



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

석사학위논문

권력간격, 지역주의 및 문화

제주대학교 행정대학원

일반행정학과

마이클 삭쓰톤

2019년 7월

권력간격, 지역주의 및 문화

지도교수 민기

마이클 삭쓰톤

이 논문을 행정학 석사학위 논문으로 제출함

2019 년 7 월

마이클 삭쓰톤의 일반행정학 석사학위 논문을 인준함

심사위원장 김성준 (인)

위 원 민기 (인)

위 원 고창훈 (인)

제주대학교 행정대학원

2019 년 7 월

Power Distance, Regionalism, and Culture

Michael Saxton
(Supervised by professor Kee Min)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Public Administration

2019 . 07 .

This thesis has been examined and approved.

.....
Thesis director, Sung-Jun Kim, Prof. of Public Administration
.....
.....
.....

(Name and signature)

.....
Date

Department of Public Administration
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
JEJU NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Section 1 Research Background	1
Section 2 Research Purpose	2
Section 3 Background of Locations	3
Section 4 Format of Thesis	5
Chapter 2 Literature Review	6
Section 1 Culture and Value	6
Section 2 Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions and Power Distance	8
Section 3 Power Distance and Obedience	11
Section 4 Power Distance and Deference	12
Section 5 Power Distance and Gender	13
Section 6 Power Distance and Seniority	13
Section 7 Power Distance and Decentralization	14

Section 8 Power Distance and Regionalism	14
Section 9 Authoritarian Attitudes and Power Distance	16
Section 10 Korea and Confucian Culture	17
Section 11 Criticisms of Hofstede	18
Chapter 3 Approach and Methods	23
Section 1 Survey Approach	23
Section 2 Hypothesis	24
Section 3 Testing the Hypothesis	25
Chapter 4 Empirical Results	27
Section 1 Introduction	27
Section 2 Value Questions	28
Section 3 Demographics	32
Section 4 Power Distance Calculation	36
Section 5 Power Distance in relation to Hometown Location	37

Section 6 Value Questions mean scores in relation to Demographic variables	47
Chapter 5 Conclusions	59
Section 1 PDI Difference	59
Section 2 Regionalism Differences	59
Section 3 Demographic Analysis	60
Section 4 Improvement for Future Studies	60
Section 5 Policy Implications	61
Section 6 Summary	62
[Works Cited]	63
[Appendix I] Survey in English	71
[Appendix II] Survey in Korean	73
[Abstract]	75
[논문초록]	76

Tables

<Table 2-1> Key Differences Between Small and Large Power Distance	
Societies	10
<Table 2-2> The Stabilizing of Culture Patterns.....	22
<Table 4-1>Basic Comparisons of Los Alamos County and Jeju Province.....	27
<Table 4-2> Value Questions between Jeju and Los Alamos Government	
Workers	28
<Table 4-3> Value Questions between Jeju and Los Alamos Statistics	30
<Table 4-4> Demographic Statistics between Jeju and Los Alamos.....	32
<Table 4-5> Comparative list of Government Departments.....	34
<Table 4-6> Power Distance of Jeju and Los Alamos Government Workers.....	36
<Table 4-7> Power Distance of Korea and USA included in Mass Studies with	
current study.....	36
<Table 4-8> Value Questions Results according to Korean Hometown	37
<Table 4-9> Value Questions Results according to Korean Hometown (CtD)	39

<Table 4-10> Comparative Statistics according to Korean Hometown for Jeju	
Workers	41
<Table 4-11> Value Questions Results according to American Hometown for	
Los Alamos workers	42
<Table 4-12> Comparative Statistics according to American Hometown for	
Los Alamos workers	45
<Table 4-13> Power Distance according to Regional location.....	46
<Table 4-14> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Females).....	47
<Table 4-15> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Males)	47
<Table 4-16> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Within Country –	
Jeju)	48
<Table 4-17> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Within Country –	
Los Alamos.....	49
< Table 4-18> Comparative Statistics according to Age (39 & under).....	50
<Table 4-19> Comparative Statistics according to Age (40 & over)	51
<Table 4-20> Comparative Statistics according to Age (Within Country – Jeju).....	51

<Table 4-21> Comparative Statistics according to Age (Within Country – Los Alamos).....	52
<Table 4-22> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Bachelors & under).....	53
<Table 4-23> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Masters and above).....	53
<Table 4-24> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Within Country – Jeju).....	54
<Table 4-25> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Within Country – Los Alamos).....	55
<Table 4-26> Comparative Statistics according to Workplace Duration (Over 7 years).....	56
<Table 4-27> Comparative Statistics according to Hometown (Locals)	57
<Table 4-28> Comparative Statistics according to Hometown (Outsiders)	58

I. Introduction

1. Research Background

In studies about cross-cultural management, there tends to be two different approaches to the role of the national culture in management.¹ On the one hand supporters of the convergence approach perceive the management practices as a factor independent of the national culture and institutional context. The practitioners of this school of thought argue that in management there are the same 'best practices' which could be used independently of the cultural and institutional environment. On the other hand, the second group, which represents the divergence approach, emphasizes that management practices are cultural bounded and their transfer is not possible in all situations, that it depends on contextual factors.

According to Białas (2009), In spite of a global movement towards the modernization of managerial practices the views of the divergence approach seems to be the more accepted or at least, researched view. Looking at articles in the psychology and organizational studies literature confirm this observation. After researching articles in organizational behavior and human resource management journals, Adler and Bartholomew stated that 70 percent of the articles include the concept of culture, and 98.3 percent of this kind of article concludes that culture is important and caused differences to the organizational behavior and style of human resource management within those organizations (Tayeb, 1994). Considering culture as a critical variable to explain the differences in management practices between nations results in more in-depth studies which show that national culture has a considerable influence on management.

Hofstede's cultural dimension model provides a useful framework for analyzing the

¹ More about the convergence-divergence debate see Pudelko, Carr, Fink, Wentges (2006, pp. 15–16).

influence of culture on the administrative workers. Hofstede's dimensions have been widely used in analyses of phenomena pertaining to different cultures. Hofstede's four original cultural dimensions are: (a) power distance, (b) uncertainty avoidance, (c) individualism-collectivism, and (d) masculinity-femininity. (Hofstede, 1980) The level of the power distance describes "how the culture tolerates and fosters pecking orders, and how actively members try reduce them" (Mead 2003) The high power distance societies are characterized by the tolerance for inequality and the members of such societies relatively agree that power should be unequally shared. The people with higher social position obtain numerous privileges and it is considered as something right or natural. The low power distance societies are those in which inequality is less tolerated. The privileges connected with the position are not easily accepted. In the cultures with low power distance, independence is more valued than conformity. (Mead 2003)

The work relationship between managers and their subordinates is dependent on power distance. And so power distance has many implications in personnel management in many organizations including that at the local government level.

2. Research Purpose

This research will focus on comparing Power distance between local government workers in South Korea (herein after just Korea), specifically workers in Jeju Special Autonomous Province (herein after as just Jeju) on Jeju Island, south of the Korean peninsula, and local government workers in Los Alamos county, New Mexico, United States. There will also be comparing power distance in relation to the hometown regions that the respondents come from. Hoping to glean relationships of cultural elements between locals within a government workplace and out of towners within a government. In addition, there will also be a comparison of other elements that makes of the measurement of power distance with various demographic factors such as gender, age, and education.

The comparison of culture in the context of Administrative and government structures can be helpful in providing perspectives about the workplace culture to each respective side, when in contrast with the other, it is through the comparative exercise that helpful

observations and attitudes could come forth.

3. Background of Locations

Los Alamos county is located in the southwestern state of New Mexico. Los Alamos is approximately 56 km to the northwest of the state capital of Santa Fe. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the county has a total area of 280 km² and a total population of approximately 18,200. Los Alamos county is the smallest county in the state and was administered exclusively by the U.S. federal government during the second world war for the Manhattan Project and the secret creation of the first Atomic Bomb, but now has equal status to New Mexico's other counties. Due to its unique way of creation, Los Alamos county basically function as a mono-government with city and county government functions combined as one. Though not officially a consolidated city-county local government (Like Louisville-Jefferson county government), it functions similarly. It has never been a municipal corporation, which entail the majority of local government forms in the United States. This style of government, along with Hawaii's local government, which has no independent cities, is ideal in comparison with Korean local government due to the more similar coverage of area and division of administrative functions.

One of the more unique feature of New Mexico's social history is that it includes some of the oldest continuously inhabited settlements in North America (Vigil and Olsen, 1990). Unlike the Native Americans of other states, New Mexico Native Americans by and large have not been uprooted from the area of their choice and moved to others parts of the country, but instead continue to inhabit their older areas of settlement. Some New Mexicans of Spanish and Mexican ancestry claim that they can trace their origins back to the seventeenth century (Garcia et al., 2006). The present capital city of Santa Fe, for example, had already been established for a decade (1610) by the time the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, Massachusetts (1620). With the end of the Mexican-American War in 1848, most of present day New Mexico was ceded over to the United States. The boundaries of the New Mexico territory were created by placing the borders around

majority Spanish speaking settlements. New Mexico's constitution is bi-lingual in English and Spanish, also New Mexico is one of two states where Anglo-Americans do not make up a majority of the state's population²(Hawaii being the other). The historical influx of very different people and cultures has resulted in an interesting pattern of political subcultures in the different geographic areas of the states. Northern and central New Mexico, where Los Alamos County is located, areas of original Spanish-Mexican settlement, have retained a very distinctive political culture. This area is one of the few places in the United States where individuals of Mexican-Spanish ancestry control the government and political institutions of their communities. Holmes (1967) says, "Los Alamos County, being created by design through actions of the federal government, is sometimes said to possess a unique scientific political culture."

Jeju Island is located south of peninsular Korea approximately 440km from Seoul and 290 km south west of Pusan. The island, which has an area of 1,845km² (roughly the same size of the Hawaiian island of Oahu), is volcanic in origin with Halla Mountain at its center. The island is located between Japan (367km from Fukuoka) and China (600km from Shanghai) Jeju has a subtropical, oceanic climate with four distinct season. The approximate population of Jeju Island is currently 670,000.³

Because of the relative isolation of the island, the people of Jeju have developed a culture and language that is distinct from those of mainland Korea. Originally, Jeju Island had been one of the independent Kingdoms in the Korean peninsula until the Koryo dynasty (AD. 918-1392) consolidated the Island with the rest of Korea in 938. After that, the central government had used it as a place of exile for dissent politicians for a long time because Jeju Island was isolated from the mainland and had barren soil with volcanic characteristics which made it difficult to cultivate the land. According to Yang (2008), the central government has a mixed history with regard to having a plan to develop Jeju Island, let alone support it. In addition to this, many foreign nations have invaded the island for its resources several times. Especially the Mongols, who had ruled Jeju for over 100 years (1273 - 1374), and Japan also ruled this Island for thirty-five years (1910 - 1945). Moreover, a series of incidents collectively known as the Jeju 4.3 incidents

² New Mexico's Population Distribution in 2010: Hispanic 43.3%, Anglo-American 42.5%, Native American 11.2%, Other 3.0%. Source: (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census)

³ (KOSIS, Korean Statistical Information Service)

from 1947 to 1954 wiped out 10 percent of Jeju Island's population, and countless damage over the island, and most residents suffered from the guilt-by-association system and other scars.⁴ Therefore, Jeju was to remain among the poorest places to live in the Korean peninsula (Yang, 1991). Because of this tragic history produced by central forces, traditionally many islanders think that the central government and comers from the mainland give more harm than benefits to the islanders (Yang 2008). The history of Jeju Island has resulted in a distrustful relationship between the people of Jeju, and the central government (Cheju Province, 1995). In partial response to rectify past injustices done to Jeju and to experiment with decentralization, In 2003, the new government which so called 'the participatory government' took place, thought that Jeju Island need a system to match this distinctive geographical character. The basic plan for Jeju Special Self-Governing Province was announced in May 2005 by President Committee on Government innovation and decentralization. To accomplish this, a special law on the establishment of the Jeju Special Self-Governing Province and International Free City was passed in the National Assembly in February 2006 and started in July of that year (PCGID 2007).

4. Format of Thesis

This research is organized as follows; chapter two will begin with a brief discussion of culture and values leading to a summary of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, focusing on power distance which is the only dimension measured in the study. Then a discussion on the literature of Hofstede's work, power distance, and the variables being surveyed in relation to power distance. This study will identify some key criticisms of Hofstede's cultural dimensions and give adequate responses. Chapter three will introduce the survey that was used to measure values that were used in the calculation of Power distance for the government workers in Jeju and Los Alamos. Chapter three will also present the hypothesizes, describe how the survey will be evaluated, how power distance will be

⁴ For further reading on the Jeju 4.3 Incidents, refer to The Jeju April 3 Incident Investigation Report, (2003) Korean, (2013) English

calculated, and discuss viability of the differences between the scores. The Power distance scores are presented in chapter four. In addition, the demographics and value elements are compared and presented. Lastly, chapter five will present the conclusions of the research and future recommendations and directions.

II. Literature Review

1. Culture and Value

It is a basic assumption that neither political nor the administrative phenomena of a nation can be understood until one first understands the culture and how it affects the country. Culture is a key variable in understanding political and administrative phenomena. Understanding culture is a difficult task to start with, but then to compare the elements of one nation's culture to another nation, increases the difficulties exponentially. It is with the hope of measurable comparative frameworks which administrative and academic practitioners can use to have a worthwhile investigation into these elements that may lead to a better understanding.

Some key constructs used in this paper for understanding political and administrative phenomena are values and culture. A simplified definition from Kluckhohn (1967) of value is "a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others." To further illuminate with a more complicated definition from Kluckhohn, "A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of actions."⁵ Rokeach's (1972) observes that to say that a person 'has a value' is to say that he has an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end-states of existence. Values

⁵ Kluckhohn, defines value no less than eleven different times in this essay about value's definition.

have intensity and direction and imply some desired state in comparison to other options. It is because of these attributes of 'value' that value is a concept able to be measured in something like a survey, among other choices available to social scientists.

