

# Cross-national distance and international business: an analysis of the most influential recent models

Cristina López-Duarte | Marta M. Vidal-Suárez | Belén González-Díaz

**Published in:** *Scientometrics* (2019)

**DOI:** 10.1007/s11192-019-03203-y

**Funding information:** This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness [grant number ECO2016-80518-R].

**How to cite this article:** López-Duarte, C., Vidal-Suárez, M. M., & González-Díaz, B. (2019). Cross-national distance and international business: an analysis of the most influential recent models. *Scientometrics*, 121(1), 173-208.

## Abstract

Cross-national distance among countries has been of central interest in International Business and Management research. Therefore, different efforts have been made to develop models/measurements to address this issue. In this article we identify the models/measurements of cross-national distance developed since the beginning of the 2000 decade. After briefly presenting each model's distinctive features, we assess their impact on the research field based on a wide range of bibliometric techniques (direct, indirect, and adjusted citation impacts, altmetrics, academic reviews, journals and publishers' prestige). Our analysis shows that the narrower cultural distance construct has lost ground to the wider psychic distance one. Furthermore, researchers highly value those models and measurement that go beyond the cultural and psychic distance constructs providing a multidimensional framework to analyze and measure cross-national distance among countries. Our analysis of these models' impact shows that this is a salient issue in the research field as a whole and a central topic in the highest ranked journals in International Business and Management.

**Keywords** Cross-national distance · Cultural distance · Psychic distance · Bibliometric analysis · Altmetrics

# Cross-national distance and International Business: An analysis of the most influential recent models

## Introduction

The concept of distance between home and target markets has been of central interest to International Business and Management (IB&M) researchers (Prime et al. 2009). Furthermore, as stated in Zaheer et al. (2012, p. 19), “essentially, international management is management of distance”. Consequently, scholars have extensively researched the impact of cross-national distance on a wide range of internationalization decisions, processes, and outcomes (i.e.: selection of host markets, timing of the internationalization process, choice of entry mode, need of local partners, performance, etc.) —see, for instance, Werner (2002), Tihanyi et al. (2005), and Smith et al. (2011), for exhaustive reviews.

Among the different dimensions of distance (e.g.: geographic, economic, etc.), psychic distance (PD) and cultural distance (CD) have received a particularly broad level of attention within IB&M literature<sup>1</sup>. As pointed out by Harzing and Pudelko (2016), IB&M researchers seem to be fascinated by the (cultural) distance concept. Although PD and CD have been extensively used as interchangeable concepts, they differ in their scope or broadness and in the level of analysis (individual versus country) at which they should be measured (Nordstrom and Vahlne 1994; Dow 2000; Dow and Karunaratna 2006; Sousa and Bradley 2006; Brewer 2007; Prime et al. 2009).

As a consequence, IB&M research has become deeply dependent upon constructs of cross-country distance to represent potential sources of country similarity or difference (Zaheer et

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Beugelsdijk et al. (2018); Ferreira et al. (2014), Shenkar (2001), Harzing (2003), Pinto et al. (2014), Sousa and Bradley (2006), Wang and Schaan (2008), Zaheer et al (2012).

1  
2  
3  
4 al. 2012). For instance, in his JIBS-decade-award-winning review of the CD construct as  
5 traditionally measured in IB&M literature<sup>2</sup> Shenkar (2001) concludes with a call for the  
6 development of new measurements of distance among countries. Since then, different  
7 projects have been developed by IB&M scholars to give rise to new models, constructs, and  
8 measurements.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 In this article we identify the models developed since the beginning of the 2000 decade,  
17 analyze their distinctive features and study their influence on the IB&M field. Therefore, it  
18 provides an exhaustive picture useful for researchers developing their studies on the impact  
19 of cross-national distance on internationalization decisions. The article has been organized  
20 as follows: the next section describes the process followed to identify the studies which  
21 develop a cross-national distance model and provides a short overview of each model's  
22 distinctive features. Then we develop an assessment of these models' use and impact on the  
23 research field through a wide range of bibliometric techniques. The article concludes with  
24 our main conclusions.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **Study selection and overview**

### 42 **Study selection**

43  
44 As a first step, we performed a keyword search using the Institute for Scientific  
45 Information's Web of Science (WOS) and Scopus databases on a set of selected journals.  
46 The list includes top IB&M Journals as identified by Acedo and Casillas (2005), Chiar et al.  
47 (2006), DuBois and Reeb (2000), as well as the top academic management journals initially  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

59  
60 <sup>2</sup> An integrative index developed by Kogut and Singh (1988) based on Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 classified by Gómez-Mejía and Balkin (1992) and later updated by Werner (2002) and  
5  
6 Pisani (2011) —see Table 1.

7  
8  
9 [TABLE 1 HERE]

10  
11 Due to methodological restrictions related to the assessment process (i.e. indirect citations  
12 require several years since an article's publication), we chose 2012 as the last year of the  
13 researched period. This means excluding some recent articles (for example, Kaasa et al.  
14 2016) that might have a relevant impact on future IB&M research.

15  
16 Through this search we identified almost 1,200 articles including in their title, abstract, or  
17 keywords at least one of the following items: culture or international culture, cultural  
18 distance, psychic distance, cross-country, cross-cultural, and cross-national. We then  
19 selected the pieces of research proposing a model to measure or define distances among  
20 countries, as well as those comparing or reflecting on particular models whose original  
21 sources were then identified. As a second step we relied on the list of articles included in  
22 López-Duarte et al. (2016) and identified the particular model of distance used in each  
23 study —this is an exhaustive review focused on IB&M and cross-country distance that  
24 relies on a dataset of 265 articles<sup>3</sup>.

25  
26 We finally found that 15 pieces of research were relevant for this study. Thirteen of them  
27 are full-length articles published in academic journals; while the remaining two are  
28 complete books.

### 29 30 31 **Selected studies: an overview**

32  
33 As shown in the Table 2, up to 10 models focus on the PD concept, while 3 of them deal  
34 with the CD construct. The remaining 2 models are wider, as they include the general idea

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  

---

<sup>3</sup> This dataset is available to scholars through the journal web site.

1  
2  
3  
4 of cross-country distance (Ghemawat 2001) or the institutional plus geographic distance  
5 among countries (Berry et al. 2010).  
6

7  
8  
9 [TABLE 2 HERE]  
10

11 [TABLE 3 HERE]  
12

13 Tables 2 and 3 summarize the main features of each model, identifying their basic  
14 premises, dimensions and sub-dimensions, as well as their antecedents or the basic pieces  
15 of research they rely on. As shown in Table 2, some of these studies provide explicit  
16 measurements of cross-country distance among countries and national dimensions, while  
17 others provide information about variables to be used to measure such distances or  
18 dimensions. A few of them carry out an empirical analysis to test the potential impact of  
19 their proposed distance measurement on different internationalization decisions.  
20  
21  
22

### 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 Studies on cultural distance

30  
31  
32  
33 *House et al.'s (2004) GLOBE project*. This model defines nine cultural dimensions that are  
34 measured in terms of values and practices. While values show the “should be” society’s  
35 ideas relative to each cultural dimension, practices show the “as is” or actual society’s  
36 behavior relative to those dimensions. The study focuses on societies rather than countries;  
37 this is a relevant issue as in some countries there are strong subcultures based, for instance,  
38 on the ethnicity of origin, language, or geography (eg, South Africa, Canada).  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 *Hofstede et al.'s (2010)*. This model is an enlarged and updated version of the Hofstede  
49 (1980) and Hofstede and Bond (1988) models whose main novelties are: (I) the redefinition  
50 and measurement of the Long/Short Term Orientation dimension in terms of the choice of  
51 focus for people's efforts: the future or the present and past and (II) the identification of an  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 entirely new dimension: Indulgence versus Restraint. It relates to gratification versus  
5  
6 control of basic human desires related to enjoying life.  
7

8  
9 *Taras et al.'s (2012)*. This is an updated and improved set of national scores along the four  
10  
11 cultural dimensions of the already mentioned Hofstede's 1980 model. The study is  
12  
13 developed through a meta-analysis of more than 450 empirical studies and centers its  
14  
15 attention on methodology and measurement issues (i.e.: it allows for consideration of  
16  
17 dynamic effects and cultural change). In short, it does not challenge the conceptual  
18  
19 assumptions of Hofstede's (1980) model.  
20  
21  
22

### 23 24 Studies on Psychic Distance 25

26  
27 *Child et al.'s (2002)*. This framework encompasses three different kinds of factors to be  
28  
29 considered: distance-creating (responsible for dissimilarity among countries), distance-  
30  
31 bridging (developed by firms to shorten dissimilarity), and distance-compressing (arising  
32  
33 from institutional convergence, mutual benchmarking, and emulation between societies). In  
34  
35 fact, the identification of the last category is the original contribution in this study. It  
36  
37 gathers together factors beyond any action taken by firms themselves that narrow the (sense  
38  
39 of) PD among countries (e.g.: social movements, institutional changes, and technological  
40  
41 advances that affect, among other things, life-styles, consumption patterns, human-rights  
42  
43 standards, and business practices).  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 *Evans and Mavondo's (2002)*. This model centers its attention on the individual perceptions  
50  
51 of existing differences relative to cultural issues, business framework differences, market  
52  
53 structure, and business and management practices. To address the cultural dimension of  
54  
55 their model, the authors use Hofstede (1980, 1988) as their basis. An interesting issue to be  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 highlighted is that the “business framework” category of this model encompasses factors  
5  
6 (i.e.: language differences) included in the cultural dimension in other models.  
7

8  
9 *Dow and Karunaratna's (2006)*. It builds on splitting psychic distance into two different  
10  
11 constructs that must be addressed in a consecutive way: PD stimuli and perceived PD. The  
12  
13 first one relates to macro-level factors from the context and the second to people's  
14  
15 perceptions. An individual's perception of PD is a function of two basic factors: the PD  
16  
17 stimuli she/he is exposed to and her/his sensitivity to those stimuli which depends on  
18  
19 her/his personal traits (e.g. previous international experience, age, education level).  
20  
21

22  
23 *Sousa and Bradley's (2006)*. This is a study focused on differentiating PD from CD in  
24  
25 terms of concept, level of analysis, and measurements. Although clearly different, PD and  
26  
27 CD are interrelated concepts, so that existing CD is one of the two key determinants of PD,  
28  
29 the individual's value system being the other one. This system encompasses a set of value  
30  
31 domains and guiding principles that condition the way in which the individual perceives the  
32  
33 world and her/his attitudes and behaviors. The “conservation” domain (related to the  
34  
35 preservation of the status quo) is the most relevant one for shaping the PD.  
36  
37

38  
39 *Brewer's (2007)*. This study relies on Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul's (1975, p. 308)  
40  
41 definition of PD as the sum of “factors preventing or disturbing the flows of information  
42  
43 between firm and markets”. It proposes a PD index that measures the ease of and  
44  
45 impediments to information flows between a country market and a firm, so that the greater  
46  
47 the impediments, the longer the distance. These impediments, in turn, depend not so much  
48  
49 on (country, cultural or business) differences but on the level of familiarity between the  
50  
51 firm and the country market.  
52  
53

