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PART II
Cultural Dimensions

Chapter 1
Cultural Dimensions

§1:1 Introduction

Cross-cultural studies in general, and research on the relationship between cultural differences and leadership styles and management practices in particular, has been strongly influenced by the development and use of several models of societal, or national, culture. These models are typically based on “cultural dimensions” which, when carefully designed, can serve as useful tools for describing and measuring the values and practices that exist in societal groups and identifying and analyzing similarities and differences between such groups. A common theme among models of cultural dimensions is the identification and description of bipolar dimensions of culture that are used to represent alternative resolutions to issues or problems thought to be common for members of each society. Each dimension is typically depicted graphically as a continuum with the two extremes at the end of the continuum used as the name for the dimension (e.g., masculinity-femininity). Generally the polar “types” for each dimension conflict with one another and a society that tends to emphasize the cultural type at one end of the dimensional pole generally deemphasizes the cultural type at the other end. For example, if a society emphasizes hierarchy it will likely be difficult to find strong support for egalitarian values. Careful identification of the characteristics of a cultural dimension that will be used as the basis for comparison between two or more societal groups requires attention to several key questions including the definition of the concepts upon which the dimension is based, the standards and procedures for measuring the presence or absence of concepts within a group and the safeguards that will be taken to ensure the equivalency of the means and measurements in all of the groups that will be of interest to parties using the dimensions.

While there is general acceptance of the analytical and explanatory value of cultural dimensions there is no universally accepted model of societal culture. Identification, description and measurement of cultural values or dimensions can be extremely difficult given the complexity associated with the very concept of “cultural” and its components. Various definitions of culture are provided elsewhere in this publication; however, the following offering by Fiske is typical: culture binds members of a group or society together through a “socially constructed constellation consisting of such things as

---

1 For detailed discussion of the evolution of cross-cultural studies, see the chapter on “Evolution and Development of Cross-Cultural Studies” in this Library.
practices, competencies, ideas, schemas, symbols, values, norms, institutions, goals, constitutive rules, artifacts, and modifications of the physical environment.”

While some of these elements can be observed and information about them can be collected through various survey techniques there nonetheless remains a fair amount of mystery “because much of the strength of cultural influences stems from the fact that they operate in the background of behavior at the value, linguistic, and construct levels” and thus “people often have difficulty defining their cultural influences, and social scientists have difficulty measuring them.”

The good news is that researchers can select from multiple models of societal culture. As discussed elsewhere in this publication, the evolution of cross-cultural studies has included proposals from a number of scholars and consultants including Parsons and Shils, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Hall, Trompenaars, Schwartz and House and his colleagues from the GLOBE project. Each of these models have been used to investigate how cultural differences might impact key management issues such as leadership style, human resource policies, operational processes and development and implementation of business strategies. The results have been fascinating, particularly when the models are accompanied by numerical measures of how societies “rank” on specific dimensions, and have shed a substantial amount of new light on issues and problems that managers around the world face on a daily basis. The problem, however, has been a lack of convergence across these models that Nardon and Steers have referred to as “the ‘cultural theory jungle’—a situation in which researchers must choose between competing, if sometimes overlapping, models to further their research goals and then defend such choices against a growing body of critics.”

Clearing the “cultural theory jungle” is beyond the scope of this chapter and one could reasonably doubt whether any effort to bring convergence across the various models will ever be successful. As Nardon and Steers explained, convergence has been limited because the developers of each model come from different academic backgrounds and thus have tended to highlight different aspects of societal beliefs, norms or values. This situation is not likely to change in the near future and if anything things may get more complex as more and more work is conducted by researchers from non-Western backgrounds who identify new dimensions based on different ways of seeing the world and how individuals interact with the world and one another. The goal of this chapter is to simply provide a basic toolkit for interested parties that includes summaries of several of the most well-known models of cultural dimensions—Hofstede, Trompenaars,
Schwartz and GLOBE\textsuperscript{7}—as well as an overview of an interesting recent attempt by Nardon and Steers to bring some sort of order to the field by identifying what they believe are five relatively common themes among the various models.