Hofstede (2001) says, "Culture could be defined as the interactive aggregate of common characteristics that influence a human group's response to its environment. Culture determines the uniqueness of a human group in the same way personality determines the uniqueness of an individual." According to Hofstede's definition, culture is collective mental programming that is distinctive only to the members of a nation, region, or group. Values are held by individuals as well as by collectivities; culture presupposes a collectivity, some plural entity. So by observing or measuring many individuals' values, one is able to reveal and/or measure culture. To put this progression in context to power distance, an individual has a value of high or low power distance which can be measured, so that measurement is put into the context of the interactive values of others in the group which has to suggest the existence of culture. Culture can be pragmatically defined by the contents and boundaries of the interests of the scholars who study it (Minkov 2013).

It is important to emphasize behavior patterns rather than structural aspects of government when comparing the local governments. One can assume that organization effectiveness depends heavily on the behavior of its personnel. So it is logical to think that the essential ingredients of bureaucratic behavior are the values and beliefs of the organizational members. Those values and belief direct inform the culture of the organization. The performance of an administrative or government system in effecting change is a function of the kind of culture the bureaucrats possess.

In the study of comparative public administration, it may be more appropriate to identify the differences between the bureaucracies in such value-system terms rather than other factors. Since changing administrative structures doesn't change the values much which lead directly to behavior. Emphasizing preferred bureaucratic behavior is an important goal in any administration. The Values Survey Module (VSM) which Hofstede uses to identify values comes also from a behavior or action element which informs the values, to the culture, of which power distance is an important element in Hofstede's estimation.

2. Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions and Power Distance

Hofstede's (1980) original four cultural dimensions can help explain the differences in shared views individuals and groups acquire by growing up in a particular country. These dimensions can provide a useful framework for analyzing the influence of culture on the administrative workers. Hofstede's dimensions have been widely used in analyses of phenomena pertaining to different cultures (e.g., Arrindell et al., 2004, Arrindell, Steptoe, & Wardle, 2003; Burgoon, 2005; Chang & Holt, 1994; Gudykunst et al., 1996). Hofstede's cultural dimension model is also cited more than other cultural value model including GLOBE and Schwartz at the national level (Kirkman et al. 2006). Hofstede's four original cultural dimensions are: (a) power distance, (b) uncertainty avoidance, (c) individualism-collectivism, and (d) masculinity-femininity. For the purposes of this paper, power distance will be the only dimension discussed, measured and compared at length.

The concept of power distance has become a significant tool in the study of organizations. With the acknowledgment that organizational activities are derivatives of an overall culture with values, norms, symbols, rituals, etc. The concept of power distance (sometimes referred to as PD) has been in wide use since Geert Hofstede used it as one of his original four cultural dimensions in cross-cultural studies of IBM corporate culture starting the late 1970s. "Power distance is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. The basic problem involved is the degree of human inequality that underlies the functioning of each particular society." – (Hofstede 2001, pg. xix) People in large-PD cultures accept that power should be distributed unequally while people in small-PD cultures try to make that power be distributed relatively equally (Oetzel et al., 2001). Hofstede's studies suggest that power distances are to a considerable extent societally determined (1985, 2001).

Power Distance is a term Hofstede borrowed from Dutch social psychologist Mulder, who in the 1960s conducted experiments to investigate interpersonal power dynamics. Mulder (1977) defined power distance as "the degree of inequality in power between a less powerful Individual (I) and a more powerful Other (O), in which I and O belong to the same (loosely or tightly knit) social system." Hofstede expanded the idea to much more

of a collective term but power distance always suggested at least two points (people), so it was never a fully individual idea. The main difference between Hofstede and Mulder is that Mulder measures power distance at a one to one level and this measurement is always changing depending on the status of the Other, but Hofstede's idea and measurement is about the whole group's acceptance of Mulder's power distance.

Hofstede (2011, p. 9) defines the power distance index as the "extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally." Exploring these differences in each nation's approach to the idea of superiority can illuminate ways in which workplace environments may differ from country to country. In the American workplace, hierarchy is established for convenience and managers are accessible to the employees they oversee (Hofstede, 2011, p. 8). Hiring and selection for promotion may rely more heavily upon previous successes, rather than seniority in the company or simply being older (Khatri, 2009, p. 6). Higher-ups may be more comfortable relying on the accumulative expertise of the team, rather than feeling pressure to be the expert in all situations. Managers are expected to set goals and give resources to employees, however, the employee may be left to determine the best method for meeting the goals. As a result, employees are often expected to take initiative, innovate, and problem solve, sometimes only checking in with the supervisor occasionally. The decision making process in American business also reflects this low power distance orientation. In a study done on the success of different leadership styles in multiple nations, American employees, and those from other low power distance nations, responded best to a participative leadership style (Dorfman et al., 1997, p. 233). Demonstrating that workers generally desire and expect to have some role in the decision making process. This also encourages more horizontal communication throughout the organization, rather than the top-down approach common in many nations with a high power distance orientation.

Power distance can manifest itself in different ways depending on if the society has low power culture, high power culture, or somewhere in the middle. Khatri (2009) through his various propositions concludes that employees in high power distance culture are unwilling to participate in decisions and prefer their superiors making decisions for them and giving them instructions, which they could follow passively. Also, jobs in such contexts are narrowly and tightly specified, giving the employees limited discretion. Communication takes place vertically downwards with no or little horizontal

communication and overall communication is small. Power distance renders large communication gap between superiors and their subordinates because it is hard for the subordinates to air their views. Power distance also gives managers unlimited power and control over subordinates. Employees, in turn, have an unquestioning, submissive attitude. Further, older and senior employees in a high power distance context get respect from junior employees not because of former's competence but because of age and long tenure in the organization.

<TABLE 2-1> Key Differences Between Small- and Large-Power-Distance Societies II: The Workplace

Hofstede et al.	2010 Pg. 76
Small Power Distance	Large Power Distance
Hierarchy in organizations means an inequality of roles, established for convenience.	Hierarchy in organizations reflects existential inequality between higher and lower levels.
Decentralization is popular	Centralization is popular.
There are few supervisory personnel.	There are more supervisory personnel.
there is a narrow salary range between the top and the bottom of the organization	There is a wide salary range between the top and the bottom of the organization.
managers rely on their own experience and on subordinates.	Managers rely on superiors and on formal rules.
Subordinates expect to be consulted.	Subordinates expect to be told what to do.
The Ideal boss is a resourceful democrat.	The ideal boss is a benevolent autocrat, or "good-father."
Subordinate-superior relations are pragmatic.	Subordinate-superior relations are emotional.
Privileges and status symbols are frowned upon.	Privileges and status symbols are normal and popular.
Manual work has the same status as office work.	White-collar jobs are valued more than blue-collar jobs.

The original cross-cultural studies of IBM corporate culture had three survey items used

for composing the power distance index, (Hofstede et al. 2010) they were as follows:

1) Answers by non-managerial employees to the question "How frequently, in your experience, does the following problem occur: employees being afraid to express disagreement with their managers?" (mean score on a 1–5 scale from "very frequently" to "very seldom")

2) Subordinates' perception of the boss's actual decision-making style (percentage choosing the description of either an autocratic style or a paternalistic style, out of four possible styles plus a "none of these" alternative)

3) Subordinates' preference for their boss's decision-making style (percentage preferring an autocratic or a paternalistic style, or, on the contrary, a style based on majority vote, but not a consultative style)

The three original questions changed over time to become four new questions starting with the VSM 94 and the current VSM 2013 is very similar to the VSM 94 but the wording has been changed a little. The above question 1 has stayed similar through all VSM editions and calculations of PD.

3. Power Distance and Obedience

The question of voiced disagreement between a subordinate and a superior is important in context of obedience to a superior where the social norm of saving face becomes important. Obedience is not necessarily a common trait among individuals in large government organizations from small power distance cultures. This is because they value participation in decision making. They also question authority and challenge the status quo for the sake of being fair (Ohbuchi et al., 1999). Furthermore, in small power distance cultures, they do not mind creating face-threatening conflicts while expressing themselves for the sake of clarity, if the end result of better service, policy, or politics is involved. However, to people from large power distance cultures who believe that any intervention that challenges authority or that threatens with the need to open up and

confront conflict is not appropriate (Westwood, Tang, & Kirkbride, 1992). Unlike individuals from small power distance cultures who believe power should be used only when it is legitimate (legality is also implied), culture members possessing large power distance grant authority and social inequality (Hofstede, 1980). Hofstede (2001) also explained that together with seeing power as a basic societal fact, individuals from large power distance cultures stress coercive or referent power. Thus, people from large power distance cultures accept coercive autocratic power, obediently following orders more than individuals from small power distance cultures (Mann, 1980). This is because power is a basic fact of society and its legitimacy is irrelevant in large power distance cultures (Hofstede, 2001). Consequently, in large power distance cultures, defiance of autocratic power is threatening to the norms of the society.

4. Power Distance and Deference

Acquiescence and power distance are positively correlated (Johnson, Kulesa, Cho, & Shavitt, 2005; Smith, 2004). This may give an explanation why in large power distance cultures, people are afraid to deviate from what is expected of them and fear approaching, disagreeing, and communicating with their superiors (Hofstede, 1980). Moreover, individuals from large power distance cultures are reluctant to trust each other (Smith et al., 1998). Cultures high in power distance tend to stress conformity and submissiveness and be more authoritarian societies (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, when it is necessary for people from large power distance cultures to interact with others, they engage in obedient, peaceful, cooperative communication strategies that compromise or collaborate with others (Kirkbride, Tang, & Westwood, 1991).

According to Hofstede (2001), respect and formal deference to authority (e.g., elders) is valued in large power distance cultures. This deference is expressed by maintaining a significant emotional distance separating individuals of different status groups such as subordinates from superiors (Basabe et al., 2002). Moreover, status differences are more pronounced, accepted, and promoted than in large versus small power distance societies (Gudykunst, 2005).

5. Power Distance and Gender

It should be noted that Hofstede (2001) has been wary of correlating gender and power distance, believing that other cultural dimensions address gender differences more directly, and Hofstede's overall distrust of demographic correlations with national culture comparisons. However, others believe that investigating gender aspects gives another observational dimension to power distance. A comparison of USA and Japan brings this aspect, since there is no current comparison of the USA and Korea. Hofstede's (2001) country scores of power distance for USA and Japan stand as 40 and 54 respectively. This difference is also substantiated in studies conducted by Stedham and Yamamura (2004) who report these scores as 32 and 36 in their sample analysis. But the scores of women in these two countries were found to be 26.2 and 14. The gender difference in power distance is, thus, more in Japan compared to USA, which is based on more gender based inequality in Japan (Tipton 2000), which is explained as: "Although women have made great progress in obtaining higher-level educational credentials and entering the business world, many obstacles continue to exist. Perhaps this situation has enabled women to recognize both level of PDI that exists and to believe that it should be minimized or eliminated. Given equal credentials, why should one group have greater power than another group?" (Stedham & Yamamura, 2004).

6. Power Distance and Seniority

While Gahye Hong, et al. (2016) did not use power distance directly as a measurement for her and her team's surveys of US and Korean employees, she shows results of a relationship between management style, structures, seniority, and preferences in the US and Korea. The management styles questions definitely have some crossover to PD related observations measured in the Values Survey of Hofstede. Khare (1999) found in high power distance countries that when a new employee starts working in an organization, they would probably never think of

competing with their seniors in the organization. Their tendencies towards moving for personal goals are stopped by the reverence and gratitude towards their seniors. Mendonca and Kanungo (1994) found management types based on seniority or duration has been tied to greater power distance.

7. Power Distance and Decentralization

Studies have shown there to be a negative relationship with high power distance and decentralization. According to Chen (1995), both the power distance dimension influenced formalization and centralization in South Korean companies. South Korea's high power distance score is reflected in the centralized structure of several South Korean companies. According to Chan R. and Chheang V. (2006), A county with high power distance is likely to find it difficult to accept decentralization. Decentralization requires trust and high power distance cultures relies less on trust for social transactions.

8. Power Distance and Regionalism

Regionalism has been showed to have a relationship to power distance. Regionalism in Korea can be seen as a larger extension of familism, where shared local people occupy primary relationship and not just one's immediate family. With the implications of familism and regionalism for administrative behavior, Paik (1990) argues that these variants of social segmentation, politics and administration inevitably assume particularistic and ascriptive forms. Many administrative problems may stem from the persistence of personal, familial, and communal loyalties. Western bureaucracy tends to demand an impersonal and impartial attitude on the part of officials towards all who use the services of the government. However, universal or impartial attitude on the part of both officials and the public is not realized in countries where familism and regionalism is widely shared among the people (Riggs, F.

1957). The dilemma lies in the conflict between formal government structure based on the expectation of responsibility to the abstraction of government or bureaucracy while the responsibilities that are meaningful to the people are to friends, relatives, and others in primary relationships rather than citizens or civil servants (Berger, 1957). In the United States, there is an acceptance of regionalism (or more commonly localism) due to the large size, decentralized method of government creation, and a common political tradition of showing preferences to the local level. However, resistance to regionalism is widespread. Briffault (2000) argues that this resistance is due to political reasons rather than theoretical ones. People do not disagree with the notion of the region as a socio-economic and ecological entity, but they do tend to see regionalism as a step toward centralization (when compared to localism) and a shift of power from local governments. Therefore, resistance to regionalism usually stems from the self-interests of local officials, firms, and other interest groups who benefit from strong local autonomy and regional fragmentation. The primary challenge for regionalism is the establishment of legal and political structures to represent regional areas. Certain special purpose bodies, such as watershed corporations, exist now but are unlikely to be able to integrate different public concerns, and also cannot keep up with the rapid changes that take place in metropolitan regions. As a first step, regionalists call for new regional processes, structures, or institutions that can identify regional problems, formulate regional solutions, implement those solutions, and coordinate regional actions (Briffault 2000).