54  
55 *Child et al.'s (2009)*. PD is defined as “decision makers' perceptions of how different the  
56  
57 host country business environment is from that of the home country in terms of aspects  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 likely to have relevance for doing business” (p. 204). This study proposes a set of aspects or  
5  
6 dimensions that should be measured. Then, in order to properly estimate PD’s impact on  
7  
8 IB&M, decision makers should be asked about the impact of each particular dimension on  
9  
10 each IB&M decision process.  
11  
12

13 *Prime et al.’s (2009)*. This study defines the PD by building on individuals’ perceptions  
14  
15 and explores and classifies the relevant stimuli of PD as perceived by these individuals.  
16  
17 These stimuli are the factors that combine to determine subjective PD and can be grouped  
18  
19 into two basic dimensions: the first one involves predominantly cultural issues while the  
20  
21 second encompasses issues pertaining to the business environment and practices.  
22  
23

24 *Hakason and Ambos’s (2010)*. The PD to a specific foreign country is a reflection of the  
25  
26 individual’s knowledge, familiarity and sense of understanding of it (p. 196). Individuals’  
27  
28 perceptions are formed on the basis of environmental stimuli, primarily the amount and  
29  
30 type of knowledge a person possesses about a foreign country. The individual’s ability to  
31  
32 correctly interpret this information depends, in turn, on the similarity of the cultural and  
33  
34 institutional contexts to which the information refers. Finally, perceptions of PD are also  
35  
36 affected by personal factors, such as individuals’ values, motivation and prior experience.  
37  
38

39 *Smith et al.’s (2011)*. as a starting point, national level inference factors are likely to  
40  
41 condition or stimulate the perceived distance. When these factors are distance creating, they  
42  
43 provide an indication of the PD an individual would perceive in the absence of any personal  
44  
45 (objective or subjective) attributes that modify this perception. An element to take into  
46  
47 account is the accuracy of information flows relative to the PD stimuli: national level  
48  
49 drivers will effectively play their role as PD stimuli only if the individual is aware of their  
50  
51 existence and potential implications.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*Sousa and Lages' (2011)*. keeping the focus on individuals' perceptions, the authors propose a definition of the PD construct as "the distance between the home and the foreign country, which is reflected in the individual's perception of differences of both country characteristics and people characteristics" (p. 207). Therefore, the PD is defined as a higher-order construct made up of two distinct dimensions (country characteristics distance and people characteristics distance.) that are clearly related to each other and can be brought together on a single multidimensional scale. In other words, to assess PD, it is necessary to take into consideration not only the macro aspects of the country, but also the particular characteristics of the people who live in it.

#### Studies on cross-national distance beyond CD and PD

*Ghemawat's (2001)*. The model provides a broad framework to define the distance among countries by identifying four dimensions: cultural, administrative, geographic, and economic (CAGE). Each of them encompasses a wide range of different factors, some of them easily apparent (e.g. shared border, common language), and some more subtle (e.g. social norms, unspoken principles). The impact of each particular distance dimension on a specific business decision depends on contingent elements such as the industry or the internationalizing firm's size.

*Berry et al.'s (2010)*. This is a comprehensive model developed from an institutional perspective that "disaggregates the construct of distance by proposing a set of multidimensional measures" (p. 1460). Based on institutional theories of national business, governance, and innovation systems, the authors propose a model that defines and measures cross-national distance over nine dimensions. Furthermore, they propose a particular

1  
2  
3  
4 method for integrating these dimensions and calculating dyadic distances between  
5  
6 countries.  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 **An assessment of model impact on the research field**

### 12 **Methods**

13  
14  
15 As journal articles and books show different publishing features, their respective impact on  
16  
17 the research field must be measured using different bibliometric techniques (Gorraiz et al.  
18  
19 2013, 2014; Kousha and Thelwall 2015; Torres-Salinas et al. 2014; Zhou et al. 2016). To  
20  
21 assess journal article impact we have relied on different bibliometric analyses<sup>4</sup>: direct  
22  
23 citation rates—including raw, per-year, and early citation counts, as well as citation  
24  
25 paths—, indirect or accumulated citation rates, adjusted impacts, and alternative metrics  
26  
27 (altmetrics<sup>5</sup>)—see Table 4 for a description of each particular measurement. The analysis  
28  
29 was conducted up to to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2015 using separately the SCOPUS and the  
30  
31 Thomson ISI Web of Science (WOS) databases as they are traditionally considered the  
32  
33 golden standard in citation analysis<sup>6</sup>. Book impact assessments based on citations using  
34  
35 these data sources may not be accurate, as publications in books are not (well) covered by  
36  
37 the SCOPUS or WOS—Gorraiz et al. (2013), Kousha et al. (2011) and Kousha and  
38  
39 Thelwall (2015). Conversely, (scholarly) book reviews and publisher prestige indexes are  
40  
41 among the most accepted and frequent measurements (see Table 4).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 [TABLE 4 HERE]  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 <sup>4</sup> See Tahanmtan and Bormmann (2018) and Waltman (2016) for exhaustive reviews on citation processes and  
57 citation impact indicators.

58 <sup>5</sup> See Bormmann (2014) for a broad overview of altmetrics features, advantages, and disadvantages.

59 <sup>6</sup> The International Studies of Management & Organization is not included in any of these data sources;  
60 therefore, the citation analysis includes no information for Child et al.'s (2002) study.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Main results

### Journal article impact

Tables 5 and 6 show information relative to raw, time distribution, per-year and early direct citation counts<sup>7</sup>, indirect citations rates, adjusted citation impacts, and altmetrics.

[TABLE 5 HERE]

[TABLE 6 HERE]

*Raw citation counts* are a first approach to measure an article's impact on the research field.

A direct citation is “an explicit recognition of an intellectual debt” (Kotchen 1987, p. 54), means an explicit linkage between the citing and cited pieces of research, and reflects the article's influence and contribution to a particular field of knowledge (Chandy and Williams 1994; Glänzel and Schoepflin 1999; Moed et al. 1998; Small 1978).

As shown in Table 5, SCOPUS provides higher raw citation counts for all the articles, reflecting its broader coverage in terms of sources. However, the two databases give rise to quite similar rankings, as only Berry et al. (2010) and Evans and Mavondo (2002) —on the upper side of the ranking— and Prime et al. (2009) and Sousa and Langes (2011) —on the lower side— exchange their positions. Eleven works are included in the H-core of highly cited papers of this set of studies<sup>8</sup> and the top-5 most cited articles accumulate almost 80% of total citation counts. As shown in the table, the two studies proposing a broad framework of cross-national distance —Ghemawat (2001) and Berry et al. (2010)— are among the studies showing the highest impact, pointing to the interest of researchers in the multidimensional nature of distance among countries.

---

<sup>7</sup> Self-citation excluded in all cases.

<sup>8</sup> The h-core or h-classics of a particular topic is composed of the h highly cited papers that have at least h citations each (Jin et al. 2007; Martinez et al. 2014).

1  
2  
3  
4 Ghemawat (2001) accumulates more than 30% of total raw citation counts gathered by the  
5  
6 whole set of articles. This is the only study published in a Management (rather than IB&M  
7  
8 focused) outlet that achieves an outstanding position in the ranking; furthermore, it is the  
9  
10 only article published in a general management magazine (rather than in an academic  
11  
12 journal) whose main readership shows a professional profile, and whose contents are  
13  
14 accessible to a general readership. As a consequence, the article itself shows quite a  
15  
16 different structure: it is a tool kit that includes an executive first approach (the idea in brief  
17  
18 and in practice), the article's main content, and a list of further readings to broaden the  
19  
20 addressed ideas, but not a list of references. The article includes a wide range of examples  
21  
22 about how distance across countries can affect different industries and, even, about  
23  
24 companies successfully and unsuccessfully addressing this issue. It clearly aims at stating a  
25  
26 framework that helps decision makers to decide whether to expand into a particular foreign  
27  
28 country and to select the right target markets. These distinctive features widen the article's  
29  
30 intended audience which is not limited to researchers, but includes teaching staff,  
31  
32 professionals, and business decision makers. Most probably, this is a key factor underlying  
33  
34 its outstanding impact in terms of citation counts. As shown in the table, it accumulates  
35  
36 more than twice as many raw citation counts than the study ranked in the second position.  
37  
38 The high amount of total citations accumulated by Berry et al. (2010) in just six years is  
39  
40 noteworthy. As previously stated, this is a comprehensive model of institutional plus  
41  
42 geographic distance that goes further than PD and CD, providing scholars with a wider  
43  
44 framework of cross-national distance. Although it does not include measurements available  
45  
46 to other scholars, it discloses a wide range of explicit indicators to be used as a basis as  
47  
48 well as information about secondary data sources to measure them. This feature increases  
49  
50 the study's usefulness for other scholars, as it provides a road map for an empirical  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 assessment of distance among countries. This issue increases its probability of use and  
5  
6 citation.  
7

8  
9 Three articles focused on PD complete the top-5 ranking: Dow and Karunaratna's (2006),  
10  
11 Evans and Mavondo (2002), and Sousa and Bradley (2006). In addition to its thorough  
12  
13 conceptual development, Dow and Karunaratna's work calculates explicit measurements of  
14  
15 PD stimuli for a wide range of countries and makes them available to other researchers.  
16  
17 This is a particularly valuable feature of the study that accumulates almost 15% of total  
18  
19 citation counts gathered in this analysis. Providing explicit measurements available to other  
20  
21 researchers increases the study usefulness and probability of citation.  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 *Citation paths* provide information about the time distribution of citation counts and the  
27  
28 speed of dissemination of knowledge, as well as about the articles' obsolescence from a  
29  
30 diachronous or prospective approach (Burrell 2002; Cunningham and Boccock 1995;  
31  
32 Glänzel 2004; Sangam 1999; Sun et al. 2016). As a general rule, an article's citation  
33  
34 lifecycle follows a typical n-shaped curve so that the number of citations per year increases  
35  
36 during the first years after its publication, reaches a peak, and then decreases as time passes  
37  
38 (Barnett and Fink 2008; Costas et al. 2010; Li et al. 2014; Sun et al. 2016). As shown in  
39  
40 Table 5, Ghemawat's (2001) citation path moves far away from this traditional n-shaped  
41  
42 citation curve: about 60% of total direct citation counts are registered in the 2012-2016  
43  
44 period (more than 10 years after its publication), the time distribution of its citation counts  
45  
46 shows a growing tendency all through the analyzed period, and its citation half-life  
47  
48 (diachronous perspective) is over 10 years. Although the aging speed of literature in social  
49  
50 sciences is relatively low (Glänzel and Schoepflin 1995; Song et al. 2015), such a long and  
51  
52 exponential increase in citations in an extended period of time points to a "classic" in the  
53  
54 research field (Li et al. 2014). Actually, none of the "oldest" articles included in our dataset  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

seems to have reached its peak of citation: although in a much less steady way than Gemawat (2001), the citation curves of Evans and Mavondo (2002), Dow and Karunaratna (2006), and Sousa and Bradley (2006) show a growing tendency throughout the analysed period.

