because, as some have suggested (Oyserman et al., 2002), these HI or HC measures capture "pure" forms of INDCOL. According to this argument, horizontal contexts or orientation measures offer a way to examine the impact of IND and COL in the absence of hierarchy and competition themes. Do the horizontal types of IND and COL represent simply the absence of vertical/hierarchy motives? Or are horizontal cultural motivations distinct?

At a structural level, these questions link to the difference in assumptions underlying the power distance dimension and the horizontal/vertical distinction. The single PDI dimension (Hofstede, 2001) implies that countries low in power distance represent either the absence or the opposite of hierarchical patterns. In contrast, the horizontal/vertical distinction is conceptualized as delineating separate, not unidimensional, cultural categories (Triandis, 1995). This conceptualization offers the potential to understand horizontal motivations.

Phenomena associated with a horizontal orientation are of interest in their own right. For instance, a fuller understanding of the role of culture in the commitment to equality can enhance understanding of the antecedents of moral obligation and the effectiveness of social marketing efforts (Nelson, Brunel, Supphellen, & Manchanda, 2006), income redistribution and social welfare policies (Triandis & Singelis, 1998), and other phenomena of societal importance.

CONCLUSIONS

We have argued for the importance of the distinction between horizontal and vertical forms of individualism and collectivism in the study of cultures and cultural orientations. This distinction offers several sources of value—as a predictor of new consumer psychology phenomena across a variety of domains, and as a basis for refining the understanding of known phenomena ascribed to INDCOL. Attending to the cultural patterning of hierarchy and status motivations offers several fruitful directions for future research and for further development of cross-cultural theory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Aaker, J. L., & Lee, A. Y. (2001). "I" seek pleasures and "we" avoid pains: The role of self-regulatory goals in information processing and persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*(1), 33–49.

Aaker, J. L., & Maheswaran, D. (1997). The effect of cultural orientation on persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research, 24*(3), 315–328.

Aaker, J. L., & Sengupta, J. (2000). Addivity versus attenuation: The role of culture in the resolution of information incongruity. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(2), 67–82.

Aaker, J. L., & Williams, P. (1998). Empathy versus pride: The influence of emotional appeals across cultures. *Journal of Consumer Research, 25*(3), 241–261.

Alden, D. L., Hoyer, W. D., & Lee, C. (1993). Identifying global and culture-specific dimensions of humor in advertising: A multinational analysis. *Journal of Marketing, 57*(2), 64–75.

Alden, D. L., Stayman, D. M., & Hoyer, W. D. (1994). Evaluation strategies of American and Thai consumers. *Psychology & Marketing, 11*(2), 145–161.

Anderson, C., & Berdahl, J. L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(6), 1362–1377.

Askgaard, H. (1992). As Denmark sees herself and is seen by others. In P. Himmelstrup, K. Hegelund, & H. Askgaard (Eds.), *Discover Denmark—On Denmark and the Danes: Past, present and future* (pp. 7–26). Herning, Denmark: Danish Cultural Institute, Copenhagen and Systime Publishers.

Bargh, J. A., Raymond, P., Pryor, J. B., & Strack, F. (1995). Attractiveness of the underling: An automatic power … sex association and its consequences for sexual harassment and aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(5), 768–781.

Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want? Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madson (1997). *Psychological Bulletin, 122*(1), 38–44.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354–364.

Berger, J., & Heath, C. (2006). *Where do people diverge from others? Domains of divergence, identity-signaling, and consumer choice*. Working paper, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Blodgett, J. G., Lu, L.-C., Rose, G. M., & Vitell, S. J. (2001). Ethical sensitivity to stakeholder interests: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 29*(2), 190–202.

Bond, M. H. (2002). Reclaiming the individual from Hofstede's ecological analysis—A 20-year odyssey: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 73–77.

Bond, M. H., Wan, K.-C., Leong, K., & Giacalone, R. A. (1985). How are responses to verbal insult related to cultural collectivism and power distance? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 16*(1), 111–127.

Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(1), 83–93.