There seems to be much more of a negative connotation of regionalism in Korea. There is a push for balanced regional developments, and there has been many studies about regionalism in the Central government bureaucracy (Yang, S.C. 1994, Kim, S.K. 1988). Kim (1988) notes that regionalism in Korea has often been distorted and transformed into a closed and exclusive provincialism. Particularly in the Presidential elections between Park Chung-hee and Kim Dae-jung and the overall noted rivalry between the Gyeongsan region and the Jeolla region. (Moon, 1984)

There is some disagreement on the strength of regionalism in Korean Bureaucracy. Paik

(1990), argues that Localism (or regionalism) is distinct characteristic of Korean administrative workers. On the other hand, Hwang (1997) agrees that localism in Korean bureaucracy is overstated or at least the negative effects are minimal. (Hwang generally argues against the negative perceptions or existence of the perceived authoritarian style of Korean bureaucracy.)

Regionalism has also been connected to decentralization, (or the acceptance of it, which is a good marker of lower power distance) Ha Yong-chool (2009) asserts that because the centralization of power was an underlying factor behind the emergence of regionalism, initiating decentralization was an important move toward breaking down regional dependence on the center. Decentralization helped move toward weakening regionalism in Korea.

9. Authoritarian Attitudes and Power Distance

At an intermediate score of 60, South Korea is a slightly hierarchical society. This means that people accept a hierarchical order in which everybody has a place and which needs no further justification. Hierarchy in an organization is seen as reflecting inherent inequalities, centralization is popular, subordinates expect to be told what to do and the ideal boss is a benevolent autocrat.⁶

There is a tendency in Korean administrators, to a more authoritarian attitude (Paik, 1990). There has shown to be some important consequences of this attitude. Firstly, being a government worker in Korean society, historically, would assume superiority to common people. The attitude emphasizes unilateral obedience on the part of the subordinates to the superior. This mass obedience meant that the legitimacy of the power ascribed to the superior was not to be questioned by the subordinates. In other words, accountability for the use of power by the superior is not usually expressed in a

⁶ Summary of Korean Power Distance dimension taken from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country/south-korea/>

clear-cut manner (Ibid.).

The second effect of authoritarianism on administrative behavior is that homogeneity of beliefs and behavior is achieved by a system of servility from the subordinate to his or her superior and an attitude of intolerance from the superior to subordinates opposing their idea or action (Bark, D.S. 1967). Korean's bureaucrats usually approach any idea, or action in a strictly autocratic or hierarchical way.

The third effect is that most decisions are more likely to be made at the top of the hierarchy, and decision making is heavily influenced by the political philosophy and outlook of the decision maker themselves. (Han, 1965, Yoon, 1982). Taking actions before getting approval from superiors tends to be avoided and dependence on the manager is important. With the more recent push in Korea, towards decentralization and the theory that Jeju is a decentralized government, one would think that this third effect may be lessened in Jeju civil officials.

10. Korea and Confucian Culture

Kenneth Kim (2000) claims that the single most important factor that contributes toward the patterns associated with Korea's power distance score is the Principle of the Five Human Relationships, which is attributed to Confucius. According to the Principle, the relationship a) between the king and the subjects should be built upon justice, b) between the parents and the children upon love and filial piety, c) between the old and the young upon the respect for the old, d) between the spouses upon the differences in roles, and e) between friends upon trust. The original intention of this Principle, concerning whether it is based on an egalitarian or authoritarian ideal, is debatable; however, a more accepted view is that this Principle basically emphasizes the hierarchical order in interpersonal relationships. Among the five principles, filial piety has had the more profound impact on Korean society. A father is a model who deserves respect of his children and wife. The dignity, authority and power of the father are absolute and protected by the cultural tradition. This role of a father at home is extended to school, workplace, political group, etc. Teachers at school, bosses at workplace and leaders of

political groups should be respected, and are envied and sometimes feared depending on the situation (Chung, 1994).

The following phenomena observed in Korean society are closely associated with the large power distance in Korean culture: (a) At the meal table, children start eating only after their parents have begun eating. (b) Parents teach obedience to their children. (c) Parents play significant roles in their children's choice of schools and study subjects at college, marriage partners, and other major decisions. (d) Any junior member of a family does not drink alcoholic beverage or smoke in front of a senior member. (e) Teachers are expected to control every aspect of class: they initiate and control all the classroom activities; teachers are givers or transmitters of information and students are passive recipients of the information. Teachers expect, and sometimes demand respect from the students. Students avoid doing anything that might embarrass or make the teacher unhappy. (f) Bosses do not mingle with plain employees in informal situations. (g) Plain employees expect to be told what to do. (h) Privilege of powerful people is taken for granted. (i) Political changes are usually changes in the leaders rather than the political ideal or platform. (j) The choice of levels of speech is highly sensitive to the power distance (in terms of ages and social status) between speech partners. (k) Face-saving is an extremely important feature in Korean culture. It is an effort to maintain one's dignity (or acceptance of power distance) by avoiding embarrassment. (Kim, K. 2000)

11. Criticisms of Hofstede

Hofstede's models are used all over the world to try to diagnose and observe organizational behavior. To say that Hofstede's cultural dimension model have it distractors would be an understatement. So, it would be worthwhile to address some of the common complaints thrown at Hofstede and to let Hofstede defend himself against these misgivings, of which many are reasonable questions to arise.

- 1) Surveys are not a suitable way of measuring cultural differences. (McSweeney, 2002)

Hofstede (2002) simply replies, "They should be the only way." And then points out the myriad of references with cross-cultural surveys and other styles of research.

2) Nations are not the best units for studying cultures. (Angouri, 2018)

True, but they are usually the only kind of units available for comparison and better than nothing (Hofstede 2002).

3) A study of the subsidiaries of one company cannot provide information about entire national cultures. Banai (1982) Cray and Mallory (1998)

What were measured were differences between national cultures. Any set of functionally equivalent samples from national populations can supply information about such differences. The IBM set consisted of well-matched samples for an unusually large number of countries (Hofstede 2001).

4) The IBM data are old and therefore obsolete. Barkema and Vermeuleu (1997)

The dimensions found are assumed to have centuries-old roots; only data that remained stable across two subsequent surveys were maintained, and the data has since been validated against all kinds of external measurements; and recent replications show no loss of validity (Hofstede 2001, Merritt 1998, Merritt 2000, Hoppe 1990, Shane 1995, Mouritzen 2002, & Van Nimwegen 2002).

5) Four or five dimensions are not enough. Schwartz (1992)

Hofstede (2001) notes that additional dimensions should be both conceptually and statistically independent from the five dimensions already defined and should be validated by significant correlations with conceptually related external measures; candidates are welcome to apply. The most promising candidates concerning dimensions found in the Korean workplace would come from Paik (1990) in my humble opinion.

6) Modernization will make all cultures more similar. Inkeles (1981)

Hofstede (2002) acknowledges that Inkeles as a result of his studies of modernity and its reflection in values, found movement toward a common pattern only with regard to certain specific qualities identified as part of the syndrome of individual modernity. There are clearly many realms of attitude and value that are

independent of the industrial organizational complex common to advanced nations.

7) People's values change with age. (Shearing & Ericson, 1991).

Differences in values among respondents of the same national culture but of different ages and/or at different points in time maybe due to three different causes: age (maturation), generation, and zeitgeist (Hofstede, 2001).

8) Cultural Changes

The largest number of scholars have criticized Hofstede's culture model for not having a reflection on the possibility of cultural changes. (Kirkaman et al., 2006; McSweeney, 2002; Schwartz, 1994; Smith 1998, Zhao 2017) To support the counter claims the critics present empirical research showing cultural value changes and that Hofstede's model using data from 1970, almost 40 years ago, wouldn't match with the changed culture currently present in today's society. (Inglehart and Baker, 2000; Ralston, Holt, Terpstra and Kai Cheng, 1997)

According to Zhao (2017), Most information technology in recent years was much advanced compared to 1970s when Hofstede's model was developed so that we added technology to reflect recent possible cultural changes most important information and communication technology was developed since 1990s. The first web page was created and its purpose was to explain what the world wide web was. YouTube launched in 2005 brought free online video hosting and shared to the masses.

Many of these theories have a technological determinism explanation.

Technological determinism seeks to show technical developments, media, or technology as a whole, as the key mover in history and social change. Therefore, technological development and innovation become the principal motor of social, economic or political change. (Heywood, 2014) Technological Determinism Theory (TDT) states that a society's technology determines the development of its social structure and cultural values (Heilbroner, 1994). Thus, it is expected technology to reflect recent possible cultural changes.

Hofstede, who developed the value model mentioned that those scholars' opinions on cultural change were naïve. It takes around 100 years to change values so that cultural changes are expected to not happened until 2100, thus

modifications were unnecessary (Hofstede, 2001). Connotations are shown of power distance differences for various institutions: in the family, for schools and educational systems, in work and organization, in political systems, and in religion and ideas. These relate to Power Distance norm differences in a process of mutual feedback between the norm and the institutions that support it. Correlations of PDI with geographic, economic, and demographic country indicators and consideration of historical factors lead to a suggested causal chain for the origins of national differences. Trend data do not suggest that such differences will disappear in the foreseeable future (Hofstede 2001). Cultures, especially national cultures, are extremely stable over time. This stability is further boasted by Six Major Replication study of the IBM Research; (Hoppe 1990, Shane 1995, Merritt, 1998, de Mooij 2001, Mouritzen 2002, and van Nimwegen 2002) which showed that the Culture Dimensions model, especially Power Distance dimension was replicated convincingly, in her late 1990's study. This stability can be explained from the reinforcement of culture patterns by the institutions that themselves are products of the dominant cultural value systems. The system is in a self-regulating quasi-equilibrium. Change comes from the outside, in the form of forces of nature or forces of human beings: trade, conquest, economic or political dominance, and technological breakthroughs.

Table 2-2 – The Stabilizing of Culture Patterns

Outside Influences	Origins	Societal Norms	Consequences	Reinforcement (To all other sections)
Forces of nature Forces of man Trade, domination, scientific discoveries	Ecological factors Geography, history, demography, hygiene, nutrition, economy, technology, urbanization	Value systems of major groups, Value systems of population	Structure and functioning of institutions: Family patterns, Role differentiation, social stratification, socialization emphases, educational systems, religion, political systems, legislation, architecture, theory development	←← ←← ←←
→→→	→→→	←← →→→	←← →→→	

(Hofstede, 2001, pg. 12)

Minkow (2013) writes how the available evidence suggests that the question of how stable or changeable culture is cannot have a definitive answer that is valid for all cases. It depends on the society, on the type and strength of factors that are exerting pressure on its culture, and on the kind of change that is measured. So it is with these reasonable defenses of the Hofstede’s dimensions, the validity of using power distance as a measure seems justified. For describing differences among nations Hofstede’s cultural dimensions framework has been accepted as important and reasonable (Triandis, 1995).

III. Approach and Methods

1. Survey Approach

To meet the objectives of this research, a quantitative approach was utilized. A questionnaire survey was distributed to measure Power Distance in the workforces of the Jeju Provincial Government and the Los Alamos County Government. The survey utilized the four power distance questions that are featured in the Values Survey Module (VSM) 2013 to remove doubt if the survey questions would accurately measure power distance or not.

After the four (4) power distance questions (hereinafter referred to as the value questions), the survey contained six (6) demographic questions assessing gender, age, education, occupation, duration of employment, and home-town location. In total, the survey contained ten (10) questions.

The survey was written in English and translated into Korean using a previous Korean example of the value questions as a guide (엥흐토포야, 2003). The questionnaire survey was administered during May 2019. In total, 92 Jeju workers and 88 Los Alamos workers answered the survey. The total sample size was 180 people ($n = 180$).

The survey was sent to participants in Jeju through a link via kakaotalk (Korean messaging app), the initial respondents then were asked to share the survey with 5-10 coworkers or other Jeju government workers. This was done with the thought to acquire a wide and as random as possible sample. Respondents in the Los Alamos government received an email link from the office of the County Manager or their direct department manager requesting to complete the survey. The distribution was either given directly to a county government manager and his office or governments workers distributing directing to their coworkers. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of the survey respondents were governments workers. Besides one request to the Los Alamos County Manager to include some police officers in the survey, there was no oversight in the

dispersal of the survey beyond the initial respondents. It was assumed that the distribution of the survey produced a random sample. A sample greater than twenty ($n > 20$ per subject country) was acquired, so it exceeded the minimum level of comparable samples suggested by Hofstede (2013) to be used for research.

2. Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was to (1) measure and compare the Power Distance of workers in the government within Korea and the United States, (2) measure and compare the Power Distance of Local and non-local workers within Korea, the United States and (3) to compare the variance within the values questions between the two countries in relationship to suitable demographic elements.

The measurement of power distance has been shown to have relationship to varied demographic markers (Hofstede 2001), which could have valuable insights into management within public administration and confirm the utility of using power distance as a measurement. And insights to the behaviors associated with each value questions and demographic question could lead to insights about structural or cultural forces to consider.

Hypothesis 1:

The difference of power distance between Jeju and Los Alamos government workers will be consistent with previous differences in Hofstede scores relating to the respective countries.

Hypothesis 2:

The location of a respondent's hometown implies a notable difference in power distance or preference within the value questions.

Hypothesis 3:

Other Demographic measures (Gender, Age, Education, Department, Duration) will show different preferences within the value questions.

3. Testing the Hypothesis

The results of the survey provided data from two distinct groups, Jeju workers and Los Alamos workers.

The value questions allow a power distance index score to be calculated as a component of national culture. All value questions are scored on a five-point scale, from 1 to 5. The power distance index score is statistically derived from the mean scores on the questions answered by the respondents. The calculation takes into account the frequency of each variant (1/2/3/4/5) and produces the mean score for each question.

For example:

We can suppose a group of 20 respondents, where:

5x	Answer 1
5x	Answer 2
3x	Answer 3
3x	Answer 4
4x	Answer 5

The calculation proceeds as follows:

$$5x_1 + 5x_2 + 3x_3 + 3x_4 + 4x_5 = \text{total score of } 52$$

The mean score under this circumstance is $52/20 = 2.6$

Power distance is calculated using the mean scores of the four value questions in the

formula below:

$$\text{PDI} = 35(\text{m02} - \text{m01}) + 25(\text{m03} - \text{m04}) + \text{C(pd)}$$

in which m02 is the mean score for question 02, etc. The index normally has a range of about 100 points between very small Power Distance and very large Power Distance countries. C(pd) is a constant (positive or negative) that depends on the nature of the samples; it does not affect the comparison between countries (Hofstede 2013). For purposes of this study, C(pd) will be a value of zero because of a comparison of only two countries. The PD scores will then be compared to the difference of Hofstede's previous scores, the scores from Millet (1998)⁷ and the created scores from previous large multiple countries studies that include Korea and the US within the literature of cross-cultural studies and power distance.