The *per year citations ratio* allows control of the articles' age (Tahamtan et al. 2016). As shown in the table, the study by Berry et al. (2010) reaches an even more salient position when focusing on this ratio. Furthermore, other “young” or more recent articles also appear as particularly influential and enter the top-5 set as Hakånsen and Ambos (2010) and Taras et al. (2012). The relevance of these 3 pieces of research also arises when analysing *early citations*, that is, citation counts within the first 3 years after publication<sup>9</sup> that reflect the primary impact of a particular piece of research (Tahamtan et al. 2016). An early recognition by the scientific community may act as an indicator of the innovative degree of the research (Chakraborty et al. 2014; Guerrero-Bote and Moya-Anegón 2014). Additionally, it may act as a predictor of the future impact of target articles (Harzing and Van der Wal, 2008).

When dealing with the youngest articles included in our data set, the whole citation period considered is long enough to be able to state that none of these articles shows the features of a “hit” or “flash in the pan” —pieces of research that are very highly cited immediately after their publication, but do not show a lasting impact in the medium (or long) term— (Costas et al., 2010; Li et al. 2014; Sun et al. 2016; van Dalen and Henken, 2005).

Consequently, this early recognition allows the prediction of a central role and major

---

<sup>9</sup> As pointed by Harzing and Van der Wal (2008), publishing processes in social sciences are long (they may take several years); therefore, to assess early citation we have worked with citation counts within the 3 years after publication. To check the reliability of our measurement, we have also measured early citation using a 2-4 year window following each article's publication. Results and rankings relative to early citation do not vary in a significant way.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 impact in terms of raw and indirect citation counts in the future (Chakraborty et al. 2014;  
6  
7 Guerrero-Bote and Moya-Anegón 2014; Stegehuis et al 2015). It is worth noting that the  
8  
9 most outstanding article in terms of raw, per year, and indirect citation counts (i.e.  
10  
11 Ghemawat 2001) was not acknowledged early on by researchers pointing to a delayed  
12  
13 recognition with an intense awakening period starting 6/7 years after its publication (Costas  
14  
15 et al. 2010; Li et al. 2014; Sun et al. 2016; van Raan 2004; van Dalen and Henkens 2005).

16  
17  
18 The *indirect citation impact* relies on the idea of generation of citations. A generation of  
19  
20 citations is the collection of articles that cite a target article either directly (first generation)  
21  
22 or indirectly (further generation) via a path in the citation process (Fragkiadaki and  
23  
24 Evangelidis 2014, 2016; Hu et al. 2011). An indirect citation shows a connection between a  
25  
26 particular article and the set of articles included in each generation; the closer the  
27  
28 generation, the stronger the connection. In short, it measures the accumulated impact of the  
29  
30 target article and relates to the generation of further knowledge in a multi-step process  
31  
32 (Kosmulski 2010). As shown in Table 6, the Single Publication h-index (SP h-index) builds  
33  
34 on the second generation of citations of an article (Schubert 2009) —i.e. articles citing the  
35  
36 articles citing the target work. For highly cited publications (as is the case of most of the  
37  
38 articles under analysis in this study), it provides information about the article's impact,  
39  
40 prestige, and centrality in the research field (Bormmann and Marx 2011; Egghe 2011;  
41  
42 Schubert 2009).

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Once again, Ghemawat (2001) leads the ranking showing a 54/47 (SCOPUS/WOS) SP h-index showing that 54/47 of the articles citing Ghemawat's (2001) piece of research received at least 54/47 direct citations each. Therefore, this index provides information not only about the articles' impact on the research field, but also about their centrality by appraising the impact, quality, and relevance of the articles citing our target ones.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Some pieces of research seriously increase their influence when we take into account their accumulated impact, as Brewer (2007) and Child et al. (2009). Quite noteworthy is the case of the latter, as the number of direct citations is not so high. In short, the influence and degree of centrality in the research field of this piece of research is higher than expected due to the relevance of its citing papers.

*Adjusted citation impacts* allow control of factors other than age that may influence the article's citation counts. The Field-Weighted Citation Impacts (FWCI) and Citation Percentiles (CP) provided by SCOPUS and the Essential Sciences Top Paper Indicator (ESI Top Paper) provided by WOS measure an article's impact adjusting its raw citation counts according to its discipline, year of publication, and kind of publication —see Table 6. Eleven articles in our dataset show a FWCI higher than 1 (indicating that they have been cited more than would be expected based on the world average for similar publications) and 10 show a CP over 90 (indicating that they are among the 10% most cited articles when compared to similar documents). Dow and Karunaratna (2006) leads this ranking with a FWCI of 14.46 (i.e. this piece of research has been cited as many as 14 times more than expected), followed by Ghemawat (2001) and Berry et al. (2010) —FWCIs over 10 and 99 CPs. When using the more restrictive WOS data source, only Berry et al. (2010) is classified as an ESI Top Paper (top 1% cited articles in the subject area and year). Nevertheless, an analysis of the second generation of citations shows that Ghemawat (2001), Hakånson and Ambos (2010), Brewer (2007), and Dow and Karunaratna (2006) have been cited by more than 4 ESI Top Articles each, pointing to the relevance and impact of the articles citing our target ones.

Analyzing the *ratio between articles' citation counts and their respective journal/year metrics* allows control of the potential “journal effect”, as the journal in which a piece of



1  
2  
3  
4 research is published is among the “extrinsic factors” influencing the article’s citation rate  
5  
6 (Qian et al. 2017; Onodera and Yoshikane 2015): empirical evidence shows that articles  
7  
8 published in highly-classified journals usually receive more attention (and citations) from  
9  
10 the academic community and that high metrics of the publishing outlet attract citations to  
11  
12 the articles in the publication (Sun and Xia 2016; Tahamtan et al. 2016; van Dalen and  
13  
14 Henkens 2005).  
15  
16

17  
18 Journal metrics measure the average number of citations received by the articles published  
19  
20 by the journal in a particular year and provide a raw indication of the number of citations an  
21  
22 article published in the journal/year would likely receive. To carry out our analysis, per-  
23  
24 year citation counts calculated using SCOPUS were compared to each journal/year Impact  
25  
26 per Publication (IPP) powered by SCOPUS and per-year citation counts calculated using  
27  
28 the WOS database were compared to Journal Citation Reports (JCR impact factor)  
29  
30 measured by WOS.  
31  
32

33  
34 As shown in Table 6, all the articles in our dataset accumulate a citation ratio higher than  
35  
36 their respective journal/year impact factors<sup>10</sup>; that is, they show a citation ratio higher than  
37  
38 the “average article” published within their respective journal/year. It should be  
39  
40 acknowledged that 3 of them (see Table 2) have been published in the Journal of  
41  
42 International Business Studies (the official publication of the Academy of International  
43  
44 Business and top-ranked journal). In a similar way, the Journal of World Business, the  
45  
46 Journal of International Management, and the Journal of International Marketing are long-  
47  
48 standing top-tier journals. On the contrary, some studies receiving a surprisingly low  
49  
50 number of citations —i.e.: the highly valuable comprehensive model of PD by Smith et al.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

59  
60 <sup>10</sup> Except for Smith et al. (2011) when relying on the WOS data source.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 (2011)— have been published in journals whose focus is not on IB&M and/or show a weak  
5  
6 impact of their field.  
7

8  
9 As a whole, these high adjusted impacts point to the relevance of the cross-national  
10 distance issue and the interest of academics in the identification of appropriate  
11 measurements of distance within the IB&M field and the broader Management field. This  
12 seems to be a salient issue in the research field as a whole, and a central topic in the highest  
13 ranked journals on IB&M and Management.  
14  
15

16  
17 Finally, the study based on *altmetrics* measures an article's impact by analyzing the  
18 interactions taking place on the internet and the social media (Ebrahimi et al. 2016; Erdt et  
19 al. 2016; Piwowar 2013; Weller 2015). Therefore, altmetrics provide information in real  
20 time avoiding the delays of citation processes and complementing the information provided  
21 by traditional citation rates (Erdt et al. 2016). Furthermore, these indicators gather  
22 information from a broad range of audiences and non-academic sources (Priem et al., 2012;  
23 Wouters and Costas 2012). In particular, we have relied on downloading and saving  
24 activities in Mendeley. This is a free reference manager and academic social network that  
25 allows researchers to share their work and access other researchers' articles, works in  
26 progress, and projects. Mendeley's download and saving counts may be used as a proxy for  
27 the readership of an article, as these counts measure at least the attention to use the  
28 downloaded material (Gorraiz et al. 2014; Li et al. 2012). Once again, Berr et al. (2010),  
29 Ghemawat (2001) and Dow and Karunaratna (2006) lead the ranking, with another two  
30 quite recent articles completing the top-5: Taras et al. (2012) and Hakanson and Andersson  
31 (2010). It seems that these pieces of research have a relevant impact not only on the  
32 research field, but also outside the academic spectrum. Noteworthy is the case of Dow and  
33 Karunaratna (2006) and, even more, Ghemawat (2001) as these are "old" articles published  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 before Mendeley started its activity in 2007: as stated in Gorraiz et al. (2014), empirical  
5  
6 evidence relative to the timelines of downloads shows that the first two years post  
7  
8 publication account for the highest downloads. In addition, these rates may be a predictor of  
9  
10 future impact in terms of traditional citation, as correlations between Mendeley readership  
11  
12 and (later) traditional citation counts have been found in different empirical studies  
13  
14 (Bornmann 2015; Li et al. 2012; Schlögl et al. 2014).  
15  
16

### 17 18 Book impact

19  
20 Table 7 shows results relative to book impact in terms of scholarly book reviews and  
21  
22 publisher prestige. A *scholarly book review* is a post-publication reflection and critical  
23  
24 analysis of a book's content provided by a scholar to draw attention to its content and value  
25  
26 within the academic community (Gorraiz et al. 2014). To guarantee the relevance of the  
27  
28 reviews, we have relied exclusively on analyses and reflections published as full-length  
29  
30 articles identified through a search in the same set of journals as the original articles (Table  
31  
32 1). Then, this review's impact on the research field was assessed through a citation analysis  
33  
34 (direct, indirect, and adjusted citation rates).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 [TABLE 7 HERE]

42  
43 The number of articles reflecting on Hofstede's model is particularly high<sup>11</sup>, but it should  
44  
45 be emphasized that none of them focuses on the new model involving six cultural  
46  
47 dimensions (see Table 7). Conversely, up to 4 articles analyze the GLOBE model of  
48  
49 cultural dimensions. All of them show a salient impact on the research field: they show  
50  
51 high raw, per year, and indirect citation rates, as well as Citation Percentiles over 50% and  
52  
53 Field Weighted Citation Impacts higher than 2. The impact of House et al. (2002) is  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