While most of the well-known cultural dimensions are described and analyzed individually below it should not be forgotten that in the “real world” several dimensions are in play at any point in time with respect to the actions and reactions of leaders and subordinates to a particular situation. In fact, Hofstede recognizes this in his use of the various cultural maps discussed elsewhere in this publication that chart countries based on their scores for two dimensions at one time and other researchers have conducted studies of leadership attributes and practices using two or more cultural dimensions to identify and explain the relationship between cultural values and relationships between leaders and subordinates in different countries. For example, one study evaluated the power distance and uncertainty avoidance dimensions in relation to how managers communicate with, and exercise control over, their subordinates and found that managers in lower power distance countries relied more on their interpersonal skills for communication and were seen as more approachable and that managers in high uncertainty avoidance countries were seen as less approachable and more likely to influence their subordinates through controlling and directive strategies.\textsuperscript{8} If one looks at “approachability” as a key measure of leader-subordinate relationships then the combination of high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance would be one extreme (i.e., leaders are not approachable when that combination of dimensions is dominant) and the combination of low power distance and low uncertainty avoidance would be the other extreme (i.e., leaders are approachable when that combination of dimensions is dominant).\textsuperscript{9}

\section{Hofstede}

As discussed elsewhere in this publication, Hofstede’s research led him to conclude that differences in national cultures could be identified, measured and described by reference to five dimensions that he labeled power distance, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, individualism-collectivism, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, and the quality of human relations.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{7} For discussion of the cultural dimensions proposed by Parsons and Shils, Kluckhohn and Strodtebeck and Hall, see the chapter on “Cross-Cultural Studies” in this Library and the fuller explanations in the following works: T. Parsons and E. Shils, Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1951); F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtebeck, Variations in Value Orientations (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1961); and E. Hall, Beyond Culture (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1976). Exclusion of detailed discussions of these models in this chapter is not intended to minimize their importance and, in fact, several of the models discussed in this chapter borrow extensively from these earlier works and the proposal for “convergence” offered by Nardon and Steers is made with mindfulness of the contributions in those works.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} L. Offermann and P. Hellmann, “Culture’s consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action,” Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28(3) (1997), 342-351.
  \item \textsuperscript{9} See the discussion in the chapter on “Country Clusters” in this Library of Hofstede’s cultural map using power distance and uncertainty avoidance as the two dimensions which showed a clear clustering of countries in all quadrants including large power distance/strong uncertainty avoidance (e.g., Latin and South American countries) and small power distance/weak uncertainty avoidance (e.g., US and other Anglo countries and Scandinavian countries).
\end{itemize}
individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity and long-term orientation. Hofstede explained that these dimensions were discovered through a combination of statistical analysis of massive amounts of data and theoretical reasoning. Using the information he collected, Hofstede assigned each country an index score for each of the dimensions. Hofstede cautioned that the dimension-based characterizations of national cultures did not mean that every person in a particular country would evidence all of the cultural characteristics that were assigned to that country by the dimensional model and that the goal of his studies was to identify national norms rather than to try and explain or predict the behavior of every individual in the country.

Hofstede developed lists of differences between the poles of each cultural dimension, such as comparing large power distance societies to small power distance societies; however, he cautioned that statements on the lists, some of which are included in the discussions below, referred to extremes and that actual situations generally fell somewhere between those extremes and that the association of a statement with a cultural dimension is always statistical rather than absolute. For example, while strong uncertainty is associated with high stress and weak uncertainty is associated with low stress it is more likely than not that some form of stress or anxiety, perhaps rising and falling over time, will be a regular part of life in all societies and institutions. Similarly, the statement that older people are neither respected nor feared in small power distance societies obviously seems a bit harsh and is largely intended to draw a sharp contrast to the situation in large power distance societies where age is routinely and almost blindly worshiped regardless of the wisdom or integrity of the particular individual. Hofstede also noted that the dimension-based characterizations of societal cultures did not mean that every person in a particular society would evidence all of the cultural characteristics that were assigned to that society by the dimensional model and that the goal of his studies was to identify societal norms rather than to try and explain or predict the behavior of every individual in the society.

The two original studies that led to the identification and explanation of Hofstede’s five cultural dimensions covered 40 and 23 countries, respectively; however, in subsequent years scores for additional countries were generated to permit comparison among an expanded group of countries. For example, one consultant has compiled and published a list of scores on at least the first four of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions for over 60 countries. Not all of the countries have been surveyed and ranked for all five cultural

---

10 For detailed discussion of Hofstede’s research techniques, including criticisms thereof by other scholars, see the chapter on “Cross-Cultural Studies” in this Library.
13 Id.
dimensions; however, the full range of data is available for a number of countries of interest including the US, African and Asian countries, industrialized countries in Europe such as Great Britain and emerging markets such as Brazil and India.\(^\text{15}\)