A problem for the replications on only a few cultures is that the reliability of the measurement cannot be checked in the usual way. According to Hofstede (2001), thesis committees and journal reviewers often ask for proof of the reliability of the surveys used. Novice researchers, forgetting that they are comparing cultures, not individuals, then apply reliability calculations (Such as Cronbach's Alpha, ANOVA, and other correlation measures) on individual scores and find low values. Because of the way the scores were calculated, they represent relative, not absolute, positions of countries: they are measures of differences only (Khatri 2009). Because the reliability of a cross-country test can only be tested across countries. This requires data from a sufficient number of countries (say 10 or more), without which the reliability of the measurement can simply not be tested in the textbook way and has to be taken for granted based on the literature. To avoid the problems addressed above, this study will only run a 2 sided, unpaired t-test and note p-values of less than 0.0010 as significant. Knowing that the best proof of the reliability of the power distance scores and the mean scores of the is its validity in explaining outside phenomena according to some previous research or well-founded logic. A confidence test of 95% was added to the mean scores of the value questions to offer an appropriate range of possible means to further emphasis only certain results as significant.

⁷ Sadly, the other 5 large scale replication studies did not include Korea.

A separate power distance will be calculated from the mean scores in relation to location of worker's home-town, assuming that the separate location pool of comparable respondents is larger than 20 for each measurement as per Hofstede suggestions. Then a standard deviation and t-test analysis will come from those four measurements.

Lastly, a comparison and t-test of the mean score of the value questions in relation to demographic questions will be performed. If appropriate significance is found, further analysis will be given.

IV. Empirical Results

1. Introduction

In total 180 surveys were collected. 92 from Jeju government workers and 88 from Los Alamos government workers. The surveys have an even distribution between Jeju and Los Alamos with 51% from Jeju and 49% from Los Alamos.

<Table 4-1> Basic Comparisons of Los Alamos County and Jeju Province

	Los Alamos County ⁸	Jeju Province ⁹
Location	Located in the southwestern state of New Mexico, about 56km northwest of Santa Fe	Located in the Korea Strait near the Southwestern tip of the Korean Peninsula
Size	280km ²	1,848km ²
Population	19,101 People (As per 2018 estimate)	692,032 People (As of 2018)

⁸ Statistics about Los Alamos Country comes from New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions' QCEW unit & Data USA at <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/los-alamos-county-nm/>

⁹ Statistics about Jeju Province come from 어뜨게렐 (2019)

Number of Government Employees	521 People (As of 2012)	5,382 People (As of 2018)
Major Industries	Science & Research, Education, Health Care	Service, Agriculture, Fisheries, Construction
Local Income	The Average income of a Los Alamos resident is 52,125 thousand won or roughly 52,125 US Dollars (As of 2017)	The Average income of a Jeju resident is 27,461 thousand won or roughly 27,461 US Dollars (As of 2017)

2. Value Questions

<Table 4-2> Value Questions between Jeju and Los Alamos Government Workers

Response	Jeju			Los Alamos			
	(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics ¹⁰	(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics	
(Q1) Importance Of Respected Boss	1) Utmost Importance	46	50.0	n=92 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =1.59 s=0.65	64	72.7	n=88 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =1.32 s=0.56
	2) Very Important	38	41.3		20	22.7	
	3) of moderate Importance	8	8.7		4	4.5	
	4) of little importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	5) of very little or no importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
Total	92	100.0		88	99.9		
(Q2) Boss Consulting Concerning	1) Utmost importance	8	8.7	n=92 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =2.22	8	9.1	n=88 R=3 (min 1, max 4) \bar{x} =2.09
	2) very	56	60.9		68	77.3	

¹⁰ n= sample size , R= range (lowest possible 1; highest possible 5) , \bar{x} = mean, s= standard deviation

One's work	important			$s=0.59$		$s=0.60$	
	3) of moderate Importance	28	30.4		8	9.1	
	4) of little importance	0	0.0		4	4.5	
	5) of very little or no importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	Total	92	100.0		88	100.0	
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	1) Never	0	0.0		3	3.4	
	2) Seldom	12	13.0	$n=92$ $R=3$ (min 2, max 5) $\bar{x}=3.65$ $s=0.97$	16	18.2	$n=88$ $R=3$ (min 1, max 4) $\bar{x}=2.88$ $s=0.66$
	3) Sometimes	28	30.4		58	65.9	
	4) Usually	32	34.8		11	12.5	
	5) Always	20	21.7		0	0.0	
	Total	92	99.9		88	100.0	
(Q4) Avoid Multiple Boss Structure	1) Strongly Agree	17	18.5		13	14.8	
	2) Agree	33	35.9	$n=92$ $R=3$ (min 1, max 4) $\bar{x}=2.54$ $s=1.08$	34	38.6	$n=88$ $R=4$ (min 1, max 5) $\bar{x}=2.57$ $s=1.05$
	3) Undecided	17	18.5		21	23.9	
	4) Disagree	25	27.2		18	20.4	
	5) Strongly Disagree	0	0.0		2	2.3	
	Total	92	100.1		88	100.0	

1) Importance of a Respected Boss

The first question asked how important was it to the respondent to have a boss that they can respect. With a range of five answers; answer one saying that it was of utmost importance to the respondent to answer five saying it was of little to no importance. Nearly all respondents (91% Jeju and 95% Los Alamos) thought that it was very important or of utmost importance to respect their boss. The table <4-2> shows the results of the survey with comparison. There was a mean score of 1.59 for Jeju and 1.32 for Los Alamos. This result suggests that Jeju respondents are slightly more willing to accept their boss' status without being shown their competence beforehand but both Jeju and Los Alamos respondents show preference to a boss that is respected and probably trusted more for it.

2) Importance of Boss Communication

The second question asked how important was it to the respondent to have their boss consult them in decision involving their work. With a range of five answers: answer one saying that it was of utmost important to the respondent to answer five where it was of little to no importance. Jeju respondent were more evenly split between of utmost importance (50%) and very important (40%), compared to Los Alamos where the majority (73%) responded that it was of utmost importance to them to be consulted with. There was a mean score of 2.22 for Jeju and 2.09 for Los Alamos. This result shows that Los Alamos respondents slightly favor more inclusion in decision about their work. Probably favoring a democratic-style boss over an autocratic-style boss.

<Table 4-3> Value Questions between Jeju and Los Alamos Statistics

Measurement Variables	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
							low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	92	1.59	2.98	0.0033	0.27	1.46	1.72
	L.A.	88	1.32				0.56	1.20
(Q2)	Jeju	92	2.22	1.47	0.1455	0.13	2.10	2.34

Boss Consulting	L.A.	88	2.09	0.60				1.96	2.21
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Jeju	92	3.65	0.97				3.45	3.85
	L.A.	88	2.88	0.66	6.20	0.0000*	0.77	2.74	3.02
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	92	2.54	1.08				2.32	2.76
	L.A.	88	2.57	1.05	0.19	0.8504	-0.03	2.35	2.79

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

3) Voiced Disagreements with Boss

The third question asked respondents How often, in their experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss? With a range of five answers: answer one saying 'never' to answer five saying 'always' in their experience. This questions had the largest discrepancies between Jeju and Los Alamos. With 66% of Los Alamos respondents favoring the middle answer of 'sometimes' while Jeju respondents had a high frequency in the high answers of sometimes (30%), usually (35%), and always (22%) being afraid to voice disagreements with bosses. There was a mean score of 3.65 for Jeju and 2.88 for Los Alamos. This result is deemed to be statistically significant with a t-value of 6.20. This result shows that Jeju respondents were more tentative in directly disagreeing with their superior than Los Alamos respondents.

4) Multiple boss structure

The fourth and last of the value questions asked respondents if they agreed with the following statement: An organization structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost. What a range of five answers: answers one being strongly agree and answer five being strongly disagree. With the process of decentralization, one could assume that Jeju people would have a higher degree of acceptance of multiple bosses but to be so similar to American responses is still surprising and not shown in previous studies. This was the question with the most similarities in response from both groups. Answer 2 (agree) was the most frequent answers for both Jeju (36%) and Los Alamos (39%).

Question 4 was also the only value question where Jeju respondents had a lower mean score than Los Alamos, 2.54 and 2.57 respectively.

3. Demographics

There were six demographic questions at the end of the survey. (Gender, age, education, departments, departments duration, and hometown location)

Table 4-4 shows gender was distributed in the government workforce respondents unevenly in Jeju and evenly in Los Alamos. Women were 41 out of 88 (47%) of the surveys in Los Alamos while Jeju only had 22 out of 92 (22%). There was a larger number of respondents in Jeju whose age was 39 and lower than in Los Alamos; 51 out of 92 compared to only 16 out of 88 respectively. There is an assumption that this partially happened due to many initial Jeju respondents being graduate school students whose ages are usually in the younger age range, compared to Los Alamos whose workforce age is older on average and the method of delivery was more blind. The education of the workforce was also very bachelors heavy with 70 out of 92 respondents in Jeju having just a bachelor's degree or less and 63 out of 88 in Los Alamos. Again, many initial Jeju respondents were graduate students, therefore placing giving a higher presence to bachelor degree holders. Though it should be noted that many of the initial Jeju respondents are currently studying for their master's degree. So the education sample taken would have looked reasonable different if the exact same people were asked about their education level in 2 years' time.

<Table 4-4> Demographic Statistics between Jeju and Los Alamos

Section		Jeju (n=92)		Los Alamos (n=88)		Total (n=180)	
		(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)	(#)	(%)
Gender	Female	22	23.9	41	46.6	63	35.0
	Male	70	76.1	47	53.4	117	65.0
Age	20 – 29 years	2	2.2	5	5.7	7	3.9
	30 – 39 years	49	53.3	11	12.5	60	33.3

	40 – 49 years	28	30.4	36	40.9	64	35.6
	50 – 59 years	10	10.9	32	36.4	42	23.3
	Over 60 years	3	3.3	4	4.5	7	3.9
Education Level	High School	0	0.0	3	3.4	3	1.7
	Associates	2	2.2	12	13.6	14	7.8
	Bachelors	68	73.9	48	54.5	116	64.4
	Masters	15	16.3	20	22.7	35	19.4
	Phd	7	7.6	5	5.7	12	6.7
Department ¹¹	Safety	15	16.5	15	17.0	30	16.8
	Tourism/ Culture	10	11.0	7	8.0	17	9.5
	Traffic / Facilities	12	13.2	20	22.7	32	17.9
	Maintenance / Parks	3	3.3	11	12.5	14	7.8
	Legislative / Judicial	20	22.0	5	5.7	25	14.0
	Records / Services	26	28.6	30	34.1	56	31.3
	Other	5	5.5	0	0.0	5	2.8
Duration At Department	Under 3 years	35	38.0	11	12.5	46	25.6
	3 – 7 years	12	13.0	29	33.0	41	22.8
	Over 7 years	45	48.9	48	54.5	93	51.6
Hometown (Korea) ¹²	Jeju	59	64.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Seogwipo	11	12.1	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Mainland Korea	21	23.1	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hometown (USA)	Los Alamos Area	NA	NA	19	21.6	NA	NA
	Rest of New Mexico	NA	NA	22	25.0	NA	NA
	Other States	NA	NA	47	53.4	NA	NA

The department of the surveyed workers was a problematic question that will be

¹¹ One respondent from Jeju left the department question blank, so the Jeju (%) was from 91 and the total (%) was from 179.

¹² One respondent from Jeju left the Hometown question blank, so the Jeju (%) was from 91

addressed more in a later section. There was one Jeju respondent who left this (Q8) and the hometown (Q10) inquiry blank. There is a larger amount of governmental staff on Jeju, whether it be legislative, judicial, or executive in nature, compared to Los Alamos. This is probably due to the size of the population of the governed area with Jeju island having a population of over 670,000 people while Los Alamos county only having a population of roughly 18,000. Another possible explanation is that the American style of government with federalism tends to have smaller governmental staffs in comparison to unitary governments like South Korea. Though the United States may have smaller governmental staff sizes, there is a much larger number of separate governments and special government districts in comparison to Korea.

<Table 4-5> Comparative list of Government Departments¹³

Los Alamos County Departments	Jeju Special Autonomous Province Departments	Jeju Special Autonomous Province Departments (ctd.)
-Department of Administrative Services	-Division of General Affairs -Office of Urban Design	-Bureau of Labor, Economics, & Trade
-Office of the County Attorney	-Office of Gender Equality	-Bureau of Urban Construction
-Department of Economic Development	-Office of Planning and Coordination	-Bureau of Health, Welfare, & Women Affairs
-Department of Community Development	-Division of Resident Safety -Bureau of Tourism	-Office of Fire Services and Safety
-Human Resources -Fire Department	-Bureau of Self-governing Administration	-Bureau of Environment Protection
-Police Department -Department of Emergency Management -Public Works Department	-Bureau of Culture, sports, and External Cooperation -Bureau of Future Strategy -Bureau of Transportation	-Bureau of Agriculture, Livestock, & Food -Bureau of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs

¹³ *Department list taken from government websites (<http://www.losalamosnm.us/>) & (<https://www.jeju.go.kr>)

-Department of Public Utilities		
-Customer Care and Services	-Office of Public Information	

In retrospect, the study would have been better served by creating encompassing groups so that manual grouping of answers was not needed and that better clarity would have been achieved. What would have been even a better choice is to choose the specific departments in both governments to be matching so that better consistency could have been achieved in the comparable results. Also when comparing jobs with PD the important characteristic is type of work, not necessarily the department. Examples of appropriate categories would have been: Unskilled and semiskilled workers, Clerical workers and nonprofessional salespeople, Skilled workers and technicians, Managers of the previous categories, Professional workers, Managers of professional workers (Hofstede et al. 2010). Due to the issues that arose from the unclear grouping of the departments and then the questionable use of such division even if they were properly done has led this study to disregard Q8 (departments) as a variable in future analysis and will be noted as an area that needs improvement if a study like this was to be attempted again.