59 <sup>11</sup> Ailon (2008), Au (2000), Kelley et al. (2006), Kirkman et al. (2006), McSweeney (2002), Ng et al. 2007,  
60 Robertson (2000), Shenkar (2001), Steenkamp (2001), Steel and Taras (2010), and Tang & Koveos (2008).  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 particularly relevant, although it should be pointed out that this article is not a traditional  
5 post-publication book review, but a pre-publication introduction providing a first approach  
6 to the GLOBE project later developed in the book published in 2004.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 It is worth noting that a relevant number of articles compare these two models of national  
12 cultural dimensions pointing to their outstanding role as key frameworks within the  
13 research field<sup>12</sup>. Once again, all of them compare the GLOBE project with Hofstede's  
14 initial framework rather than the updated one. All but one show CPs over 90% and FWCI's  
15 higher than 2, pointing to the interest of researchers in these two particular models.  
16 Furthermore, the comparisons carried out by the authors themselves (Javidan et al. 2006;  
17 Hofstede 2006) seem to have played an outstanding role due to their high number of raw  
18 and per year citation counts, and their performance in terms of accumulated impact,  
19 prestige, and central role (H-index over 35/40). Only McSweeney (2013) and de Mooij  
20 (2013) focus on Hofstede's new model when comparing its cultural dimensions with those  
21 identified in House et al.'s (2004). These are two recent articles; therefore, direct and  
22 indirect citation counts are limited. However, both show a high CP (over 85 and 90,  
23 respectively) and an FWCI higher than 2 pointing to a high performance when compared to  
24 similar articles and to a high impact on the research field in the near future.  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 In short, there is no doubt about the salient role of Hofstede's traditional model of national  
30 culture and cross country distance; however, it seems that the updated model which  
31 includes 2 new cultural dimensions has (still) not achieved significant recognition among  
32 Management and IB&M scholars. On the contrary, the cultural dimensions identified and  
33 measured as values and practices at society level in the GLOBE project by House et al.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58  
59 <sup>12</sup> See Ferreira et al. (2014) and Pinto et al. (2014) for an exhaustive analysis of existing connections between  
60 both models.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 (2004) have attracted scholars' attention by themselves and, even more, as a framework  
5  
6 challenging Hofstede's one.

7  
8  
9 To assess *Publishers Prestige* we have relied on the Scholarly Publishers Indicators  
10  
11 Expanded (SPIE) system that analyzes publishers' prestige, specialization degree, and  
12  
13 quality of the manuscript selection process. As shown in Table 8, this system relies, in turn,  
14  
15 on the presence of book publishers in a set of 5 different international information systems  
16  
17 —i.e. Book Citation Index by Thomson Reuters, Scopus Book Titles by Elsevier,  
18  
19 Norwegian list, Scholarly Publishers Indicators (SPI) by ILIA/CSIC Research Group, and  
20  
21 Finnish list.  
22

23  
24 [TABLE 8 HERE]  
25

26  
27 House et al. (2004) has been published by Sage Publications and Hofstede et al. (2010) by  
28  
29 McGraw Hill. Both publishers are indexed within the SPIE system: Sage is indexed in 3 of  
30  
31 the above mentioned systems and McGraw Hill in 2. In short, both are prestigious  
32  
33 publishers of scholarly work; although none of them is covered by the 5 information  
34  
35 systems included in SPIE. It must be taken into account that Hofstede et al. (2010) has been  
36  
37 translated into 9 different languages<sup>13</sup> and, therefore, published by a wide range of  
38  
39 international and local publishers apart from the initial one. Conversely, House et al. (2004)  
40  
41 remains as a piece of research published exclusively in English.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 48 **Reflections** 49

50  
51 This study develops an analysis of the recent studies aimed at providing models of cross-  
52  
53 national distance, as this is a central topic within IB&M literature and many calls have been  
54  
55 made by academicians to address this issue. By carrying out an exhaustive review of  
56  
57  
58

59  
60 <sup>13</sup> Korean, Danish, Dutch, French, Japanese, Polish, Romanian, Swedish, and Vietnamese.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 existing literature between 2000 and 2012, 15 different models have been identified; most  
5  
6 of them published in academic international business and international management  
7  
8 focused journals (see Table 2). After providing a short overview of each model's  
9  
10 characteristics and distinctive features (Tables 2 and 3), an assessment of their respective  
11  
12 use by academic scholars and impact on the research field based on a wide set bibliometric  
13  
14 techniques has been carried out.  
15  
16

17  
18 To assess the impact of the pieces of research published as articles in academic journals we  
19  
20 have carried out citation studies relying on SCOPUS and the Web of Sciences (WOS) data  
21  
22 sources and analyzing direct, indirect, and adjusted citation rates by Academia.  
23  
24 Additionally, some altmetrics that provide faster feedback and information about a broader  
25  
26 usage scope have been analyzed. The impact of the models published as books has been  
27  
28 studied by identifying the academic reviews published in top-tier journals and their impact  
29  
30 on the research field, as well as on publishers' prestige.  
31  
32

33  
34 The narrower cultural distance construct seems to lose ground to the wider psychic distance  
35  
36 one, as only 3 models focused on CD have been identified. Furthermore, two of them are  
37  
38 not new models, but renewals or updates of the traditional Hofstede's (1980) model based  
39  
40 on 4 cultural dimensions (Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity/Femininity,  
41  
42 and Collectivism/Individualism). Although this model has been extensively used in IB&M  
43  
44 literature (Beugelsdijk et al. 2018; Ferrerira et al. 2014; López-Duarte et al. 2016; Pinto et  
45  
46 al. 2014), its flaws and shortcomings have been also widely highlighted by different  
47  
48 scholars (McSweeney 2002; Sasaki and Yoshikawa 2014; Shenkar 2001). Hofstede et al.'s  
49  
50 (2010) model enriches the former one by adding two additional dimensions of national  
51  
52 culture (Long/Short Term Orientation and Indulgence/Restraint); while Taras et al. (2012)  
53  
54 updates and improves the scores relative to the 4 initial cultural dimensions by relying on a  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 meta-analysis of a wide set of empirical works. In short, neither of them challenges the  
5  
6 initial conceptual background in Hofstede (1980). The third study focused on cultural  
7  
8 distance is the one by House et al. (2004), known as the GLOBE project. It shows quite  
9  
10 differentiated features, as its unit of analysis is societies (instead of countries); it identifies  
11  
12 nine cultural dimensions, and it measures values and practices differentiating how  
13  
14 individuals within societies actually behave (positive approach) and how they think they  
15  
16 should do so (normative approach).  
17

18  
19  
20 Both House et al. (2004) and Hofstede et al. (2010) have been published as books. The  
21  
22 number of academic book reviews published as full-length articles in top-tier journals and  
23  
24 their impact on the research field in terms of direct, indirect, and adjusted impact point to  
25  
26 House et al. (2004) as a salient piece of research. The key role of Hofstede's traditional  
27  
28 cultural framework is undeniable, however, it seems that the enlarged model involving six  
29  
30 cultural dimensions is still far from achieving its predecessor's recognition. Noteworthy is  
31  
32 the fact that the GLOBE project has attracted the attention of the academic community not  
33  
34 only in its own right, but also as a challenger to Hofstede's model.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Taras et al. (2012) is the only piece of research related to ID published in an academic  
40  
41 journal. Therefore, it becomes quite difficult to compare its actual impact with that of the  
42  
43 other two studies. Nevertheless, it can be affirmed that this is a relevant piece of research  
44  
45 whose influence is likely to increase in the near future: it shows an early recognition by  
46  
47 researchers, a high impact when compared to similar pieces of research, and a wide  
48  
49 recognition by broader (including non-research focused) audiences.  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Up to 10 models focus on the psychic distance construct as the central cross-national  
55  
56 distance issue to be considered when making IB&M decisions. These models build on  
57  
58 individuals' perceptions of existing differences between countries as the key component of  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 PD: as stated in Evans and Mavondo (2002), Prime et al. (2009), and Sousa and Bradley  
5 (2006), the major determinant of the PD construct is the individual mind's processing of  
6 cross-country differences. In other words, the PD exists in an individual's mind and,  
7 therefore, it has a perceptual and subjective nature, as individuals' perceptions are  
8 subjective interpretations of reality. As a consequence, most of these models agree on the  
9 idea that PD should be measured at individual rather than at country or society level.  
10

11  
12 Nevertheless, there are some country-level factors that influence or condition the  
13 individuals' perceptions labelled as psychic distance stimuli (Dow and Karunaratna's 2006;  
14 Prime et al. 2009); influential factors or impactful dimensions (Child et al. 2009; Sousa and  
15 Bradley 2006; Smith et al. 2011), conditioners of information flows between countries  
16 (Brewer 2007), or antecedents of cognitive perceptions (Håkanson and Ambos's 2010).  
17 Some of these models point to cultural distance as one of these country-level factors that  
18 may influence perceived distance. Furthermore, some of them are based on the above  
19 mentioned Hofstede (1980) model to measure the CD: Dow and Karunaratna (2006); Evans  
20 and Mavondo (2002); and Sousa and Bradley (2006).

21  
22 These last 3 pieces of research are particularly influential in terms of direct citation rates,  
23 accumulated citation counts, adjusted impact, and, even, altmetrics. In other words, it is not  
24 only that these pieces of research have been highly cited and recognized by researchers, but  
25 they have performed better than similar (in terms of field and year) articles, their citing  
26 articles are also influential pieces of research, and they have been recognized by broader  
27 (including non-academic) audiences. These high accumulated and adjusted impacts point to  
28 prestigious studies that are central to the research field and have received more attention  
29 (and citations) than similar (year, field) pieces of research. In addition, Håkanson and  
30 Ambos (2010) arises as a promising piece of research in terms of future impact due to its  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 high per year citation counts, its early recognition by colleagues, and its wide recognition  
5 on the internet and the social media. Furthermore, it occupies an outstanding position in  
6 terms of adjusted impact when compared to similar documents.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 It should be acknowledged that all the PD-focused articles show a per year citation rate  
12 higher than their respective journal/year impact factor and that up to 80% of them show a  
13 FWCI greater than 1 (citation rate higher than average when compared to similar  
14 documents) and a CP over 85% (they are among the 15% most cited articles when  
15 compared to similar documents) pointing to their high impact as individual pieces of  
16 research, but also to the relevance of the psychic-distance-issue within the research field.  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Two articles offer a broad approach to the cross-national distance issue: Ghemawat's  
22 (2001) general framework and Berry et al.'s (2010) institutional approach to distance  
23 among countries. Although these two studies share a basic feature (i.e. they go far beyond  
24 psychic and cultural concepts when analyzing the impact of distance among countries on  
25 IB&M decisions), they differ in their approach, kind of publishing outlet, development, and  
26 proposal: while the former is a piece of research published in a management magazine  
27 targeted at professional audiences, the second has been published in the most salient  
28 IB&M-focused journal.  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 Both of them are among the most salient pieces of research in terms of direct, accumulated,  
34 and adjusted citation rates and therefore point to high influence and relevance in the  
35 research field. Most probably, their wide approach to the cross-national distance issue is a  
36 key driver of their high impact on the research field. Actually, Ghemawat (2001) gathers  
37 together over 30% of total direct raw citation counts and Berry et al. (2010) about 17%.  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Both of them are over 30/24 (SCOPUS/WOS) citations per year, and show high indexes of  
43 indirect impact. Furthermore, Berry et al. (2010) is the only article in our dataset  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

recognized as an ESI Top Paper (i.e. it is classified by the WOS within the 1% of most cited articles published in same subject area and year), and both of them show a 99 CP and a FWCI over 10. All these data point, once again, to the relevance of the distance-issue within the IB&M field. It clearly seems that the way in which cross-national distance is or should be measured is of central interest for Management and IB&M scholars and that the studies that address this topic from a multi-dimensional perspective arise as central pieces of research in this field.