### §1.3 --Power distance

The power distance dimension appears in both the Hofstede model and the GLOBE model described below. For Hofstede, power distance indicates the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations (e.g., for-profit business firms) is distributed unequally.\(^\text{16}\) Hofstede wrote that in extreme examples of a large power distance society it is believed that “there should be an order of inequality in the world in which everybody has a rightful place”.\(^\text{17}\) In contrast, in the smallest power distance societies it is believed that “inequality in society should be minimized” and that “all should have equal rights”.\(^\text{18}\) Values regarding power distance are accepted and understood up and down the entire societal hierarchy from those at the top with the most power and influence to the least powerful at the bottom and, in fact, when working with the power distance dimension it is important to remember that measured levels of inequality are endorsed by those who are followers as much as by those who are leaders occupying recognized positions of authority in the society.\(^\text{19}\) Inequality within groups is a fundamental condition of society and all societies have some degree of inequality; however, research using this dimension appears to illustrate and confirm that some societies are more unequal than others.\(^\text{20}\)

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in large power distance societies include the following:\(^\text{21}\):

- Power is a basic fact of society antedating good or evil; its legitimacy is irrelevant.

\(^\text{15}\) Hofstede’s own compilation of country scores on the various cultural dimensions, including countries not included as part of the original IBM survey, can be found in G. Hofstede & G.J. Hofstede, Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Revised and expanded 2nd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005). Country scores are also published on various websites, such as the website operated by ITIM consultants: www.geert-hofstede.com; however, Hofstede has made it clear that he is not responsible for the information presented on those websites. Hofstede has maintained his own website at www.geerthofstede.eu; however, it contains no country scores.


\(^\text{17}\) Id.

\(^\text{18}\) Id.

\(^\text{19}\) Id. at 45.


\(^\text{21}\) G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad”, Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 46 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to be seen in large power distance societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).
• Only a few people should be independent and most people should be dependent.
• Superiors consider subordinates to be a different kind of people and subordinates feel
the same way about superiors. Subordinates expect to be told what to do.
• Superiors are inaccessible and entitled to special privileges.
• The underdog is to blame, a belief that discourages subordinates from attempting to
disrupt the accepted social order.
• The way to initiate changes in the society is not to seek change of the social system
but to dethrone those who are in power within that system.
• For those who are in power other people should be seen as threats to their power and
should not be trusted.
• Parents teach children obedience and older people are both respected and feared.

Hofstede also suggested that large power distance societies tend to have autocratic
governments based on co-optation and changeable only by revolution; corruption is
common in large power distance societies and the accompanying scandals are typically
covered up; religion in large power distance societies is dominated by a hierarchy of
priests; and income distribution within large power distance societies is uneven.\textsuperscript{22}

On the other hand, some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be
seen in small power distance societies include the following\textsuperscript{23}:

• The existence and use of power must be legitimate and is to be judged using criteria
of good and evil.
• Superiors and subordinates alike consider each other to be “people like me”. Subordinates expect to be consulted.
• Superiors are accessible and attempt to look and act less powerful than they really
are. Hierarchy means inequality of roles, not people, and is established largely for
convenience and organizational efficiency.
• If there are problems within the society the system is to blame and changes can be
made in that system by redistributing power among the members of the society.
• Parents treat children as equals and older people are neither respected nor feared.

According to Hofstede, government in small power distance societies is generally
pluralistic based on majority votes and changes in government are accepted and carried
out peacefully in accordance with law; corruption is rare in small power distance
societies and when scandals do occur they generally ruin the careers of those involved;
religion in small power distance societies is less hierarchical and is based on the notion of

\textsuperscript{22} Id.
\textsuperscript{23} G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?”,
Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 46 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to
be seen in small power distance societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing
cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.),
Online Readings in Psychology and Culture. Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in
Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).
equality among believers; and income distribution within small power distance societies is relatively even.  

Hofstede found the highest power distance indexes in countries such as Malaysia, China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, the Philippines and Singapore; a number of Arab countries; and in Latin and South American countries such as Guatemala, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, while the countries with the smallest power distance indexes in his study were Australia, Denmark, Israel and New Zealand. Tang and Koveos later found that national wealth, measured by GDP per capita, had a curvilinear relationship with Hofstede’s power distance scores as well as with his individualism and long-term orientation scores.