The duration of departmental employment separates the respondents into 3 groups. First, being new (under 3 years), established (3-7 years), and veteran (over 7 years). About half of respondents in both Jeju (48%) and Los Alamos (54%) were veterans of their departments, therefore acquiring a familiarity with their work and colleagues.

The location of the respondents' hometown shows that there were many more non-New Mexicans working within the Los Alamos county government (53%) compared to non-Jeju people (23%) in Jeju's government. Due to the vast size of New Mexico (315,194km²) it was decided to further breakdown New Mexico residents into Los Alamos county and the immediate area, which includes the Espanola valley to the northeast and Pojoaque valley to the east and the Jemez mountains to the west, and the rest of New Mexico. There is a fairly even split between the Los Alamos area and the rest of New Mexico with 46% (19 out of 41) coming from the Los Alamos area and 54% (22 out of 41) coming from the rest of New Mexico. Jeju Island (about 1850km²) is split administratively between Jeju city on the North half of the Island and Seogwipo city on

the South half. Those respondents whose hometown are on Jeju Island (70 in total), 59 (84%) were from Jeju city and 11 (16%) were from Seogwipo city. This is reasonably close to the 18% of the island's population that Seogwipo city contains.

4. Power Distance Calculation

The results of the 180 surveyed respondents show that the PDI differences between Jeju government workers and Los Alamos government workers to be 15.1. With Korea predictably measuring with a higher PD. It is important to note again that the PD measurement is not considered absolute and the focus is on the difference of PD between the two locations.

<Table 4-6> Power Distance of Jeju and Los Alamos Government Workers

PDI = 35(m02-m01) + 25(m03-m04) + C(pd)	
Jeju PDI = 22.05 + 27.75 + 0 =	49.8
Los Alamos PDI = 26.95 + 7.75 + 0 =	34.7
PDI Difference =	15.1

<Table 4-7> Power Distance of Korea and USA included in Mass Studies with current study

Study	Korean PDI	US PDI	Difference
Hofstede (1980)	60	40	20
Merritt (1998)	38	23	15
*Beugelsdijk et al (2015) 1941 set	98	35	63
*Beugelsdijk et al (2015) 1971 set	84	32	52

Current study	50	35	15
Mean difference w/o Beugelsdijk et al.	16.67	Mean difference w Beugelsdijk et al.	33
Standard Deviation	2.89	Standard Deviation	22.79

The numbers from Beugelsdijk are created by taking data from the GLOBE project and the WVS (World Values Survey) and creating corresponding data to connect to Hofstede scores. This study calculated the mean difference score with the Beugelsdijk numbers and without them. Without the Beugelsdijk scores, the PDI difference of this study matches very well with Hofstede's and Merritt's differences. With the Beugelsdijk scores the PDI differences of this study does not replicated the difference well enough.

5. Power Distance in relation to Hometown Location

The surveyed groups of Jeju city and Seogwipo city were combined for one location of Jeju island because the sample size of Seogwipo (11) was below the threshold of 20. Due to proximity and isolation from other land masses, it is reasonable to believe that people from Jeju city and Seogwipo city would have similar values on the macro level, therefore justifying the combining of the two sample groups for further comparison purposes. Respondents from mainland Korea barely qualified past the threshold of 20 with 21 people coming from not-Jeju.

1) Korean Hometown

<Table 4-8> Value Questions Results according to Korean Hometown

Korean Response	Jeju Island	Mainland Korea
-----------------	-------------	----------------

Hometown	(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics ¹⁴	(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics	
(Q1) Importance Of Respected Boss	1) Utmost Importance	38	54.3	n=70 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =1.57 s=0.69	7	33.3	n=21 R=1 (min 1, max 2) \bar{x} =1.67 s=0.48
	2) Very Important	24	34.3		14	66.7	
	3) of moderate Importance	8	11.4		0	0.0	
	4) of little importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	5) of very little or no importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	Total	70	100.0		21	100.0	
(Q2) Boss Consulting Concerning One's work	1) Utmost importance	5	7.1	n=70 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =2.16 s=0.51	3	14.3	n=21 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =2.52 s=0.75
	2) very important	51	72.9		4	19.0	
	3) of moderate Importance	14	20.0		14	66.7	
	4) of little importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	5) of very little or no importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	Total	70	100.0		21	100.0	

(1) Importance of a Respected Boss

The first question asked how important was it to the respondent to have a boss that they can respect. With a range of five answers; answer one saying that it was of utmost importance to the respondent to answer five saying it was of little to no importance. Nearly all respondents (88% of Jeju people and 100% of

¹⁴ n= sample size , R= range (lowest possible 1; highest possible 5) , \bar{x} = mean, s= standard deviation

Mainland Koreans) thought that is was very important or of utmost importance to respect their boss. The table <4-8> shows the results of the survey with comparison. There was a mean score of 1.57 for Jeju and 1.67 for mainland Korea. This result suggests that mainland Koreans respondents are slightly more willing to accept their boss' status without being shown their competence beforehand; similar in comparison to Jeju and Los Alamos but both Jeju and mainland Korean respondents show a heavy preference to a boss that is respected and probably trusted more for it.

(2) Importance of Boss Communication

The second question asked how important was it to the respondent to have their boss consult them in decision involving their work. With a range of five answers: answer one saying that it was of utmost important to the respondent to answer five where it was of little to no importance. Jeju respondent showed a majority (73%) with very important while mainland Koreans favored the answer of moderate importance at 67%. There was a mean score of 2.16 for Jeju and 2.52 for mainland Korea. This result shows that Jeju people prefer more inclusion in decisions about their work than mainland Korean counterparts while working in the Jeju government. While the largest mean difference (see <Table 4-10>) for Korean hometown location occur on Q2, the result was still not statistically significant.

<Table 4-9> Value Questions Results according to Korean Hometown (ctd.)

Korean Hometown	Response	Jeju Island			Mainland Korea		
		(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics ¹⁵	(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With	1) Never	0	0.0	n=70 R=3 (min 2, max 5) \bar{x} =3.64	0	0.0	n=21 R=3 (min 2, max 5) \bar{x} =3.86
	2) Seldom	10	14.3		1	4.8	

¹⁵ n= sample size , R= range (lowest possible 1; highest possible 5) , \bar{x} = mean, s= standard deviation

Boss	3) Sometimes	22	31.4	$s=0.98$	6	28.6	$s=0.85$
	4) Usually	23	32.9		9	42.9	
	5) Always	15	21.4		5	23.8	
	Total	70	100.0		21	100.1	
(Q4) Avoid Multiple Boss Structure	1) Strongly Agree	14	20.0	n=70 R=3 (min 1, max 4) $\bar{x}=2.53$ $s=1.07$	2	9.5	n=21 R=3 (min 1, max 4) $\bar{x}=2.71$ $s=1.10$
	2) Agree	23	32.9		10	47.6	
	3) Undecided	16	22.9		1	4.8	
	4) Disagree	17	24.3		8	38.1	
	5) Strongly Disagree	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	Total	70	100.1		21	100.0	

(3) Voiced Disagreements with Boss

The third question asked respondents How often, in their experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss? With a range of five answers: answer one saying 'never' to answer five saying 'always' in their experience. While there was a higher likelihood for mainlanders to be afraid to express disagreements, the difference was not considered statistically significant.

(4) Multiple boss structure

The fourth and last of the value questions asked respondents if they agreed with the following statement: An organization structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost. What a range of five answers: answers one being strongly agree and answer five being strongly disagree. With

the process of decentralization, one could assume that Jeju people would have a higher degree of acceptance of multiple bosses but the survey shows that mainland Koreans have a slight less aversion to multiple boss structures. This result is surprising but due to the rather low sample count of mainland Koreans and the moderately low mean difference, the result is noted but that to be considered result that needs future verification and study.

<Table 4-10> Comparative Statistics according to Korean Hometown for Jeju workers

Korean Hometown	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
							low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	70	1.57	0.62	0.5372	-0.10	1.43	1.75
	Mainland	21	1.67				0.48	1.46
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	70	2.16	2.74	0.0075	-0.36	2.04	2.28
	Mainland	21	2.52				0.75	2.20
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Jeju	70	3.64	1.06	0.2942	-0.22	3.41	3.87
	Mainland	21	3.86				0.85	3.5
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	70	2.53	0.75	0.4573	-0.18	2.28	2.78
	Mainland	21	2.71				1.10	2.24

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

There seems to be little statistical significance to the hometown location of workers in the Jeju government. While Jeju people scored lower on all of the mean scores for the value question. Also, there is a reasonable difference between Jeju people and mainlanders on Q2 (boss communication), Jeju people put a higher importance of communication with their boss than mainlanders in the context of working in the Jeju government, perhaps due to some of the latent factors of regional ties.

2) American Hometown

The amount of Los Alamos Area respondents was below the threshold of 20 by 1

at 19. It was decided to combine respondents from Los Alamos area and the rest of New Mexico together to make a sample group of 41. While New Mexico is quite large and the far edges may not have the same culture, it is reasonable to assume that people in New Mexico would share more in common with each other than with people from other states, when differences in culture arose. Due to a shared public school curriculum, more similar environment, and lifestyle in comparison to respondents from other states. Other states respondents numbered 47, passing the suggested threshold for comparison.

<Table 4-11> Value Questions Results according to American Hometown

USA Hometown	Response	New Mexico			Other States		
		(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics ¹⁶	(#)	(%)	Descriptive Statistics
(Q1) Importance Of Respected Boss	1) Utmost Importance	22	53.7	n=41 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =1.54 s=0.64	42	89.4	n=47 R=2 (min 1, max 3) \bar{x} =1.13 s=0.40
	2) Very Important	16	39.0		4	8.5	
	3) of moderate Importance	3	7.3		1	2.1	
	4) of little importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	5) of very little or no importance	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	Total	41	100.0		47	100.0	
(Q2) Boss Consulting Concerning One's work	1) Utmost importance	3	7.3	n=41 R=3 (min 1, max 4) \bar{x} =2.12 s=0.56	5	10.6	n=47 R=3 (min 1, max 4) \bar{x} =2.06 s=0.64
	2) very important	31	75.6		37	78.8	
	3) of moderate Importance	6	14.6		2	4.3	
	4) of little importance	1	2.4		3	6.4	
	5) of very little	0	0.0				

¹⁶ n= sample size , R= range (lowest possible 1; highest possible 5) , \bar{x} = mean, s= standard deviation

	or no importance				0	0.0	
	Total	41	99.9		47	100.1	
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	1) Never	3	7.3		0	0.0	
	2) Seldom	7	17.1	n=41 R=3 (min 1, max 4) \bar{x} =2.76 s=0.70	9	19.1	n=47 R=2 (min 2, max 4) \bar{x} =2.98 s=0.61
	3) Sometimes	28	68.3		30	63.8	
	4) Usually	3	7.3		8	17.0	
	5) Always	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	Total	41	100.0		47	99.9	
(Q4) Avoid Multiple Boss Structure	1) Strongly Agree	2	4.9		11	23.4	
	2) Agree	15	36.6	n=41 R=3 (min 1, max 4) \bar{x} =2.63 s=0.73	19	40.4	n=47 R=4 (min 1, max 5) \bar{x} =2.51 s=1.27
	3) Undecided	20	48.8		1	2.1	
	4) Disagree	4	9.8		14	29.8	
	5) Strongly Disagree	0	0.0		2	4.3	
	Total	41	100.1		47	100.0	

(1) Importance of a Respected Boss

The first question asked how important was it to the respondent to have a boss that they can respect. With a range of five answers; answer one saying that it was of utmost importance to the respondent to answer five saying it was of little to no importance. A majority of both groups of respondents (54% of New Mexico people and 89% of people from other states) thought that is was of utmost

importance to respect their boss. The table <4-11> shows the results of the survey with comparison. There was a mean score of 1.54 for New Mexicans and 1.13 for non-New Mexicans. This result suggests that New Mexicans are more willing to accept their boss' status without being shown their competence beforehand; similar in comparison to Jeju and Los Alamos but both groups of American showed a heavy preference to a boss that is respected.

(2) Importance of Boss Communication

The second question asked how important was it to the respondent to have their boss consult them in decision involving their work. With a range of five answers: answer one saying that it was of utmost important to the respondent to answer five where it was of little to no importance. Americans of both groups showed a similar majority of thinking that boss communication was very important, with New Mexicans responding as such 76% and non-New Mexicans responding 79% as such. With such a similar result, it would suggest that hometown location would not have a noted effect on one's preference in boss communication.

(3) Voiced Disagreements with Boss

The third question asked respondents How often, in their experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss? With a range of five answers: answer one saying 'never' to answer five saying 'always' in their experience. While there was a higher likelihood for people not from New Mexico to be afraid to express disagreements, the difference was not considered statistically significant. The mean difference of locals and outsiders was the same for both Korea and the US, which suggests that it is reasonable to think that hometown location might have a similar result in other locations. Further investigation would be warranted.

(4) Multiple boss structure

The fourth and last of the value questions asked respondents if they agreed with the following statement: An organization structure in which certain subordinates

have two bosses should be avoided at all cost. What a range of five answers: answers one being strongly agree and answer five being strongly disagree. A plurality of New Mexicans (49%) were undecided with their opinion on multiple boss structure while people from other states were more committed in either agreeing or disagreeing with 40% and 30%, respectively. But the mean difference between New Mexicans and non-New Mexicans is deemed not significant, like most measurements concerning question 4 in the study.