It should be mentioned that Ghemawat (2001) suffered some degree of delayed recognition with a late awakening period and that it is becoming a classic in the research field that has not yet reached its peak in terms of impact. On the other hand, Berry et al. (2010) achieved early recognition by academia and by the broader audience covered by altmetrics. Therefore, this early and fast recognition predicts an even higher impact on the research field in the future.

All in all, it seems that researchers highly value models and measurements that go beyond the CD and PD constructs and provide a broad framework to analyze and measure cross-national distance among countries.

## References

- Acedo, F.J., Casillas, J.C. (2005). Current paradigms in the international management field: An author co-citation analysis. *International Business Review*, 14, 619-639.
- Ailon, G. (2008). Mirror, mirror on the wall: culture's consequences in a value test of its own design. *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (4), 885-904.
- Au, K.Y. (2000). Intra-cultural variation as another construct of international management: a study based on secondary data of 42 countries. *Journal of International Management*, 6, 217-238.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Avloniti, A., Filippaios, F. (2014). Unbundling the differences between Psychic and Cultural Distance: An empirical examination of the existing measures. *International Business Review*, 23 (3), 660-674.
- Barnett, G., Fink, E. (2008). Impact of the internet and scholar age distribution on academic citation age. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(4), 526-534.
- Berry, H., Guillén, M.F., Zhou, N. (2010). An institutional approach to cross-national distance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 1460-1480.
- Beugelsdijk, S., Kostova, T., Kunst, V.E., Spadafora, E., van Essen, M. (2018). Cultural distance and the process of firm internationalization: A meta-analytical review and theoretical implications. *Journal of Management*, 44 (1), 89-130.
- Bornmann, L. (2014). Do altmetrics point to the broader impact of research? An overview of benefits and disadvantages of altmetrics. *Journal of Informetrics*, 8 (4), 895-903.
- Bornmann, L. (2015). Alternative metrics in Scientometrics: a meta-analysis of research into three altmetrics. *Scientometrics*, 103 (3), 1123-1144.
- Bornmann, L., Marx, W. (2011). The h index as a research performance indicator. *European Science Editing*, 37 (3), 77-80.
- Bornmann, L., Leydesdorff, L., Wang, J. (2013). Which percentile-based approach should be preferred for calculating normalized citation impact values? An empirical comparison of five approaches including a newly developed citation-rank approach (P100). *Journal of Informetrics*, 7 (4), 933-944.
- Bornmann, L., Leydesdorff, L., Wang, J. (2014). How to improve the prediction based on citation impact percentiles for years shortly after the publication date? *Journal of Informetrics*, 8 (1), 175-180.
- Brewer, P. (2007). Operationalizing psychic distance: A revised approach. *Journal of International Marketing*, 15(1), 44-66.
- Brewer, P., Venaik, S. (2011). Individualism-Collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42, 436-445.
- Brewer, P., Venaik, S. (2012). On the misuse of national culture dimensions. *International Marketing Review*, 29 (6), 673-683.
- Burrell, Q. L. (2002). The nth-citation distribution and obsolescence. *Scientometrics*, 53(3), 309-323.
- Chakraborty, T., Kumar, S., Goyal, P., Ganguly, N., Mukherjee, A. (2014). Towards a stratified learning approach to predict future citation counts. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE joint conference on digital libraries. <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84919398068&partnerID=40&md5=4ab5eaa92d5b8f6d089ef130650f22ac>.
- Chan, K.C., Fung, H.G., Leung, W.K. (2006). International business research: trends and school rankings. *International Business Review*, 15 (4), 317-338.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Chandy, P. R., Williams, T. G. (1994). The impact of journals and authors on international business research: A citational analysis of JIBS articles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25 (4), 715-728.
- Child, J., Ng, S.H., Wong, C. (2002). Psychic distance and internationalization. Evidence from Hong Kong firms. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 32(1), 36-56
- Child, J., Rodrigues, S., Frynas, J. (2009). Psychic distance, its impact and coping modes. Interpretations of SME decision makers. *Management International Review*, 49 (2), 199-224.
- Costas, R., van Leeuwen, T.N., van Raan, A.F.J. (2010). Is scientific literature subject to a 'sell-by-date'? A general methodology to analyze the 'durability' of scientific documents. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61 (2), 329-339.
- Cunningham, S. J., Bocock, D. (1995). Obsolescence of computing literature. *Scientometrics*, 34 (2), 255-262.
- de Mooij, M. (2013). On the misuse and misinterpretation of dimensions of national culture. *International Marketing Review*, 30 (3), 253-261.
- Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 504-518.
- Dow, D. (2000). A note on psychological distance and export market selection. *Journal of International Marketing*, 8(1), 51-55.
- Dow, D., Karunaratna A. (2006). Developing a multidimensional instrument to measure psychic distance stimuli. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(5), 578-602.
- Dubois, F.L., Reeb, D. (2000). Ranking the international business journals. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(4), 689-704.
- Earley, P.C. (2006). Leading cultural research in the future: a matter of paradigms and taste. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (pp. 902-921).
- Ebrahimi, S., Mehrad, J., Setareh, F., Hosseinchari, M. (2016). Path analysis of the relationship between visibility and citation: the mediating roles of save, discussion, and recommendation metrics. *Scientometrics*, 109, 1497-1510.
- Egghe, L. (2011). The single publication H-index of papers in the Hirsch-core of a researcher and the indirect H-index. *Scientometrics*, 89, 727-739.
- Erdt, M., Nagarajan, A., Sin, S-C. J., Theng, Y-L. (2016). Altmetrics: an analysis of the state-of-the-art in measuring research impact on social media. *Scientometrics*, 109, 1117-1166.
- Evans, J., Mavondo, F.T. (2002). Psychic distance and organizational performance: An empirical examination of international retailing operations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33 (3), 515-532.
- Ferreira, M.P., Li, D., Reis, N., Serra, F. (2014). Culture in international business research: A bibliometric study in four top IB journals. *Management Research*, 12, 68-91.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Ferreira, M.P., Santos, J., Almeida, M., Reis, N. (2014). Mergers and acquisitions research: A bibliometric study of top strategy and international business journals, 1980–2010. *Journal of Business Research*, 67 (12), 2550-2558.
- Finardi, U. (2014). On the time evolution of received citations, in different scientific fields: An empirical study. *Journal of Informetrics*, 8 (1), 13-24.
- Fragkiadaki, E., Evangelidis, G. (2014). Review of the indirect citations paradigm: Theory and practice of the assessment of papers, authors and journals. *Scientometrics*, 99 (2), 261–288.
- Fragkiadaki, E., Evangelidis, G. (2016). Three novel indirect indicators for the assessment of papers and authors based on generations of citations. *Scientometrics*, 106, 657–694.
- Ghemawat, P. (2001). Distance Still Matters. The hard reality of global expansion. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(8), 137-147.
- Giménez-Toledo, E., Román-Román, A. (2009). Assessment of humanities and social sciences monographs through their publishers: a review and a study towards a model of evaluation. *Research Evaluation*, 18 (3), 201–213.
- Glänzel, W. (2004). Towards a model for diachronous and synchronous citation analyses. *Scientometrics*, 60 (3), 511-522.
- Glänzel, W., Schoepflin, U. (1995). A bibliometric study on ageing and reception processes of scientific literature. *Journal of Information Science*, 21 (1), 37–53.
- Glänzel, W., Schoepflin, U. (1997). A bibliometric study of reference literature in the sciences and social sciences. *Information Processing and Management*, 35, 31-44.
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Balkin, D.B. (1992). Determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(5), 921-955.
- Gorraiz, J., Gumpenberger, C., Purnell, P. J. (2014). The power of book reviews: A simple and transparent enhancement approach for book citation indexes. *Scientometrics*, 98(2), 841-852.
- Gorraiz, J., Gumpenberger, C., Schlögl, C. (2013). Difference and similarities in usage versus citation behaviours observed for five subject areas. In J. Gorraiz, E. Schiebel, C. Gumpenberger, M. Hörlesberger, H. Moed (Eds.), Proceedings of the 14th International Society of Scientometrics and Informetrics Conference, Vienna, 15th–18th July (Vol. 1, 519–535). Austria: Vienna.
- Gorraiz, J., Purnell, P. J., Glänzel, W. (2013). Opportunities for and limitations of the Book Citation Index. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(7), 1388–1398.
- Guerrero-Bote, V. P., Moya-Anegón, F. (2014). Relationship between downloads and citations at journal and paper levels, and the influence of language. *Scientometrics*, 101, 1043–1065.
- Hakason, L., Ambos, B. (2010). The antecedents psychic distance. *Journal of International Management*, 16, 195-2010