§1:4 --Uncertainty avoidance

The uncertainty avoidance dimension appears in both the Hofstede model and the GLOBE model described below. For Hofstede, uncertainty avoidance indicates “the degree to which members in a society feel comfortable with ambiguous and uncertain situations, and take steps to avoid them.” Hofstede wrote that in many instances societies characterized as having “strong” uncertainty avoidance attempt to avoid these situations by implementing various coping mechanisms such as providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise. In this view, strong uncertainty avoidance societies need clarity and structure and there is an emotional need for rules even if the rules are sometimes ignored or disobeyed. However, some societies in which uncertainty avoidance is strong also evidence high levels of anxiety and aggression that causes people in those societies to have a strong urge to choose hard work as the preferred strategy for overcoming their fears. In contrast, in countries where uncertainty avoidance is low there tends to be more flexibility in jobs and roles, more job mobility and emphasis on general as opposed to specialized skills.

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in strong uncertainty avoidance societies include the following:

24 Id.
31 G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad”, Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 47 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to be seen in strong uncertainty avoidance societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede,
The uncertainty inherent in life is felt as a continuous threat that must be fought.
- Members of the society experience high levels of emotionality, anxiety and stress.
- Members of the society have a strong inner urge to work hard to dissipate excess nervous energy even though this tends to lead to issues of poor health and well-being.
- Aggressive behavior of self and other is accepted; however, conflict and competition within the society can unleash unwanted levels of aggression and should be avoided.
- There is a strong need for consensus and deviant persons and ideas are considered to be dangerous and will not be tolerated.
- There is a great concern with security in life and this means that members of the society will often stay in jobs that they dislike rather than dealing with the unknowns and uncertainties associated with changing jobs.
- There is a constant search for ultimate, absolute truths and value and these are reflected by the promulgation of extensive sets of written rules and regulations.
- If the rules and regulations cannot be followed the problem must be with those who violated the rules and they are considered to be “sinners” who must repent.
- Belief and often blind trust is placed in experts and their knowledge and ordinary citizens are considered to be incompetent compared with those in authority.

On the other hand, some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in weak uncertainty avoidance societies include the following:\(^{32}\):

- The uncertainty in life is accepted as normal and each day is taken as it comes without attempt to prescribe or force outcomes or events.
- Members of the society are more at ease, experience lower levels of stress and anxiety and a higher degree of self-control.
- Hard work, in and of itself, is not necessarily considered to be a virtue.
- Aggressive behavior is frowned upon; however, dissent is accepted and conflict and competition are tolerated when done fairly and used constructively.
- Deviant persons and ideas are not considered to be threats and are greeted with tolerance and respect.
- There is more willingness within society to take risks in life, such as changing jobs, and members of society are relatively comfortable with ambiguity and chaos.
- Teachers are not expected to have all of the answers and are allowed to say “I don’t know”.
- Relativism and empiricism are valued and the society seeks to function with as few rules and regulations—written or unwritten—as possible.

\(^{32}\) G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?”, Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 47 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to be seen in weak uncertainty avoidance societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).
If those rules and regulations that do exist are continuously violated or fail to have their desired or expected effect they should be eliminated or changed.

Belief is placed in generalists and common sense and those placed in authority are expected to serve the citizens of the society.

Hofstede found the highest uncertainty avoidance indexes in Eastern and Central European countries, German speaking countries, Latin countries and Japan, while the lowest uncertainty avoidance indexes in his study were found in English-speaking, Nordic and Chinese culture countries.  

An interesting characteristic with respect to this dimension in relations to the others in the Hofstede model was uncovered by Tang and Koveos, who found that while scoring for several of Hofstede’s dimensions—individualism, long-term orientation and power—was related to changes in economic conditions and had a curvilinear relationship with national wealth, as measured by GDP per capita, uncertainty avoidance was less likely to change over time since it mainly reflects relatively stable institutional traditions such as language, religion, climate, ethnic homogeneity and legal origin.

§1:5 --Individualism—collectivism

Hofstede measured the relative importance of individual versus group interests through his individualism-collectivism dimension. The term individualism implies a loosely knit social framework in which members of the group are expected to take care of themselves and their immediately families only. In contrast, collectivism represents the opposite extreme and assumes that there is a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups. Persons who are members of an in-group expect that the other members of that group will look out for them and, in exchange for this help and support, they commit to absolute loyalty to that group and its members.

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in strongly individualist societies include the following:

---

The identity of members of the society is based in the individual and there is emotional independence of individuals from the organizations and institutions that exist within the society (sometimes referred to as “I” consciousness).

The emphasis in society is on individual initiative and achievement and leadership, rather than organizational or institutional membership or affiliation, is the ideal.

Everybody in society has a right to their private lives and the right to hold and speak their own opinions. In the electoral context each person has their own vote and is expected to exercise it in accordance with their own beliefs.

Members of the society appreciate and pursue autonomy, variety, pleasure and individual financial security.