<Table 4-12> Comparative Statistics according to American Hometown for Los Alamos workers

USA Hometown	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
							low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	NM ¹⁷	41	1.54	3.65	0.0000*	0.41	1.34	1.74
	OS	47	1.13				1.02	1.24
(Q2) Boss Consulting	NM	41	2.12	0.46	0.6433	0.06	1.95	2.29
	OS	47	2.06				1.88	2.24
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	NM	41	2.76	1.58	0.1188	-0.22	2.55	2.97
	OS	47	2.98				2.81	3.15.
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	NM	41	2.63	0.53	0.5955	0.12	2.41	2.85
	OS	47	2.51				2.15	2.87

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

There was a significant result in regard to Q1 (respected boss) with a t-value of 3.65. People from outside of New Mexico placed a larger importance on having a respected boss. This could possibly be explained outsiders wanting to trust their superior more, or a small preference to charismatic managers in the workplace when employed in a place away from home, but there is very little in the literature that would support that. The other questions show little significance in comparison. The lack of difference could be explained by a

¹⁷ NM meaning New Mexico and OS meaning other states other than New Mexico

unique factor in Los Alamos County, if a person comes from another state, most likely they are highly educated and taking a mid to high-level job in the county or married to someone who is highly educated. Los Alamos county has one of the highest percentages of PhDs per capita in the US because of the presence of the Los Alamos National Laboratories. In connection to previous studies (Hofstede 2001), that shows education to connect with Power Distance questions, may explain the result. The larger PD difference of 20.75 implies a necessity to further investigate this study's limitations or future Power Distance studies at the regional level in the United States.

3) Power Distance Calculations

<Table 4-13> Power Distance according to Regional location

Jeju Island PDI	$19.95 + 27.75 = 47.7$
Mainland Korea PDI	$29.75 + 28.75 = 58.5$
PDI Difference	10.8
New Mexico PDI	$20.3 + 3.25 = 23.55$
Other States PDI	$32.55 + 11.75 = 44.3$
PDI Difference	20.75

The results of survey show a 10.8 difference in PD from native Jeju people who work in the Jeju government and non-Jeju people who work in the Jeju government. This results agree with the hypothesis that location of hometown would have an effect on PDI; with outsiders having a higher scores compared to locals. The fact that there is no significant statistical difference between Jeju and the mainland but still a PD difference of 10.8, shows the importance of the whole ecological view in the calculation of the PD score. While the number of non-jeju people is low at 21, this result still implies that regional differences may be able to account for differences in workplace behavior and values which confirms prior research about regionalism in Korea. What is more surprising is that the Difference of the PDI scores between New Mexico people who work in the Los Alamos county government and people raised in other states who work in the

Los Alamos county government is almost double that of the Korean difference. (20.75 to 10.8) Both PD scores from Koreans were still higher than either US score, suggesting that regional differences of culture within country would have less effect on PD than the national differences discussed in the PD literature. Both results confirm that regionalism and hometown location may have an effect on PD and it warrants further investigation.

6. Value Questions mean scores in relation to Demographic variables

(1) Gender

<Table 4-14> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Female)

Gender Cross-country	Female	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	20	1.20	0.41	0.73	0.4699	0.08	1.02	1.38
	L.A.	41	1.12	0.40				1.00	1.24
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	20	2.25	0.44	0.06	0.9513	0.01	2.06	2.44
	L.A.	41	2.24	0.66				2.04	2.44
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Jeju	20	4.50	0.51	8.23	0.0000*	1.48	4.28	4.72
	L.A.	41	3.02	0.72				2.80	3.24
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	20	2.75	0.72	0.45	0.6522	0.12	2.43	3.07
	L.A.	41	2.63	1.07				2.30	2.96

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

<Table 4-15> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Male)

Gender Cross-country	Male	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high

(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	72	1.70	0.66	1.74	0.0850	0.21	1.55	1.85
	L.A.	47	1.49	0.62				1.31	1.67
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	72	2.21	0.63	2.28	0.0247	0.25	2.06	2.36
	L.A.	47	1.96	0.51				1.81	2.11
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Jeju	72	3.42	0.93	4.47	0.0000*	0.68	3.21	3.63
	L.A.	47	2.74	0.57				2.58	2.90
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	72	2.49	1.16	0.10	0.9239	-0.02	2.22	2.76
	L.A.	47	2.51	1.04				2.21	2.81

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

Gender has the highest discrepancy for any of the mean scores of a value question (see Table 4-15). On Q3 (voiced disagreements with boss) Korean women scored a full point higher on averaged than Korean men (4.5 to 3.42 respectively). The test result (t-value 4.98) implies a statistically significant difference between Men's and Women's experience of disagreeing with a superior in Jeju but that the difference is not significant in the Los Alamos workplace. The test also implies (t-value 8.23 & 4.47) a statistically significant difference between Jeju and Los Alamos respondents regardless of gender.

<Table 4-16> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Within Country - Jeju)

Gender Same Country	Jeju	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Male	72	1.70	0.66	3.21	0.0018	0.50	1.55	1.85
	Female	20	1.20	0.41				1.02	1.38
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Male	72	2.21	0.63	0.27	0.7909	-0.04	2.06	2.36
	Female	20	2.25	0.44				2.06	2.44
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Male	72	3.42	0.93	4.98	0.0000*	-1.08	3.21	3.63
	Female	20	4.50	0.51				4.28	4.72
(Q4)	Male	72	2.49	1.16	0.95	0.3444	-0.26	2.22	2.76

Multiple Boss Structure	Female	20	2.75	0.72				2.43	3.07
-------------------------	--------	----	------	------	--	--	--	------	------

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

<Table 4-17> Comparative Statistics according to Gender (Within Country – Los Alamos)

Gender Same Country	Los Alamos	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Male	47	1.49	0.62	3.27	0.0015	0.37	1.31	1.67
	Female	41	1.12	0.40				1.00	1.24
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Male	47	1.96	0.51	2.24	0.0276	-0.28	1.81	2.11
	Female	41	2.24	0.66				2.04	2.44
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Male	47	2.74	0.57	2.41	0.0181	-0.28	2.58	2.90
	Female	41	3.02	0.72				2.80	3.24
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Male	47	2.51	1.04	0.53	0.5956	-0.12	2.21	2.81
	Female	41	2.63	1.07				2.30	2.96

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

One possible explanation for the large difference in Korea but not in America is the Confucian culture concerning women and the norms dictating saving face to one's superior is even more burdensome on women in the workplace (Chung, 1994). Another possible explanation is that the sample of Korean women surveyed was not large enough, the 20 women was the bare minimum needed for reasonable comparison of value questions, so it would be reasonable to assume that the small sample size has put more weight on higher answers. But it should be noted that all 20 surveyed women responded with either 'usually' (answer 4) or 'always' (answer 5) on question 3. So there is a chance that the score would return closer to the men's mean score with more respondents but there is still reasonable inference to think that Korean women are more likely to give a higher answer on average for question 3. While there is no gender

comparison for Korean concerning power distance, Stedham and Yamamura (2004) did indicate that gender differences exist in the power distance dimension for Japan, so it may be possible to replicate their study in reference to comparing Korea and the US. Both Korean and US women responded with a lower score on question 1 showing a preference to a more respected boss which is in line with previous research, indicating women preference to certain boss types. (Hofstede 2005, Bruins et al. 1993)

(2) Age

It was decided to combine age categories of 20-29 years and 30-39 years into one 39 years and under, in addition 40-49 years, 50-59 years, and over 60 years were combined into one 40 years and over category. The two categories simplified the comparison because with the more categories there are, the more likely one category will not qualify for the minimum threshold for meaningful comparisons. Even with the combining of some categories, the Los Alamos 39 years and under group did not reach the 20-person threshold with only 16 respondents and so while comparative statistics were done, results were to be generally ignored in the comparisons in this section.

<Table 4-18> Comparative Statistics according to Age (39 & under)

Age Cross-country	39 & Under	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	51	1.57	0.45	1.41	0.1648	-0.24	1.45	1.69
	L.A.	16	1.81	0.75				1.44	2.18
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	51	2.53	0.54	2.52	0.0142	0.47	2.38	2.68
	L.A.	16	2.06	0.93				1.60	2.52
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Jeju	51	3.57	1.02	2.79	0.0068	0.76	3.29	3.85
	L.A.	16	2.81	0.66				2.49	3.13
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	51	2.43	1.08	1.05	0.2969	-0.32	2.13	2.73
	L.A.	16	2.75	1.00				2.26	3.24

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

<Table 4-19> Comparative Statistics according to Age (40 & over)

Age Cross-country	40 & Over	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	41	1.61	0.63	3.96	0.0000*	0.40	1.42	1.80
	L.A.	72	1.21	0.44				1.11	1.31
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	41	1.83	0.38	2.95	0.0038	-0.27	1.71	1.95
	L.A.	72	2.10	0.51				1.98	2.22
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	Jeju	41	3.76	0.89	5.88	0.0000*	0.87	3.49	4.03
	L.A.	72	2.89	0.67				2.74	3.04
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	41	2.68	1.08	0.72	0.4740	0.15	2.35	3.01
	L.A.	72	2.53	1.06				2.28	2.77

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

The test showed (t-value 5.88) a significant difference on Q3 between Jeju and Los Alamos workers of 40 years of age and older (<Table 4-19>), but there was a reasonably less significant score (t-value 2.79) for Jeju and Los Alamos workers under the age of 40. Because of the small sample of Los Alamos workers of less than 40 years of age, it was less likely to find significant results, but it should be noted that Jeju and Los Alamos workers less than 40 years old was the only cross-country comparison to not have a statistically significant result for Q3. Though one could easily think that if more respondents for younger in Los Alamos workforce that the difference could be similar to the other categories.

<Table 4-20> Comparative Statistics according to Age (Within Country – Jeju)

Age Same Country	Jeju	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high

(Q1) Respected Boss	39 under	51	1.57	0.45	0.45	0.6543	-0.04	1.45	1.69
	40 over	41	1.61	0.63				1.42	1.80
(Q2) Boss Consulting	39 under	51	2.53	0.54	8.05	0.0000*	0.70	2.38	2.68
	40 over	41	1.83	0.38				1.71	1.95
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	39 under	51	3.57	1.02	0.94	0.3501	-0.19	3.29	3.85
	40 over	41	3.76	0.89				3.49	4.03
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	39 under	51	2.43	1.08	1.1	0.2727	-0.25	2.13	2.73
	40 over	41	2.68	1.08				2.35	3.01

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

<Table 4-21> Comparative Statistics according to Age (Within Country – Los Alamos)

Age Same Country	Los Alamos	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	39 under	16	1.81	0.75	4.27	0.0000*	0.60	1.44	2.18
	40 over	72	1.21	0.44				1.11	1.31
(Q2) Boss Consulting	39 under	16	2.06	0.93	0.24	0.8114	-0.04	1.60	2.52
	40 over	72	2.10	0.51				1.98	2.22
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	39 under	16	2.81	0.66	0.43	0.6660	-0.07	2.49	3.13
	40 over	72	2.89	0.67				2.74	3.04
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	39 under	16	2.75	1.00	0.76	0.4504	0.22	2.26	3.24
	40 over	72	2.53	1.06				2.28	2.77

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

There was a 0.7-point mean score difference between the Jeju 39 years and under group and the Jeju 40 years and over group on Q2 (Boss communication),

which showed to have a significant test with a t-value of 8.05 (<Table 4-20>). The older group placed more importance on boss communication than younger respondents. This result implies the deference that age in general is still given in Korea, not only to rank superiors. Korea still has a large power distance and most decisions must be approved from upper hierarchies. Younger respondents are more likely to have a lower level in the Korean government bureaucracy so the expectation of communication over one's work is less expected (Berggren, M & Aberg, S. 2011). There was also a significant difference (t-value 4.27) between respondents on Q1 (Respected boss) between the Los Alamos age groups (see <Table 4-21>). The older respondents placed more importance on having a boss that is respected. This is in line with research that shows that younger people in America care about their boss but find they care more about just having a job, while for older people, there is less worry about the ability to change jobs so there is a greater importance placed on the image of the superior.

(3) Education

The education categories were combined to be bachelor's degree or less and graduate degree (Masters and PhDs). Both categories from both nations qualified for the 20 minimum respondent threshold for comparison.

<Table 4-22> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Bachelors & under)

Education Cross-country	Bachelors & Under	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	70	1.70	0.67	2.95	0.0038	0.27	1.54	1.86
	L.A.	63	1.43	0.61				1.28	1.58
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	70	2.30	0.62	0.58	0.5607	0.06	2.15	2.44
	L.A.	63	2.24	0.56				2.10	2.38
(Q3) Voiced	Jeju	70	3.74	1.00	4.95	0.0000*	0.72	3.51	3.97
	L.A.	63	3.02	0.61					

Disagreements With Boss								2.87	3.17
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	70	2.61	1.07				2.36	2.86
	L.A.	63	2.67	1.16	0.31	0.7568	-0.06	2.38	2.96

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

<Table 4-23> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Masters & above)

Education Cross-country	Masters & Over	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	22	1.23	0.43	1.98	0.0537	0.19	1.05	1.41
	L.A.	25	1.04	0.20				1.00	1.12
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	22	1.95	0.38	1.67	0.1026	0.23	1.79	2.11
	L.A.	25	1.72	0.54				1.51	1.93
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	Jeju	22	3.36	0.79	4.00	0.0000*	0.84	3.03	3.69
	L.A.	25	2.52	0.65				2.27	2.77
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	22	2.32	1.13	0.00	1	0.00	1.85	2.79
	L.A.	25	2.32	0.63				2.07	2.57

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

While the mean scores show no larger than a 0.50 difference between nations, so no large contrasts in education on the scores but the results show that graduate degree holding workers have more similar views on the value questions with the respondents with similar education background than their countrymen. (though the overall difference is still reasonably small) The one exception is again question 3 where Koreans (regardless of education background) score higher on the voiced disagreement with one's boss. The t-test shows a value of 4.95 for Bachelor degree and under holders and 4.00 for Masters and higher holders, again showing significant difference between the two cultures in regard to superior and subordinate relationships.