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Harzing, A. (2003). The role of culture in entry mode studies: From neglect to myopia. *Advances in international management*, 15 (15), 75-127.
- 5  
6  
7 Harzing, A., Pudelko, M. (2016). Do we need to distance ourselves from the distance  
8 concept? *Management International Review*, 56 (1), 1-34.
- 9  
10 Harzing, A., Van der Wal, R. (2008). Google Scholar as a new source for citation analysis.  
11 *Ethics in science and environmental politics*, 8 (1), 61-73
- 12  
13 Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related*  
14 *Values*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- 15  
16 Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus  
17 respondents' minds. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (6), 882-896.
- 18  
19 Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online*  
20 *readings in psychology and culture*, 2(1), 8.
- 21  
22 Hofstede, G., Bond, M.H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to  
23 economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16 (4), 4-21.
- 24  
25 Hofstede, G., Hofstede G.J., Minkov M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations*. London:  
26 McGrawHill.
- 27  
28 House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership*  
29 *and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 30  
31 House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and  
32 implicit leadership theories across the globe: an introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of*  
33 *World Business*, 37, 3-10.
- 34  
35 Hu, X., Rousseau, R., Chen, J. (2011). On the definition of forward and backward citation  
36 generations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 5 (1), 27-36.
- 37  
38 Javidan, M., House, R.J., Dorfman, P.W., Hanges, P.J., de Luque, M. (2006).  
39 Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of  
40 GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (6),  
41 897-914.
- 42  
43 Jin, B. H., Liang, L. M., Rousseau, R., Egghe, L. (2007). The R- and AR-indices:  
44 Complementing the h-index. *Chinese Science Bulletin*, 52 (6), 655-660.
- 45  
46 Johanson, J., Wiedersheim- Paul, F. (1975). The internationalization of the firm—four  
47 Swedish cases. *Journal of management studies*, 12 (3), 305-323.
- 48  
49 Kaasa, A. Vadi, M., Varblane, U. (2016). A new dataset of cultural distances for European  
50 countries and regions. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 37, 231-244.
- 51  
52 Kelley, L., MacNab, B., Worthley, R. (2006). Crossvergence and cultural tendencies: A  
53 longitudinal test of the Hong Kong, Taiwan and United States banking sectors. *Journal of*  
54 *International Management*, 12, 67-84.
- 55  
56 Kirkman, B.L., Lowe, K.B., Gibson, C.B. (2006). A quarter century of "culture's  
57 consequences": A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values  
58 framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (3), 285-320.
- 59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Kochen, M. (1987). How well do we acknowledge intellectual debts? *Journal of Documentation*, 43(1), 54-64.
- Kogut, B., Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411-432.
- Kosmulski, M. (2010). Hirsch-type approach to the 2nd generation citations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 4(3), 257-264.
- Kostoff, R. (1997). Citation analysis cross-field normalization: A new paradigm. *Scientometrics*, 39 (3), 225-230.
- Kousha, K., Thelwall, M. (2015). Alternative metrics for book impact assessment: Can Choice reviews be a useful source? In A. A. Salah, Y. Tonta, A. A. A. Salah, C. Sugimoto, and U. Al (Eds.), Proceedings of the 15th international conference on scientometrics and informetrics, pp. 59–70. Istanbul: Bogazici University Printhouse.
- Kousha, K., Thelwall, M., Rezaie, S. (2011). Assessing the citation impact of books: The role of Google Books, Google Scholar, and Scopus. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62 (11), 2147–2164.
- Lachance, C., Larivière, V. (2014). On the citation lifecycle of papers with delayed recognition. *Journal of Informetrics*, 8(4), 863-872.
- Li, J., Shi, D., Zhao, S.X., Ye, F.Y. (2014). A study of the “heartbeat spectra” for “sleeping beauties”. *Journal of Informetrics*, 8 (3), 493-502.
- Li, X., Thelwall, M., Giustini, A. (2012). Validating online reference managers for scholarly impact measurement. *Scientometrics*, 91, 461–471.
- López-Duarte, C., Vidal-Suárez, M.M., González-Díaz, B. (2016). International business and national culture: A literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18, 397-416.
- Magnusson, P., Wilson, R.T., Zdravkovic, S., Zhou, J.K., Westjohn, S.A. (2008). Breaking through the cultural clutter: A comparative assessment of multiple cultural and institutional frameworks. *International Marketing Review*, 25 (2), 163-201.
- Martínez, M.A., Herrera, M., López-Gijón, J., Herrera-Velamí, E. (2014). H-Classics: characterizing the concept of citation classics through H-index. *Scientometrics*, 98, 1971–1983.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede’s model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55 (1), 89-118.
- McSweeney, B. (2013). Fashion founded on a flaw: The ecological model – deterministic fallacy of Hofstede, GLOBE, and followers. *International Marketing Review*, 30 (5) 483-504.
- Min, C., Sun, J., Pei, L., Ding, Y. (2016). Measuring delayed recognition for papers: Uneven weighted summation and total citations. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10 (4), 1113-1165.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Moed, H. F., Van Leeuwen, T. N., Reedijk, J. (1998). A new classification system to describe the ageing of scientific journals and their impact factors. *Journal of Documentation*, 54 (4), 387-419.
- Ng, S., Lee, J.A., Soutar, G.N. (2007). Are Hofstede's and Schwartz's value frameworks congruent? *International Marketing Review*, 24 (2), 164-180.
- Nicolaisen, J. (2002). The scholarliness of published peer reviews: A bibliometric study of book reviews in selected social science fields. *Research Evaluation*, 11 (3), 129-140.
- Nordstrom, K.A., Vahlne, J.E. (1994). Is the globe shrinking? Psychic distance and the establishment of Swedish sales subsidiaries during the last 100 years. In Landeck, M. (Ed.), *International Trade: Regional and Global Issues*, St Martin's Press, New York, 41- 56.
- Onodera, N. (2016). Properties of an index of citation durability of an article. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10 (4), 981-1004.
- Onodera, N., Yoshikane, F. (2015). Factors affecting citation rates of research articles. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66 (4), 739-764.
- Pinto, C. F., Serra, F. R., Ferreira, M. P. (2014). A bibliometric study on culture research in IB. *BAR-Brazilian Administration Review*, 11 (3), 340-363.
- Pisani, N. (2011). International management research: Investigating its recent diffusion in top management journal. *Journal of Management*, 35 (2), 199-218.
- Pooladian, A., Borrego, Á. (2010). A longitudinal study of the bookmarking of library and information science literature in Mendeley. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10 (4), 1135-1142.
- Piwowar, H. (2013). Altmetrics: Value all research products. *Nature*, 493 (7431), 159-159.
- Priem, J., Parra, C., Piwowar, H., Waagheest, A. (2012). Uncovering impacts: CitedIn and total impact, two new tools for gathering altmetrics. Paper presented at the iConference 2012.
- Priem, J., Piwowar, H. A., Hemminger, B. M. (2017). Altmetrics in the wild: Using social media to explore scholarly impact. arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.04745
- Prime, N. Obadia, C., Vida, I. (2009). Psychic distance in exporter-importer relationships: A grounded theory approach. *International Business Review* 18(2), 184-198.
- Qian, Y., Rong, W., Jiang, N., Tang, J., Xiong, Z. (2017). Citation regression analysis of computer science publications in different ranking categories and subfields. *Scientometrics*, 110 (3), 1351-1374.
- Robertson, C.J. (2000). The global dispersion of Chinese values: A three-country study of confucian dynamism. *Management International Review*, 40 (3), 253-268.
- Salimi, N. (2017). Quality assessment of scientific outputs using the BWM. *Scientometrics*, 112, 195-213.
- Sangam, S. (1999). Obsolescence of literature in the field of psychology. *Scientometrics* 44 (1), 33-46.



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Sasaki, I., Yoshikawa, K. (2014). Going beyond national cultures – Dynamic interaction between intra-national, regional, and organizational realities. *Journal of World Business*, 49 (3), 455-464.
- Schlögl, C., Gorraiz, J., Gumpenberger, C., Jack, K., Kraker, P. (2014). Comparison of downloads, citations and readership data for two information systems journals. *Scientometrics*, 101, 1113–1128
- Schubert, A. (2009). Using the h-index for assessing single publications. *Scientometrics*, 78 (3), 559–565.
- Schubert, A., Braun T. (1986). Relative indicators and relational charts for comparative assessment of publication output and citation impact, *Scientometrics*, 9, 281-291.
- Schubert, A., Braun, T. (1996). Cross-field normalization of scientometric indicators. *Scientometrics*, 36 (3), 311-324.
- Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In Kim, U., Triandis, H., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S. and Yoons, G. (Eds.). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods and applications*, pp. 85-119, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Shenkar, O. (2001). Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32 (3), 519-535.
- Small, H. G. (1978). Cited documents as concept symbols. *Social studies of science*, 8 (3), 327-340.
- Smith, M., Dowling P.J., Rose, E.L. (2011). Psychic distance revisited: A proposed conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 17(1), 123-143.
- Smith, P. B. (2006). When elephants fight, the grass gets trampled: The GLOBE and Hofstede Projects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (5), pp. 915-921.
- Song, Y., Ma, F., Yang, S. (2015). Comparative study on the consciousness of humanities and social sciences in China: under the new situation of web. *Scientometrics* 102, 365–388.
- Sousa, C.M., Bradley, F. (2005). Global markets: does psychic distance matter? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 13(1), 43-59.
- Sousa, C.M., Bradley, F. (2006). Cultural distance and psychic distance: Two peas in a pod? *Journal of International Marketing*, 14(1), 49-70.
- Sousa, C.M., Lages, L. (2011). The PD scale: a measure of psychic distance and its impact on international marketing strategy. *International Marketing Review*, 28 (2), 201-222
- Steel, P., Taras, V. (2010). Culture as a consequence: A multi-level multivariate meta-analysis of the effects of individual and country characteristics on work-related cultural values. *Journal of International Management*, 16, 211-233.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Steenkamp, J.B.E.M. (2001). The role of national culture in international marketing  
5 research. *International Marketing Review*, 18 (1), 30-44.  
6  
7 Stegehuis, C., Litvak, N., Waltman, L. (2015). Predicting the long-term citation impact of  
8 recent publications. *Journal of Informetrics*, 9 (3), 642-657.  
9  
10 Sun, J., Min, C., Li, J. (2016). A vector for measuring obsolescence of scientific article.  
11 *Scientometrics*, 107, 745-757.  
12  
13 Sun, Y., Xia, B.S. (2016). The scholarly communication of economic knowledge: a citation  
14 analysis of Google Scholar. *Scientometrics*, 109, 1965-1978.  
15  
16 Tahamtan, I., Bornmann, L. (2018). Core elements in the process of citing publications:  
17 Conceptual overview of the literature. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12 (1), 203-216.  
18  
19 Tahamtan, I., Afshar, A.S., Ahamdzadeh, K. (2016). Factors affecting number of citations:  
20 a comprehensive review of the literature. *Scientometrics*, 107, 1195-1225.  
21  
22 Tang, L., Koveos, P.E. (2008). A framework to update Hofstede's cultural value indices:  
23 Economic dynamics and institutional stability. *Journal of International Business Studies*,  
24 39 (6), 1045-1063.  
25  
26 Taras, V., Steel, P., Kirkman, B. (2010). Negative practice-value correlations in the  
27 GLOBE data: Unexpected findings, questionnaire limitations and research directions.  
28 *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 1330-1338.  
29  
30 Taras, V., Steel, P., Kirkman, B. (2012). Improving national cultural indices using a  
31 longitudinal meta-analysis of Hofstede's dimensions. *Journal of World Business*, 47 (3),  
32 329-341.  
33  
34 Thelwall, M., Nevill, T. (2018). Could we just use Altmetric.com scores to predict longer  
35 term citation counts? *Journal of Informetrics*, 12 (1), 237-248.  
36  
37 Tihanyi, L., Griffith, D.A., Russell, C.J. (2005). The effect of cultural distance on entry  
38 mode choice, international diversification, and MNE performance: A meta-analysis.  
39 *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36 (3), 270-287.  
40  
41 Torres-Salinas, D., Robinson-García, N., Cabezas-Celajo, A., Jiménez-Contreras, E.  
42 (2014). Analyzing the citation characteristics of books. Indexed books, book series and  
43 publisher types in the book citation index. *Scientometrics*, 96 (3), 2113-2127.  
44  
45 van Dalen, H.P., Henkens, K. (2005). Signals in science —On the importance of signaling  
46 in gaining attention in Science. *Scientometrics*, 64 (2), 209-233.  
47  
48 van Raan, A.F.J. (2004). Sleeping beauties in science. *Scientometrics*, 59 (3), 467-472.  
49  
50 Venaik, S., Brewer, P. (2010). Avoiding uncertainty in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of*  
51 *International Business Studies*, 41, pp. 1294-1315.  
52  
53 Venaik, S., Brewer, P. (2013). Critical issues in the Hofstede and GLOBE national  
54 culture models. *International Marketing Review*, 30 (5), 469-482.  
55  
56 Vinkler, P. (1988). An attempt of surveying and classifying bibliometric indicators for  
57 scientometric purposes. *Scientometrics*, 13 (5-6), 239-259.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Vinkler, P. (2003). Relations of relative scientometric indicators. *Scientometrics*, 58 (3), 687-694.
- Vinkler, P. (2013). Comparative rank assessment of journal articles. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7 (3), 712-717.
- Walters, G. (2006). Predicting subsequent citations to articles published in twelve crime-psychology journals: Author impact versus journal impact measures: From cross-field to cross-scale effects of field-normalisation. *Scientometrics*, 69 (3), 499-510.
- Waltman, L. (2016). A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10 (2), 365-391.
- Wang, H., Schaan, J.L. (2008). How much distance do we need? Revisiting the "National cultural distance paradox". *Management International Review*, 48 (3), 263-278.
- Weller, K. (2015). Social media and altmetrics: An overview of current alternative approaches to measuring scholarly impact. In: Welpel I., Wollersheim J., Ringelhan S. and Osterloh M. (eds). *Incentives and Performance*. Springer, Cham, 261-276.
- Werner, S. (2002). Recent development in international management research: A review of 20 top management journals. *Journal of Management*, 28(3), 277-305.
- Wouters, P., Costas, R. (2012). Users, narcissism and control: tracking the impact of scholarly publications in the 21st century. SURFfoundation Utrecht.
- Yeganeh, H. (2014). A weighted, Mahalanobian, and asymmetrical approach to calculating national cultural distance. *Journal of International Management*, 20 (4), 436-463.
- Zahedi, Z., Haustein, S. (2018). On the relationships between bibliographic characteristics of scientific documents and citation and Mendeliev readership counts: A large-scale analysis of Web of Science publications. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12 (1), 191-202.
- Zaheer, S., Schomaker, M. S., Nachum, L. (2012). Distance without direction: Restoring credibility to a much-loved construct. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43(1), 18-27.
- Zhou, Q., Zhang, C., Zhao, X., Chen, B. (2016). Measuring book impact based on the multi-granularity online review mining. *Scientometrics*, 107, 1431-1455.
- Zitt, M., Ramanana-Rahary, S., Bassecoulard, E. (2005). Relativity of citation performance and excellence measures: From cross-field to cross-scale effects of field-normalisation. *Scientometrics*, 63 (2), 373-401.
- Zoller, D., Doerfel, S., Jäschke, R., Stumme, G., Hotho, A. (2016). Posted, visited, exported: Altmetrics in the social tagging system BibSonomy. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10 (3), 732-749.
- Zuccala, A., Guns, R., Cornacchia, R., Bod, R. (2015). Can we rank scholarly book publishers? A bibliometric experiment with the field of history. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 66 (7), 1333-1347.