Briley, D. A., & Wyer, R. S. J. (2001). Transitory determinants of values and decisions: The utility (or nonutility) of individualism and collectivism in understanding cultural differences. *Social Cognition, 19*(3), 197–227.

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., et al. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*(4), 300–315.

Chan, K.-Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 481–498.

Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hunt, R. G. (1997). Testing the effects of vertical and horizontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28*(1), 44–70.

Chen, S., Lee-Chai, A. Y., & Bargh, J. A. (2001). Relationship orientation as a moderator of the effects of social power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(2), 173–187.

Chiou, J.-S. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(5), 667–678.

Chirkov, V. I., Lynch, M., & Niwa, S. (2005). Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(4), 469–490.

Choi, S. M., Lee, W.-N., & Kim, H.-J. (2005). Lessons from the rich and famous: A cross- cultural comparison of celebrity endorsement in advertising. *Journal of Advertising, 34*(2), 85–98.

Choi, Y. K., & Miracle, G. E. (2004). The effectiveness of comparative advertising in Korea and the United States: A cross-cultural and individual-level analysis. *Journal of Advertising, 33*(4), 75–87.

Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 791–808.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122*(1), 5–37.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of pathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4), 349–354.

Daun, A. (1991). Individualism and collectivity among Swedes. *Ethnos, 56*, 165–172.

Daun, A. (1992). Modern and modest: Mentality and self-stereotypes among Swedes. In S. A. & L. Janson (Eds.), *Culture and management* (pp. 101–111). Stockholm, Sweden: Institution for International Business.

de Mooij, M. K. (1998). *Global marketing and advertising: Understanding cultural paradoxes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dwyer, S., Mesak, H., & Hsu, M. (2005). An exploratory examination of the influence of national culture on cross-national product diffusion. *Journal of International Marketing, 13*(2), 1–27.

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.

Earley, P. C., & Erez, M. (1997). *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology*. San Francisco, CA: The New Lexington Press.

Earley, P. C., & Gibson, C. B. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism–collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management, 24*(3), 265–304.

Erez, M., & Earley, P. (1987). Comparative analysis of goal-setting strategies across cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(4), 658–665.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1964). *The manual of the Eysenck personality inventory*. London: University of London Press.

Feather, N. (1994). Attitudes toward high achievers and reaction to their fall: Theory and research concerning tall poppies. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 26* (pp. 1–73). San Diego, CA: Academic.

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Private and public self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 522–527.

Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review, 99*(4), 689–723.

Fu, H.-Y., Chiu, C.-Y., Morris, M. W., & Young, M. Y. (2006). *Spontaneous inferences from cultural cues: Varying responses of cultural insiders, outsiders, and sojourners*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois.

Gabriel, S., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Are there "his" and "hers" types of interdependence? The implications of gender differences in collective ver-

sus relational interdependence for affect, behavior, and cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(3), 642–655.

Gaines, S. O., Jr., Marelich, W. D., Bledsoe, K. L., Steers, W., Henderson, M. C., Granrose, C. S., et al. (1997). Links between race/ethnicity and cultural values as mediated by racial/ethnic identity and moderated by gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(6), 1460–1476.

Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(3), 453–466.

Gannon, M. J. (2001). *Understanding global cultures: Metaphorical journeys through 23 nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Lee, A. Y. (1999). "I" value freedom, but "we" value relationships: Self-construal priming mirrors cultural differences in judgment. *Psychological Science, 10*(4), 321–326.

Gelfand, M. J., Bhawuk, D., Nishii, L. H., & Bechtold, D. J. (2004). Individualism and collectivism. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 437–512). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). New maps of development: New visions of maturity. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52*(2), 199–212.

Gilligan, C. (1986). On in a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum: Reply. *Signs, 11*(2), 324–333.

Gouveia, V. V., Clemente, M., & Espinosa, P. (2003). The horizontal and vertical attributes of individualism and collectivism in a Spanish population. *Journal of Social Psychology, 143*(1), 43–63.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gur, R. C., & Sackeim, H. A. (1979). Self-deception: A concept in search of a phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(2), 147–169.