<Table 4-24> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Within Country – Jeju)

Education Same Country	Jeju	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Bach-	70	1.70	0.67	3.09	0.0027	0.47	1.54	1.86
	Mast-	22	1.23	0.43				1.05	1.41
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Bach-	70	2.30	0.62	2.5	0.0143	0.35	2.15	2.44
	Mast-	22	1.95	0.38				1.79	2.11
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	Bach-	70	3.74	1.00	1.63	0.1071	0.38	3.51	3.97
	Mast-	22	3.36	0.79				3.03	3.69
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Bach-	70	2.61	1.07	1.09	0.2768	0.29	2.36	2.86
	Mast-	22	2.32	1.13				1.85	2.79

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

<Table 4-25> Comparative Statistics according to Education (Within Country – Los Alamos)

Education Same Country	Los Alamos	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Bach-	63	1.43	0.61	3.12	0.0025	0.39	1.28	1.58
	Mast-	25	1.04	0.20				1.00	1.12
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Bach-	63	2.24	0.56	3.97	0.0000*	0.52	2.10	2.38
	Mast-	25	1.72	0.54				1.51	1.93
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	Bach-	63	3.02	0.61	3.4	0.0000*	0.50	2.87	3.17
	Mast-	25	2.52	0.65				2.27	2.77
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Bach-	63	2.67	1.16	1.42	0.1580	0.35	2.38	2.96
	Mast-	25	2.32	0.63				2.07	2.57

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

There did not appear to be a significant difference in Jeju respondents (t-value 1.63) due to education level, while there was a significant difference in Los Alamos respondents (t-value 3.4) in education level. Hofstede (1976 & 2001) and Inkeles (1969) have shown in their research that education level is a major factor in power distance. With a measureable reduction of PD for additional years of education. The range of PDI scores among different countries, holding occupation and education constant, was still nearly as large as PD alone. The differences in hierarchical power distance found between equally educated employees in different countries were of similar magnitude as those between unskilled and trained within one country (Hofstede 2001). Now, most government workers are college educated, but that the education level showed statistically significant difference in responses in Los Alamos workers to the superior-subordinate relationship while the Jeju respondents did not show that difference is notable, considering Hofstede (2001) considers education and occupation to be the most relevant factors in power distance. It shows the power of Korean culture to supersede over other factors. This doubly enforces the cultural differences in the US and Korea while showing the cultural power of saving face and different relationship norms in the two countries. (Lee, C. 2012, Oetzel, J et al. 2001). Education level also showed a significant test for question 2 (boss communication) in regard to Los Alamos respondents with a t-value of 3.97. More educated respondents placed a higher importance of boss communication than less educated respondents which would be in line with the above mentioned Hofstede's (2001) research.

(4) Department Duration

<Table 4-26> Comparative Statistics according to Workplace Duration (Over 7 years)

Duration Cross-country	Over 7 years	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	45	1.91	0.47	5.89	0.0000*	0.62	1.77	2.05
	L.A.	48	1.29	0.54				1.14	1.44
(Q2)	Jeju	45	1.91	0.36	1.34	0.1825	-0.13	1.80	2.02

Boss Consulting	L.A.	48	2.04	0.54				1.89	2.19
(Q3) Voiced Disagreements With Boss	Jeju	45	3.73	0.96	5.39	0.0000*	0.92	3.43	4.01
	L.A.	48	2.81	0.67				2.62	3.00
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	45	2.56	1.10	0.17	0.8657	0.04	2.24	2.88
	L.A.	48	2.52	1.17				2.19	2.85

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

Respondents with 7 years or more experience with their current department was the only group to pass the 20-person threshold in both Jeju and Los Alamos, so a t-test was performed to compare their results. Similar to almost all previous cross-country categories, Q3 (voiced disagreement) showed to have a significant score with a t-value of 5.39. This holds steady with the results of this whole study showing a difference between US and Korean workers. There was also a significant result (t-value of 5.89) on Q1 (respected boss) showing that Korean workers with 7 years or more experience placed less importance on a respected boss than their US counterparts. This result matches previous studies that show that Mendonca and Kanungo (1994) found management types based on seniority or duration have been tied to greater power distance (Mendonca and Kanungo 1994).

(5) Hometown Location

<Table 4-27> Comparative Statistics according to Hometown (Locals)

Hometown Cross-Country	Locals	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Jeju	70	1.57	0.69	0.23	0.8209	0.03	1.43	1.75
	NM	41	1.54	0.64				1.34	1.74
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Jeju	70	2.16	0.51	0.01	0.9236	0.04	2.04	2.28
	NM	41	2.12	0.56				1.95	2.29
(Q3)	Jeju	70	3.64	0.98	4.87	0.0000*	0.88	3.41	3.87

Voiced disagreements With Boss	NM	41	2.76	0.70				2.55	2.97
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Jeju	70	2.53	1.07				2.28	2.78
	NM	41	2.63	0.73	0.64	0.5261	-0.10	2.41	2.85

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

In the cross-country comparison of locals to outsiders. Q3 (Voiced disagreement) continues to show significant difference between Jeju and New Mexicans, and Mainland Koreans and Other state people, with a respective t-value of 4.87 and 4.85. Another significant difference was shown on Q1 (respected boss) between Mainland Koreans and Americans from Other states with a t-value of 4.83. These differences are an extension of the comparison between New Mexicans and non-New Mexicans with little in the literature to account for the difference. It is an item to be noted but would require further testing.

<Table 4-28> Comparative Statistics according to Hometown (Outsiders)

Hometown Cross-Country	Out-Siders	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-test	p-value	Mean Difference	Confidence Intervals for Mean	
								low	high
(Q1) Respected Boss	Mainland	21	1.67	0.48	4.83	0.0000*	0.54	1.46	1.88
	OS	47	1.13	0.40				1.02	1.24
(Q2) Boss Consulting	Mainland	21	2.52	0.75	2.60	0.0116	0.46	2.20	2.84
	OS	47	2.06	0.64				1.88	2.24
(Q3) Voiced disagreements With Boss	Mainland	21	3.86	0.85	4.85	0.0000*	0.88	3.50	4.22
	OS	47	2.98	0.61				2.81	3.15.
(Q4) Multiple Boss Structure	Mainland	21	2.71	1.10	0.62	0.5347	0.20	2.24	3.18
	OS	47	2.51	1.27				2.15	2.87

Note 1: * is statistically significant at p(0.001 level as a result of a P-test.

V. Conclusions

1. PDI Difference

The results of the PDI calculations between Korean workers in the Jeju local government and American workers in the Los Alamos local government shows a consistent difference with some previous studies. (Hofstede 1980, and Merritt 1998) The analysis of the Value question and the variables reinforced the differences along the Power Distance dimension between the US and Korea. Koreans on all variables (except the removed department variable) and especially Korean women scored higher power distance mean scores denoting the fear of a subordinate to voice a disagreement with a superior directly (Choong 2012). The cultural norms behind this value and behavior from it, reinforces the notion that culture which Hofstede is measuring is relatively stable over time. The deep influence of Confucianism culture (Kim, K 2000) shows the strict practice dictating relationships. With a high Power distance score a society is willing to accept the unequal status of their relationships. When people accept this inequality there is a qualified legitimacy given to the superior of this inequality. To have a position that strives to induce change, the ramifications of this 'legitimate' power is not something to be overlooked.

2. Regionalism Differences

The results of the PDI calculations, control for location, lends approval to the theory that Hofstede VSM2013 can be used at the regional level within a country if one puts some language that is relevant to local issues. The difference of PDI between Jeju Island and Mainland Korea were reasonably significant, implying the different culture or relationship

norms that govern Jeju island but the PDI difference of New Mexico to other states people, was large enough to spur further questions about large values comparisons between states or regions within the United states. Korean provinces and regions are historically very similar that one could easily do a study to compare their cultural dimensions without having to change parameters, while some region borders in the US do no follow state lines and a regional comparison would have to be organized differently.

3. Demographic Analysis

There was a consistent, statistically significant difference in the responses of Jeju and Los Alamos workers on Q3 (voiced disagreement) across all demographic questions (except department which was excluded for bad data). Instead of assuming that each demographic variable in relation to each other explains the difference it would be far more logical to assume that a national cultural difference between the US and Korea would better explain the difference.

4. Improvement for future studies

It is importance to create a viable occupation demographic question since there has been links to occupation types and power distance in Hofstede (2001). The survey was also administered in an uneven way. In Jeju, the survey was personally sent to known government workers, mostly at the lower levels, and then asked them to take the quick survey. They were then asked to send the link to 5-10 people that they worked with in the government. It was very much a grass roots style dispersion method. While it was a relatively effective dispersal system, the results gave too much of one kind of worker and probably lead to an uneven sample set. In contrast, the Los Alamos survey was sent from the very top of the chain, from the County manager's office who would then

send it to various department managers and so on. Certain requests were able to be given to the Los Alamos manager to include some police officers in the survey, therefore matching some of the respondents in Jeju. The top down method while slower, was overall a better and more consistent way to obtain data.

5. Policy Implications

The values and motivations of an organization's management also impacts its governance structure. In 2002, Hofstede et al. surveyed 1800 junior managers and professionals from fifteen different countries and constructed an archetypal chief executive for each culture. They found that in cultures with higher power distance the model executive placed a greater value upon power, reputation, and family interest. This suggests that higher power distance countries ideal archetypal leader would be a Family Manager as described by Hofstede et al. (2002).

Subordinates are generally afraid and unwilling to express disagreement with their superiors in high power distance organizations (Hofstede, 2001). They prefer to work for superiors who make decisions, take responsibilities, and then tell them what to do (Triandis, 1994). Such an unquestioning attitude of subordinates may enable decisions made by top management to be carried out much faster in a high power organization than a low one. On the other hand, employees in a low power distance organization may resist implementation of decisions which are made without consulting them (Brockner et al., 2001). In a high power distance organization, the problem of communication gaps between the superiors and the subordinates tend to hamper the reaching and implantation of effective decisions (Khatri, 1996). Superiors who are surrounded by 'yes men' are unable to benefit from the diverse perspectives, experience, and knowledge of their subordinates. Worse still, with stress on conformity, ideas are unlikely to be refined and improved through group discussion and debate. So the quality of decisions in a high power distance organization tend to be poorer than the decisions in a low power distance organization (Khatri 2009).

6. Summary

This study reasonably confirmed that the power distance difference between the US and Korea is consistent with previous Hofstede PD scores. This study also suggests that a relationship between regionalism and power distance could exist and while not as strong as the effect as different nations. Domestically, different regions have cultural differences that are worthwhile to explore and measure. Bringing with it, similar implications that Hofstede's research does for cross-national comparisons.

Works Cited:

어뜨게렐, 다바바타르. (2019) 한국과 몽골의 지방공무원 부패에 관한 비교연구 – 한국 제주특별자치도와 몽골 투브도를 중심으로. 석사학위논문, 제주대학교 대학원 행정학과.

앵흐토야 (2003) G. Hofstede의 연구모형을 이용한 연구 – 한국과 몽골의 문화비교를 중심으로. 석사학위논문, 고려대학교 대학원 경영학과.

Angouri, J. (2018). Culture, Discourse, and the Workplace. London: Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351068444>

Arrindell, W. A., Eisemann, M, Oei, T. P. S., Caballo, V. E., Sanavio, E., Sica, C., et al. (2004). Phobic anxiety in 11 nations: Part II. Hofstede's dimensions of national cultures predict national-level variations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 627–643.

Arrindell, W. A., Steptoe, A., & Wardle, J. (2003). Higher levels of state depression in masculine than in feminine nations. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 41, 809–817.

Asgari A, Silong A, Ahmad A, Samah BA (2008). The relationship between organizational characteristics, task characteristics, cultural context and organizational citizenship behaviors. *European Journal of Economic, Financial, & Administrative Sciences*, 13: 94-107.

Banai, M. Review of Geert Hofstede: 'Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1982, 19(4), 351–4.

Bark, D.S., (1967). Policy Making in the Korean Executive Branch, in Koh, B.C. (ed.), *The Aspect of Korean Administrative Development*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Korean Research and Publication.

Barkema, H. & Vermeulen, F. (1997). What Differences in the Cultural Backgrounds of Partners Are Detrimental for International Joint Ventures? *Journal of International Business Studies*. 28. 845-864.

Basabe, N., Paez, D., Valencia, J., Gonzalez, J. L., Rime, B., & Diener, E. (2002). Cultural dimensions and socioeconomic development, climate, and emotional hedonic level. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16, 103–125.

Bass BM (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press

Berger, M. (1957) *Bureaucracy and Society in Modern Egypt: Study of the Higher Civil*

Service. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Berggren, M & Aberg, S. (2011), SKB International in South Korea: A study about consultancy of nuclear waste system management from Northern Europe to Far East Asia. Paper presented at the Företagsekonomiska institutionen at Uppsala Universitet. (2011-03-02)

Beugelsdijk, S., Maseland, R., & van Hoorn, A. (2015). Are scores on Hofstede's dimensions of national culture stable over time? A cohort analysis. *Global Strategy Journal* 5(3), 223-240.

Białas S (2009). Power distance as a determinant of relations between managers and employees in the enterprises with foreign capital. *Journal of Intercultural Management*, 1(2): 105-115.

Brockner J, Ackerman G, Greenberg J, Gelfand MJ, Francesco AM, Chen ZX, Leung K, Bierbrauer G, Gomez C, Kirkman BL, Shapiro D (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(4): 300-315

Bruins JJ, Wilke AMH (1993). Upward power tendencies in a hierarchy: Power distance theory versus bureaucratic rule. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23: 239-254.

Burgoon, J. (2005). Expectancy violations and interaction adaptation. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 149–171). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chan R. and Chheang V. (2006) *Cultural Challenges to the Decentralization Process in Cambodia*.

Chang, H.-C., & Holt, G. R. (1994). A Chinese perspective on face as interrelational concern. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework* (pp. 95–132). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cheju Province. (1995) *History of Cheju*, Cheju: Cheju National University.

Chen, M. (1995). *Asian Management Systems*. Routledge, London.

Choong Y. Lee 2012. Korean Culture and its Influence on business practice in South Korea. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, Volume 7, Number 2,

Chung, Edward, Y.J. 1994 "Confucianism and Women in Modern Korea: Continuity, Change and Conflict." In A. Sharma and K. Young, eds. *The Annual Review of Women in World Religions* 3: 142-188

Cray, D. & Mallory, G. *Making sense of managing culture*. London: International Thompson Business Press, 1998

Gahye Hong, Youngsam Cho, Fabian Jintae Froese, Mannsoo Shin, (2016) "The effect of leadership styles, rank, and seniority on affective organizational commitment: A comparative study of US and Korean employees", *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, Vol. 23 Issue: 2, pp.340-362

Garcia, F.C., Hain, P.L., St. Clair, G.K., Seckler, K. (2006) *Governing New Mexico* (3rd Ed.). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Ghosh, A. (2011) Power Distance in Organizational Contexts- A Review of Collectivist Cultures. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 47, No. 1, 89-101.