Table 2. Cross-national distance models included in the analysis

Authors	Year	Publication	Explicit measurements	Empirical test	Secondary variables	Antecedents and/or models incorporated
<i>Models on cultural distance</i>						
House et al.	2004	Book	62 societies			
Hofstede et al.	2010	Book	93 countries			Hofstede (1980), Hofstede & Bond (1988)
Taras et al.	2012	JWB	49 countries / regions			Hofstede (1980)
<i>Models on psychic distance</i>						
Child et al.	2002	ISMO <sup>1</sup>				Nordstrom & Vahlne (1994)
Evans & Mavondo	2002	JIBS		Financial performance & strategic effectiveness	Yes	Hofstede (1980), Hofstede & Bond (1988)
Dow & Karunaratna	2006	JIBS	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Trade flows among country pairs		Hofstede (1980)
Sousa & Bradley	2006	JIMk				Schwartz (1992, 1994), Sousa & Bradley (2005), Hofstede (1980)
Brewer	2007	JIMk	Australia-25 countries	Exporters to host countries	Yes	Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul (1975)
Child et al.	2009	MIR		Business development in host countries	Yes	Ghemawat's (2001)
Prime et al.	2009	IBR		Exporter-importer relationships		
Hakanson & Ambos	2010	JIM	600 country pairs			
Smith et al.	2011	JMO <sup>3</sup>				Dow & Karunaratna (2006)
Sousa & Lages	2011	IMF		Marketing strategy adaptation		
<i>Other models</i>						
Ghemawat	2001	HBR			Yes	
Berry et al.	2010	JIBS		Choice of foreign market by US companies		

<sup>1</sup> International Studies of Management & Organization<sup>2</sup> A wide set of measurements relative to country pairs is available on the researchers' website<sup>3</sup> Journal of Management & Organization

**Table 3. Recent models on cross national distance: An overview of basic dimensions**

MODELS ON CULTURAL DISTANCE			
<b>House et al. (2002)</b>	Uncertainty avoidance		
	Power distance		
	Societal collectivism		
	In-Group collectivism		
	Gender egalitarianism		
	Assertiveness		
	Future orientation		
	Performance orientation		
Human orientation			
<b>Hofstede et al. (2010)</b>	Power distance		
	Uncertainty avoidance		
	Masculinity versus femininity		
	Individualism versus collectivism		
	Long versus short term orientation		
Indulgence versus restraint			
<b>Taras et al. (2012)</b>	Power distance		
	Uncertainty avoidance		
	Individualism / Collectivism		
	Masculinity /Femininity		
MODELS ON PSYCHIC DISTANCE			
	Distance-reducing factors	Culture & language Level of economic development Level of education Level of technological development Geographical distance (temporal & climate)	
	<b>Child et al. (2002)</b>	Distance-bridging factors (initiative of firms)	Strategic (location choice) Operational (international unit management)
			Distance-compressing factors (macro developments)

<b>Evans &amp; Mavondo (2002)</b>		Power distance, Uncertainty avoidance Masculinity / Femininity Individualism / Collectivism Long term orientation	
	Business differences	Legal & political environment Economic environment Market structure Business & management practices Language	
Inter-state State Local			
Enterprise density Market concentration			
<b>Dow &amp; Karunaratna (2006)</b>	Culture	Hofstede's dimensions	
	Language	Mayor language Incidence of one country major language within other countries	
	Education level	Literacy rate Second & third level education	
	Industrial development	GDP per capita Consumption of energy Vehicle ownership % of employment in agriculture % of GDP from manufacturing Degree of urbanisation Development of communication infrastructures	
		Political system	Degree of democracy or political freedom Policy preferences
		Religion	Dominant religion Incidence of own country's dominant religion within other countries
		Time Zones	Independent form geographical distance
	Colonial ties		

Accepted Version

**MODELS ON PSYCHIC DISTANCE**

	Cultural distance	Hofstede's dimensions	
<b>Sousa &amp; Bradley (2006)</b>	Individual's value system	Self-transcendence	Climate
		Self-enhancement	Consumers' purchasing power
		Openness to change	Consumers' preferences
		Conservation: Conformity Security Tradition	Lifestyles Cultural values, beliefs & traditions Language Level of literacy & education
<b>Brewer (2007)</b>	Commercial ties	Two way trade Stock of foreign investment	
	Political ties	Trade agreements Value of aid programs Trade representation office	
	Historic ties	Colonial relationship Shared wars	
	Geographic ties	Geographic proximity	
	Social ties	Cultural similarities Sport preferences Language similarities	
	Information ties	Secondary information availability Immigration numbers	
	Development	Level of development of the foreign country Level of corruption of the foreign country	
	<b>Child et al. (2009)</b>	Geographical distance Culture Language Level of education Level of technical development Level of economic development Logistics infrastructure Political system Legal system Regulations Accepted business practices Business ethics	

Accepted Version

<b>Prime et al. (2009)</b>	Cultural issues	Patterns of thought Language Behaviors
	Business environment & practices	Relationships with businessmen Business practices Economic, political, & legal environment
<b>Håkanson &amp; Ambos (2010)</b>	Cultural distance Geographic distance Linguistic differences Political rivalry (current and historical) Economic development differences Economic development of the host country Weakness of governance system in host country Economic, cultural & political influence	
	National level stimuli	National culture Language Education levels Industrial development Political systems Religions Time zones Colonial links
<b>Smith et al. (2011)</b>	Objective characteristics	International experience Cultural background Education Command of foreign languages
	Individual level determinants	Risk tolerance Flexibility Proneness to change Conformity, tradition, security values
		Information flows

Accepted Version



---

**MODELS ON PSYCHIC DISTANCE**

---

	Country characteristics distance	Level of economic & industrial development Communications infrastructure Marketing infrastructure Technical requirements Market competitiveness Legal regulations
<b>Sousa &amp; Lages (2011)</b>	People characteristics distance	Per capita income Purchasing power of customers Lifestyles Consumer preferences Level of literacy and education Language Cultural values, beliefs, attitudes and traditions

---

**OTHER MODELS**

---

	Cultural factors	Language Social norms Religion Ethnicity Connective ethnic & social networks
	Administrative factors	Colonial ties Shared monetary or political association Political hostilities Government policies Institutional weakness
<b>Ghemawat (2001)</b>	Geographic distance	Shared border Waterway access Transportation links Communication links Physical remoteness Climate Country size
	Economic distance	Consumers income Cost & quality of natural, human & financial resources Information & knowledge Infrastructures Intermediate inputs

Berry et al. (2010)	Economic distance	Income GDP per capita (2000 US\$) Inflation GDP deflator (% GDP) Exports Exports of goods and services (% GDP) Imports Imports of goods and services (% GDP)
	Financial distance	Private credit Stock market capital Listed companies
	Political distance	Political stability Democratic character Size of the state WTO member Regional trade agreement
	Administrative distance	Colonizer–colonized link Common language Common religion Legal system
	Cultural distance	Power distance Uncertainty avoidance Individualism Masculinity
	Demographic distance	Life expectance Birth rate Population under 14 Population under 65
	Knowledge distance	Patents Scientific articles
	Global connectedness distance	International tourism expenditure International tourism receipts Use of internet
	Geographic distance	Great circle distance