Gürhan-Canli, Z., & Maheswaran, D. (2000). Cultural variations in country of origin effects. *Journal of Marketing Research, 37*(3), 309–317.

Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, F. (1994). *The seven cultures of capitalism*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

Han, S.-P., & Shavitt, S. (1994). Persuasion and culture: Advertising appeals in individualistic and collectivistic societies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30*(4), 326.

Ho, D. Y.-F., & Chiu, C.-Y. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism, and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory and applications* (pp. 137–156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. H. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hong, J. W., Muderrisoglu, A., & Zinkhan, G. M. (1987). Cultural differences and advertising expression: A comparative content analysis of Japanese and U.S. magazine advertising. *Journal of Advertising, 16*(1), 55–62, 68.

Hong, Y.-Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C.-Y., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*(7), 709–720.

Johnson, T. P., Kulesa, P., Cho, Y. I., & Shavitt, S. (2005). The relation between culture and response styles: Evidence from 19 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*(2), 264–277.

Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S.-C., Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism–collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(5), 925–937.

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review, 110*(2), 265–284.

Kemmelmeier, M., & Oyserman, D. (2001). The ups and downs of thinking about a successful other: Self-construals and the consequences of social comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(3), 311–320.

Kim, H. S., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 77*(4), 785–800.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(6), 1245–1267.

Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (2002). Interrelationships among vertical and horizontal collectivism, modesty, and self-enhancement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(1), 71–86.

Lalwani, A. K., & Shavitt, S. (2006a). *Cultural orientation and socially desirable response styles*. Unpublished data, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Lalwani, A. K., & Shavitt, S. (2006b). *Gender differences in cultural orientation and self- presentation*. Unpublished data, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Lalwani, A. K., Shavitt, S., & Johnson, T. (2006). What is the relation between cultural orientation and socially desirable responding? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(1), 165–178.

Lee, A. Y., Aaker, J. L., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). The pleasures and pains of distinct self- construals: The role of interdependence in regulatory focus. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(6), 1122–1134.

Maheswaran, D., & Shavitt, S. (2000). Issues and new directions in global consumer psychology. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(2), 59–66.

Mandel, N. (2003). Shifting selves and decision making: The effects of self-construal priming on consumer risk-taking. *Journal of Consumer Research, 30*(1), 30–40.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224–253.

Mick, D. G. (1996). Are studies of dark side variables confounded by socially desirable responding? The case of materialism. *Journal of Consumer Research, 23*(2), 106–119.

Nelson, M. R. (1997). *Examining the horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism within the United States and Denmark.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Nelson, M. R., Brunel, F. F., Supphellen, M., & Manchanda, R. V. (2006). Effects of culture, gender, and moral obligations on responses to charity advertising across masculine and feminine cultures. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 16*(1), 45–56.

Nelson, M. R., & Shavitt, S. (2002). Horizontal and vertical individualism and achievement values: A multimethod examination of Denmark and the United States. *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 439–458.

Ng, K., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Individualism–collectivism as a boundary condition for effectiveness of minority influence in decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 84*(2), 198–225.

Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., Diener, E., & Suh, E. M. (1998). The measurement of values and individualism–collectivism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(11), 1177–1189.

Oyserman, D. (1993). The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(5), 993–1009.

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.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(3), 598–609.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17–59). San Diego, CA: Academic.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998a). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(5), 1197–1208.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998b). *Paulhus Deception Scales: User's manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741–763.

Probst, T., Carnevale, P. J., & Triandis, H. C. (1999). Cultural values in intergroup and single-group social dilemmas. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77*(3), 171–191.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 890–902.

Rhee, E., Uleman, J. S., & Lee, H. K. (1996). Variations in collectivism and individualism by in-group and culture: Confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(5), 1037–1054.

Robert, C., Lee, W. C., & Chan, K.-Y. (2006). An empirical analysis of measurement equivalence with the INDCOL measure of individualism and collectivism: implications for valid cross-cultural inference. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 65–99.