Gudykunst, W. B. (2005). An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory of effective communication: Making the net of the mesh finer. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 281–322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research*, 22, 510–543.

Ha, Yong-chool. (2005) Impact of democratization on regionalism in Korea: A complex Interplay. Paper presented at New paradigms for Transpacific Collaboration. U.S.-Korea Academic Symposium.

Han, B.H., (1965), Authoritarian Decision Making, *Sindong-A (New East Asia)*, pp 57-61.

Heilbroner, R. (1994), "Technological Determinism Revisited." In *Does Technology Drive History? The dilemma of technological determinism*, edited by M.R. Smith and L. Marx, Cambridge, MA: MIT press

Heywood, Andrew (2014). *Global politics*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Hofstede, G.H. (1968) *The Game of Budget Control*. Tavistock: London (2001 reprint)

- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). "The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories." *Journal of International Business Studies*, Fall: 75-89.
- Hofstede, G. (1985) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values, abridged version*. London: Sage.
- Hofstede G (1993). Cultural constraints in management Theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1): 81-94
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations – 2nd ed.* Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks.
- Hofstede, G. (2002) Dimensions do not exist: A reply to Brendan McSweeney. *Human Relations*, 55(11)
- Hofstede, G. (2013) Values survey module 2013 questionnaire – English language version
- Hofstede, G. Van Deusen, C., Mueller, C., Charles, T. (2002) What Goals Do Business Leaders Pursue? A Study in Fifteen Countries, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(4): 785-803
- Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, M (2010) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Intercultural Cooperation and its importance for survival*. McGraw Hill: New York 3rd edition
- Hofstede, G. & Minkov, M (2013) VSM 2013 – Values survey module 2013 manual
- Holmes, J. (1967) *Politics in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Hwang, S.D., (1997) Confucianism and Korean Bureaucracy. In Ro, C.H., Frederickson, H.G., & Hwang, S.D. (eds.) *Confucian Thought and Bureaucracy in East Asia*. Seoul: The Korea Institute of Public Administration.
- Inglehart, R. & Baker, W. (2000) Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values, *American Sociological Review*, vol.65, February: 19-51.
- Inkeles, A. (1981). Convergence and divergence in industrial societies. In M.O. Attir, B. Holzner, & Z. Suda (Eds.), *Directions of change: Modernization theory, research, and*

realities (pp.3-38). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Jeju Special Self-Governing Province (2007), White Paper of Process of Jeju Special Self-Governing Province.

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

Khare, A. (1999), "Japanese and Indian Work Patterns: A Study of Contrast", in Kao, H.S.R., Sinha, D. & Wilpert, B. (eds.), *Management and Cultural Values: The Indigenization of Organizations in Asia*: 121 - 36, Sage Publication, New Delhi.

Khatri, N. (1996), "Further Evidence for Logical Incrementalism: A Study of Computer, Banking, and Utility Industries in the United States," *The Best Papers Proceedings of the Academy of Management*, pp. 21-25.

Khatri, Naresh. (2009), "Consequences of Power Distance Orientation in Organizations". *Vision*, 13(1):1-9

Kim, Kenneth Kong-On. (2000) Dimensions of Korean Culture. *The Korean Language in America*, 5, 199-208.

Kim, Seung-kuk. (1988) "The Formation of Civil Society and the Rise of Regionalism in Korea." *Korea Journal*, vol 28, no. 6.

Kirkbride, P. S., Tang, S. F., & Westwood, R. I. (1991). Chinese conflict preferences and negotiating behaviour: Cultural and psychological influences. *Organization Studies*, 12, 365–386.

Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., & Gibson, C. B. (KLG) 2016. A retrospective on Culture's Consequences: The 35-year journey. *Journal of International Business Studies*. doi: [10.1057/s41267-016-0037-9](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-016-0037-9).

Kluckhohn, C. (1967). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E.A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mann, L. (1980). Cross-cultural studies of low groups. In H. C. Triandis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 155–210). Boston: Allyn &

Bacon.

Mead, R., 2003. *International Management*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Matsumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Pan, X., Takai, J., & Wilcox, R. (2001). Face and facework in conflict: A cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs*, 68, 235–258.

Ohbuchi, K., Sato, S., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Nationality, individualism-collectivism, and power distance in conflict management. *Tohoku Psychologica Folia*, 58, 36–49.

PCGID (Presidential Committee on Government Innovation and Decentralization) 2007

Paik, Wanki. (1990) *Korean Administrative Culture*. Seoul, Korea: Korea University Press

Park, Soojin. (2003). "The Impact of national culture on competitiveness variables: An empirical analysis of linkage between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and Porter's diamond model". Masters thesis for Economics. Seoul National University.

Pudelko, M., Carr, Ch., Fink, G., Wentges, P., 2006. The Convergence Concept in Cross Cultural Management Research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 15–18.

McSweeney, B. Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 2002, 55, 89–118.

Merritt, A. (2000). Culture in the cockpit: Do Hofstede's dimensions replicate? *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 31(3), 283-301.

Minkov, Michael. (2013) *Cross-cultural analysis: The science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Moon, S.K., (1984). "Inter-Regional Disparities and Conflict: A Focus on the Yeongnam and Honam Regions," *Korean Sociology* 18 (winter).

Mulder, M. (1977). *The daily power game*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Newstrom JW, Davis K (1993). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Ralston, Holt, Tepstra, and Kai Cheng. (1997) The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values: A study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(1), 177-207

- Riggs, F. (1957). "Agraria and Industria," in Siffin, W.J. (ed.), *Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Robbins SP (1994). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*. Eskişehir: ETAM
- Rodrigues CA (1998). Cultural classifications of Societies and how they affect cross-cultural management. *Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 5(3): 31-41.
- Rokeach, M. (1972). *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sagie, A., Aycan, Z., 2003. A cross-cultural analysis of participative decision-making in organizations. *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, No. 4.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1992) Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 25, 1–65.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1994) Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S-C. Choi, and G. Yoon (Eds), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods and applications*. London: Sage, pp. 85–119.
- Shane SA (1994). The effect of national culture on the choice between licensing and direct foreign investment. *Strategy Management Journal*, 15(8): 627-642
- Shearing, C.D. & Ericson, R.V. Culture as figurative action. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 1991, 42(4), 481–506
- Smith, M.J. (1998) *Social science in question*. London: Sage, 1998.
- Smith, P. B. (2004). Acquiescent response bias as an aspect of cultural communication style. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 50–61.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., Peterson, M. F., Leung, S. P., & Mark, F. (1998). Individualism: Collectivism and the handling of disagreement: A 23 country study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 351–367.
- Spencer-Oatey, H (1997). Societies unequal relationships in high and low power distance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(3): 284-302.
- Stedham, Y & Yamamura, J. (2004). Measuring national culture: Does gender matter? *Women in Management Review*. 19. 233-243.

- Tayeb, M., 1994. Organizations and National Culture: Methodology Considered. *Organization Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3.
- Tipton, E.K. (2000), "Being Women in Japan, 1970-2000", in Edwards, L. and Roces, M. (eds), *Women in Asia: Tradition, Modernity, and Globalisation*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Triandis, H.C. (1995), *Individualism and Collectivism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Vigil, M.E., Olsen, M. (1990). *New Mexico Politics and Government*. New York: University Press of America.
- Westwood, R. I., Tang, S. F., & Kirkbride, P. S. (1992). Chinese conflict behavior: Cultural antecedents and behavioral consequences. *Organization Development Journal*, 10, 13–19.
- Yang, S.C. (1994) South Korea's Top Bureaucratic Elites 1948-1993: Their Recruitment Patterns and Modal Characteristics. *Korea Journal*. Vol 34, no. 3.
- Yang, Y.C. (1991) The study of indigenous regional development, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Kun Kook University,
- Yang, Y.C. (2008) *The Process and Meaning of Jeju Special Self-Governing Province in Republic of Korea*. Presented at the International Conference on Government Innovation and Human Resources Development, Seoul, Korea.
- Yoo, B., Donthe, N., & Lenartowicz T. (2011). "Measuring Hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE". *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(3-4), 193-210.
- Yoon, W.K. (1982). *Korean Public Bureaucracy*, Seoul, Sungkyun Kwan University Press.
- Zhao, Hong-Yan. (2017). "Updating Hofstede's Cultural Value Indices to reflect Cultural changes". Ph.d Thesis for Business Administration. Kangwon National University

Appendix I – English Language Survey

Local Government Culture Comparison (05)

Attitudes to Bosses (superiors) - English Language Survey

1. Please think of an ideal job, disregarding your present job. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you to have a boss (direct superior) you can respect.

- of utmost importance
- very important
- of moderate importance
- of little importance
- of very little or no importance

2. Please think of an ideal job, disregarding your present job, if you have one. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you to be consulted by your boss in decisions involving your work?

- of utmost importance
- very important
- of moderate importance
- of little importance
- of very little or no importance

3. How often, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss?

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Usually
- Always

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement:

An organization structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Undecided
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

5. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

6. How old are you?

- Under 20
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60 or over

7. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Under High-school
- High-school
- Associates Degree
- Bachelors Degree
- Masters Degree
- Doctorate Degree

8. What department do you work in?

9. How long have you worked at your current department?

- Under 3 years
- Between 3 - 7 years
- Over 7 years

10. Where is your hometown? (city, state)

Appendix II – Korean Language Survey

지방정부 문화비교 조사 (05)

상사(상위)에 대한 태도 - 한국어 설문 조사

1. 귀하가 존경할 수 있는 직속상급자를 갖는 것이 얼마나 중요하십니까?

- 극히 중요하다
- 매우 중요하다
- 어느 정도 중요하다
- 조금 중요하다
- 중요하지 않다

2. 직속상급자가 의사결정시 귀하에게 문의하는 것이 얼마나 중요하십니까?

- 극히 중요하다
- 매우 중요하다
- 어느 정도 중요하다
- 조금 중요하다
- 중요하지 않다

3. 귀하의 경험으로 볼 때, 부하직원이 상급자와 의견이 다르다는 것을 표현하기를 얼마나 자주 두려워하십니까?

- 절대 않다
- 드물게
- 가끔
- 보통
- 항상

4. 귀하가 다음의 항목에 관하여 어느 정도 동의 또는 반대하십니까?
한 종업원이 두 명의 상사를 갖는 직무 조직구조는 피해야 한다.

- 매우 찬성하다
- 찬성하다
- 어느 쪽이라 말할 수 없다

- 반대한다
- 매우 반대한다

5. 당신의 성별은 다음의 어디에 해당하는가?

- 남성
- 여성

6. 당신의 연령은 다음의 어디에 해당하는가?

- 20 세 미만
- 20-29 세
- 30-39 세
- 40-49 세
- 50-59 세
- 60 세 이상

7. 당신의 학교 교육연수는 다음 어느 것에 해당하는가?

- 고졸없음
- 고졸
- 전문대졸
- 대졸
- 대학원졸 (석사)
- 대학원졸 (박사)

8. 당신은 어느 부서에서 근무하는가?

9. 당신은 현 부서에서 얼마나 근무하는가?

- 3 년 미만
- 3 년 ~ 7 년 사이
- 7 년 이상

10. 당신은 고향이 어디인가? (시/군)

Thesis Abstract:

Hofstede's cultural dimension of power distance provides a useful framework for analyzing the influence of culture on the administrative workers. The level of the power distance describes the acceptance of unequal power between people. The high power distance societies are characterized by the tolerance for inequality and the members of such societies relatively agree that power should be unequally shared. The people with higher social position obtain numerous privileges and it is considered as something right or natural. The low power distance societies are those in which inequality is less tolerated. The privileges connected with the position are not easily accepted. In the cultures with low power distance, independence is more valued than conformity. The work relationship between managers and their subordinates is dependent on power distance. And so power distance has many implications in personnel management in many organizations including that at the local government level. Through research and survey results from Jeju, South Korea and Los Alamos, New Mexico, USA local government workers, this research was able to confirm previous difference in power distance measurements between the two countries and suggest a power distance difference between the workers of different regions within the respective countries.

Key words: Power Distance, Regionalism, cultural differences, Hofstede Cultural Dimensions, Local Government, Jeju, Los Alamos

논문초록:

홉스테데(Hofstede)의 문화적 차원 권력간격(Power Distance)은 행정업무 종사자에 대한 문화의 영향을 분석하는 데 유용한 틀을 제공한다. 권력간격 수준은 사람들 사이의 불평등한 권력의 수용을 묘사한다. 높은 권력간격 사회는 불평등에 대한 관용이 특징이며, 그러한 사회의 구성원들은 권력이 공정하게 공유되어야 한다는 것에 비교적 동의한다. 사회적 지위가 높은 사람들은 많은 특권을 얻으며 그것은 옳거나 자연스러운 것으로 간주된다. 낮은 권력간격 사회는 불평등이 덜 용인되는 사회다. 그 직책과 관련된 특권은 쉽게 받아들여지지 않는다. 낮은 권력간격을 가진 문화에서 독립성은 복종성보다 더 중시된다. 관리자와 부하 직원의 업무 관계는 권력간격에 따라 달라진다. 그래서 권력간격은 지방정부 차원에서 그것을 포함한 많은 기관들의 인사 관리에 많은 영향을 끼친다. 본 연구는 제주도, 한국과 로스앨러모스, 뉴멕시코, 미국 지방정부 근로자들의 연구와 조사 결과를 통해 양국 간 권력간격 측정의 이전 차이를 확인하고, 해당 국가 내 다른 지역 근로자들 간의 전력 거리 차이를 제안할 수 있었다.

주요 단어: 권력간격, 지역주의, 문화적 차이, 홉스테데 문화차원, 지방정부, 제주도, 로스앨러모스