Table 4. Measurements for the assessment of the impact on the research field

Publication type	Impact	Measurement	Description	Basic references
Journal articles	Direct impact	Raw citation	First generation of citations	Glänzel & Schoepflin (1999), Kotchen (1987), Small (1978)
		Citation Path	Age distribution of raw citation counts	Burrell (2002), Cunningham & Boccock (1995), Glänzel (2004), Sangam (1999)
		Citation Per year	Ratio: raw citation counts / years since publication	Tahamtan et al. (2016)
		Early citation	Raw citation counts in the first 3 years after publication	Chakraborty et al. (2014), Guerrero-Bote & Moya-Anegón (2014)
	Indirect impact	H index	The citation h-index of the set of papers citing the target one	Fragkiadaki & Evangelidis (2014, 2016), Schubert (2009)
	Adjusted impact	Field weighted citation impact (FWCI)	Ratio: raw citation counts / expected number of citation counts for similar publications	Kostoff (1997), Salimi (2017), Schubert & Braun (1985, 1986), Vinkler (1988, 2003)
		Citation Percentil (CP)	Article's citation percentile when compared to similar articles	Kostoff (1997), Salimi (2017), Schubert & Braun (1986, 1996), Vinkler (1988, 2003, 2013)
		Essential Sciences Indicator Top Paper	Article included in the top 1% most cited articles	Kostoff (1997), Salimi (2017), Schubert & Braun T. (1985, 1986), Vinkler (1988, 2013), Zitt et al. (2005)
		Comparison to journal impact factor	Ratio: per year citation counts /Journal impact factors	van Dalen & Henkens (2005); Onodera & Yoshikane (2015), Qian et al. (2016), Sun & Xia (2016), Tahamtan et al. (2016), Walters (2006)
		Altmetrics	Mendeley downloads	Articles downloading and saving activities
Books	Academic book review	Number of reviews	Post-publication reflection and critical analysis of a book's content	Gorraiz et al. (2014), Kousha & Thelwall (2015), Nicolaisen (2002), Zhou et al. (2016)
		Reviews impact	Raw citation, H index, FWCI and CP	
	Publisher prestige	Scholarly Publisher Indicators Expanded	Publishers' prestige, specialization degree, and quality of the manuscript selection process	Giménez-Toledo & Román-Román (2009), Kousha & Thelwall (2015), Torres-Salinas et al. (2014), Zuccala et al. (2015)

**Table 5. Assessment of articles' impact on the research field: Direct impact**

Article (Year) <sup>1</sup>	Raw <sup>2</sup>	Citation Path <sup>2</sup>																Per year <sup>2</sup>	Early <sup>3</sup>
		02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Ghemawat (2001)	566/368	2/0	9/3	10/4	15/7	16/7	21/8	47/30	37/22	42/21	44/31	57/36	70/48	60/41	65/53	71/57	37.7/24.5	21/7	
Dow & Karunaratna (2006)	231/156					0/0	10/5	12/9	16/10	18/11	22/13	12/7	31/21	45/27	26/19	39/34	23.1/15.6	38/24	
Evans & Mavondo (2002)	195/134	0/0	1/0	1/1	7/4	6/5	11/10	16/9	17/12	18/8	17/9	11/8	16/10	34/21	15/11	25/26	13.9/9.6	9/5	
Berry, Guillen & Zhou (2010)	186/153									1/1	5/2	11/8	26/23	39/24	50/41	54/54	31.0/25.5	43/34	
Sousa & Bradley (2006)	142/98					0/0	6/4	15/11	13/8	11/6	12/11	12/4	13/10	21/14	19/15	20/15	14.2/9.8	34/23	
Hakanson & Ambos (2010)	100/82									1/1	4/2	10/6	18/12	25/19	19/19	23/23	16.7/13.7	33/21	
Brewer (2007)	98/61						1/0	5/4	8/4	10/5	13/9	9/2	11/4	18/14	10/9	13/10	10.9/6.8	24/13	
Taras, Steel & Kirkman (2012)	53//42											1/1	6/3	14/9	17/15	15/14	13.3/10.5	38/28	
Sousa & Lages (2011)	35/27										1/1	2/1	6/3	9/4	11/9	6/9	7.0/5.4	18/9	
Prime, Obadia & Vida (2009)	34/29								0/0	1/1	4/4	1/1	5/2	11/10	6/6	6/5	4.9/4.1	6/6	
Child, Rodrigues & Frynas (2009)	29/24								0/0	0/0	3/4	4/2	4/2	4/3	9/8	5/5	4.1/3.4	7/6	
Smith, Dowling & Rose (2011)	7/3										0/0	1/0	1/0	1/0	2/1	2/2	1.4/0.6	3/0	

<sup>1</sup>Ranked by raw citation (Scopus)<sup>2</sup>Scopus/WOS

Accepted Version

**Table 6. Assessment of articles' impact on the research field: Indirect, adjusted, and almetrics impact**

Article (Year) <sup>1</sup>	Indirect H index Scopus/WOS	Article (Year) <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted				Article (Year) <sup>3</sup>	Almetrics: Mendeley
			FWCI	CP	ESI TP	AI/JI <sup>4</sup> Scopus/WOS		
Ghemawat (2001)	54/47	Dow & Karunaratna (2006)	14.5	99	No	8.1/6.9	Berry, Guillen & Zhou (2010)	316
Dow & Karunaratna (2006)	34/26	Ghemawat (2001)	14.0	99	No	13.6/10	Ghemawat (2001)	260
Evans & Mavondo (2002)	30/26	Berry, Guillen & Zhou (2010)	11.4	99	No	7.1/6.1	Dow & Karunaratna (2006)	185
Sousa & Bradley (2006)	20/21	Sousa & Bradley (2006)	10.7	96	No	14.7/10.1	Taras, Steel & Kirkman (2012)	176
Berry, Guillen & Zhou (2010)	26/17	Taras, Steel & Kirkman (2012)	8.2	99	Yes	3.6/4	Hakanson & Ambos (2010)	167
Brewer (2007)	14/15	Hakanson & Ambos (2010)	7.6	98	No	10.7/10.5	Sousa & Bradley (2006)	147
Hakanson & Ambos (2010)	19/12	Brewer (2007)	6.3	94	No	8.3/7.1	Evans & Mavondo (2002)	107
Taras, Steel & Kirkman (2012)	8/6	Evans & Mavondo (2002)	5.2	96	No	6.3/6.6	Brewer (2007)	84
Prime, Obadia & Vida (2009)	7/6	Sousa & Lages (2011)	3.9	91	No	3.2/4.6	Sousa & Lages (2011)	72
Child, Rodrigues & Frynas (2009)	8/7	Child, Rodrigues & Frynas (2009)	1.9	86	No	2.5/3.9	Child, Rodrigues & Frynas (2009)	68
Sousa & Lages (2011)	8/6	Prime, Obadia & Vida (2009)	1.8	90	No	3.2/3.9	Prime, Obadia & Vida (2009)	60
Smith, Dowling & Rose (2011)	2/2	Smith, Dowling & Rose (2011)	0.7	55	No	2.5/1.5	Smith, Dowling & Rose (2011)	14

<sup>1</sup>Ranked by H-Index (Scopus)<sup>2</sup>Ranked by FWCI<sup>3</sup>Ranked by Almetrics: Mendeley<sup>4</sup>AI/JI: Article Impact / Journal Impact

Accepted Version

**Table 7. Assessment of books' impact on the research field: Academic reviews**

Book	Scholarly reviews	Impact				FWCI	CP	
		Raw Citation <sup>1</sup>	Per year citation <sup>1</sup>	H Index <sup>1</sup>				
<i>House et al (2004)</i>	Dorfman et al. (2012)	50/43	12.5/10.8	7/7	7.3	99		
	Hofstede (2011)	47/45	7.8/7.5	10/9	2.7	95		
	House et al. (2002)	476/304	34/21.7	43/36	14.7	99		
	Taras et al. (2010)	36/32	6.0/5.3	10/10	2.9	93		
<i>Hofstede et al. (2010)</i>								
<i>Comparison of both (Hofstede-4)</i>	Avloniti & Filippaios (2014)	11/11	5.5/5.5	4/4	2.6	90		
	Brewer & Venaik (2011)	48/36	9.6/7.2	11/8	6.6	93		
	Brewer & Venaik (2012)	23/8	5.8/2.0	5/3	2.3	93		
	Early (2006)	120/72	12.0/7.2	25/20	22.02	99		
	Hofstede (2006)	239/177	23.9/17.7	42/35	15.5	98		
	Javidan et al. (2006)	291/206	29.1/20.6	42/37	16.1	98		
	Magnusson et al. (2008)	52/36	6.5/4.5	14/12	3.7	92		
	Smith (2006)	138/85	13.8/8.5	29/23	9.9	96		
	Venaik & Brewer (2010)	61/56	10.2/9.3	14/13	5.6	97		
	Venaik & Brewer (2013)	11/9	3.7/3.0	3/3	2.3	90		
	Yeganeh (2014)	1/2	0.5/1.0	1/1	0.6	55		
	<i>Comparison of both (Hofstede-6)</i>							
	McSweeney (2005)	13/8	4.3/2.7	3/3	2.7	88		
De Mooij (2013)	8/12	4.0/2.8	3/3	2.5	91			

<sup>1</sup>Scopus/WOS

**Table 8. Assessment of books' impact on the research field: Publishers' prestige**

Scholarly Publishers Indicators Expanded	House et al. (2004) <i>Sage Publications</i>	Hofstede et al. (2010) <i>McGrawHill</i>
Book Citation Index (Thomson)	Yes	No
Scopus Book Titles (Elsevier)	No	No
Norwegian lists/CRISTIN	No	Yes
Finnish lists	Yes	No
Scholarly Publishers Indicators (SPI)	Yes	Yes
<b>Presence in information systems</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

Source. Own elaboration based on information available at [http://ilia.cchs.csic.es/SPI/expanded\\_index\\_en.html](http://ilia.cchs.csic.es/SPI/expanded_index_en.html)

Accepted Version

**Table 1. Breakdown of searched journals**

Journals		International Management & Business	Management & Business
Academy of Management Journal	AMJ		✓
Academy of Management Review	AMR		✓
Administrative Science Quarterly	ASQ		✓
Decision Sciences	DS		✓
Human Relations	HR		✓
Industrial & Labor Relations Review*	ILRR		✓
Industrial Relations	IR		✓
International Business Review	IBR	✓	
International Marketing Review	IMR	✓	
Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*	JABS		✓
Journal of Applied Psychology	JAP		✓
Journal of International Business Studies	JIBS	✓	
Journal of International Management	JIM	✓	
Journal of International Marketing	JIMk	✓	
Journal of Management	JM		✓
Journal of Management Studies	JMS		✓
Journal of Occupational and Org. Psychology	JOOP		✓
Journal of Organizational Behavior	JOB		✓
Journal of Vocational Behavior	JVB		✓
Journal of World Business	JW	✓	
Management International Review*	MIR	✓	
Management Science	MS		✓
Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes	OBHDP		✓
Personnel Psychology	PP		✓
Psychological Bulletin	PB		✓
Strategic Management Journal	SMJ		✓

\*Journals not available in these databases for some particular years. Direct search in the journals' archives for those particular years