Roth, M. S. (1995). The effects of culture and socioeconomics on the performance of global brand image strategies. *Journal of Marketing Research, 32*(2), 163–175.

Sackeim, H. A., & Gur, R. C. (1979). Self-deception, other-deception, and self-reported psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47*(1), 213–215.

Schlenker, B. R., & Britt, T. W. (1999). Beneficial impression management: Strategically controlling information to help friends. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(4), 559–573.

Schlenker, B. R., Britt, T. W., & Pennington, J. (1996). Impression regulation and management: Highlights of a theory of self-identification. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition, Vol. 3: The interpersonal context* (pp. 118–147). New York: Guilford.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(3), 550–562.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 878–891.

Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*(6), 1010–1028.

Shavitt, S., Lee, A., & Johnson, T. P. (in press). Cross-cultural consumer psychology. In C. Haugtvedt, P. Herr, & F. Kardes (Eds.), *Handbook of Consumer Psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Shavitt, S., Nelson, M. R., & Yuan, R. M.-L. (1997). Exploring cross-cultural differences in cognitive responding to ads. In M. Brucks & D. J. MacInnis (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research* (Vol. 24, pp. 245–250). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Shavitt, S., Zhang, J., & Johnson, T. P. (2006). *Horizontal and vertical cultural differences in advertising and consumer persuasion.* Unpublished data, University of Illinois.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1993). Racism and support of free-market capitalism: A cross-cultural analysis. *Political Psychology, 14*(3), 381–401.

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 29*(3), 240–275.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27*(2), 231–264.

Soh, S., & Leong, F. T. (2002). Validity of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism in Singapore: Relationships with values and interests. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(1), 3–15.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (1997). Unequal relationships in high and low power distance societies: A comparative study of tutor–student role relations in Britain and China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28*(3), 284–302.

Strunk, D. R., & Chang, E. C. (1999). Distinguishing between fundamental dimensions of individualism–collectivism: Relations to sociopolitical attitudes and beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27*(4), 665–671.

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

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-group relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(2), 323–338.

Triandis, H. C., Carnevale, P., Gelfand, M., Robert, C., Wasti, A., Probst, T. M., Kashima, E. S., et al. (2001). Culture and deception in business negotiations: A multilevel analysis. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 1,* 73–90.

Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(2), 275–289.

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1), 118–128.

Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19*(4), 395–415.

Triandis, H. C., & Singelis, T. M. (1998). Training to recognize individual differences in collectivism and individualism within culture. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*(1), 35–47.

Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 133–160.

Trilling, L. (1972). *Sincerity and authenticity*. London: Oxford University Press.

Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

van Hemert, D. A., van de Vijver, F. J., Poortinga, Y. H., & Georgas, J. (2002). Structural and functional equivalence of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire within and between countries. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*(8), 1229–1249.

Wade-Benzoni, K. A., Okumura, T., Brett, J. M., Moore, D. A., Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Bazerman, M. H. (2002). Cognitions and behavior in asymmetric social dilemmas: A comparison of two cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 87–95.

Wang, C. L., Bristol, T., Mowen, J. C., & Chakraborty, G. (2000). Alternative modes of self- construal: Dimensions of connectedness–separateness and advertising appeals to the cultural and gender-specific self. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(2), 107–115.

Weldon, E. (1984). Deindividualization, interpersonal affect, and productivity in laboratory task groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14*(5), 469–485.

Wiles, C. R., Wiles, J. A., & Tjernlund, A. (1996). The ideology of advertising: The United States and Sweden. *Journal of Advertising Research, 36*(3), 57–66.

Winter, D. G. (1973). *The power motive*. New York: Free Press.

Winter, D. G. (1988). The power motive in women—and men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(3), 510–519.

Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(5), 699–727.

Zhang, Y., & Gelb, B. D. (1996). Matching advertising appeals to culture: The influence of products' use conditions. *Journal of Advertising, 25*(3), 29–46.