Transgression of norms leads to feelings of guilt.

The purpose of education is learning how to learn.

Belief is placed in individual decisions.

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in strongly collectivist societies include the following:

- The identity of the members of the society is based in the collective social system and there is emotional dependence of individuals on the organizations and institutions that exist within the society (sometimes referred to as “we” consciousness).
- The emphasis in society is on belonging to an organization or institution and membership, rather than leadership, within an organization or institution is the ideal.
- Organizations and clans have the right to invade the privacy of their members and appropriate and acceptable opinions are predetermined by those organizations and clans. In the electoral context votes are predetermined by the in-group and all members are expected to follow.
- Organizations and clans are the source of expertise, order, duty and security for their members.
- Transgression of norms leads to feelings of shame.
- The purpose of education is learning how to do.
- Belief is placed in group decisions.

Developed and Western countries tended to be more individualistic based on the scores generated by Hofstede, Japan fell into the middle of the pack on this dimension and less developed and Eastern countries could be found near the collectivist pole.

§1:6 --Masculinity—femininity

Hofstede’s masculinity-femininity dimension is related to the division of emotional roles between men and women within a society and the balance struck between ego and social

---

37 G. G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?”, Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 48 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to be seen in strongly collectivist societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).
values by a society. Hofstede’s measurements on this dimension focus primarily on the extent to which the dominant values in a society are “masculine,” which he describes as assertiveness; the desire to acquire money and things; and a lack of care for others, the quality of life or people. He explains that these values are referred to as masculine because within nearly all of the countries included in the survey men scored higher in terms of the positive sense of these values as opposed to their negative sense. Values described as “feminine,” even though they could be held and practiced by members of both genders, include modesty and caring. The country scores on this dimension reflect the strength of emotional and social role differentiation between the genders—maximum differentiation in the most masculine societies and minimum differentiation in the most feminine societies. In the countries nearest the feminine pole on this dimension both women and men tended to have similar modest and caring values while in countries nearest the masculine pole women were somewhat more assertive and competitive than women in feminine countries but noticeably less so than the men in their countries (i.e., a larger gap between the genders with respect to these cultural values). It is not surprising that the issues surrounding this dimension are generally quite sensitive and, in fact, Hofstede noted that there was often a taboo about this dimension in masculine societies that inhibited free discussion in those societies regarding feelings about the underlying values and beliefs.

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in strongly masculine societies include the following:

- The roles of the sexes within the society are clearly differentiated—men should be assertive and ambitious while women should be nurturing, modest and caring.
- Men should be dominant in the society, make the decision regarding size of families and occupy most of the elected political positions.
- Performance is what counts and money and things are important and are to be pursued. Work prevails over family.
- The drive for work and success is fueled by ambition and those who are strong and achieve success are admired and praised.
- Girls cry, boys don’t; boys should fight back while girls should not fight.

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in strongly feminine societies include the following:

---

40 G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?”, Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 49 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to be seen in strongly masculine societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).
- The roles of the sexes within the society are more fluid and men do not need to be assertive and can actually assume nurturing roles.
- There should be equality between the sexes in the society and many women should be elected to political positions.
- Quality of life, as well as people and the environment, are important and there should be a balance between family and work.
- Motivation is provided by the desire to be of service.
- Both boys and girls may cry and neither should fight.
- Sympathy should be shown to those who are weak.

Hofstede explained that the dominant values in masculine societies stress assertiveness and “being tough”, striving for the acquisition of money and material objects and a lack of caring for others or the overall quality of life of people in the society. In contrast, the dominant values in feminine societies include warm social relationships, respect and care for the quality of life of all people and care for the weaker members of the society. While the labeling of the dimension has caused the confusion and debate noted above Hofstede’s intent was that when a value was identified as “dominant” in a society it was likely to be subscribed to by both sexes regardless of what the value itself was characterized as masculine or feminine.

The highest masculinity scores were found in Japan, in German-speaking countries and in some Latin countries such as Italy and Mexico; moderately high masculinity was found in English-speaking Western countries; moderately low masculinity was found in certain other Latin countries such as France, Spain and Portugal and in some Asian countries such as Korea and Thailand; and low masculinity was found among the Nordic countries and in the Netherlands.

One of the most controversial elements of the masculinity–femininity dimension has been Hofstede’s claim that while societal expectations regarding the actions and attributes of women—modesty and tenderness—remain constant regardless of the strength or weakness of masculinity in the society there are real differences in the expectations regarding male behavior depending on the level of masculinity—men in strongly masculine societies men are expected to be assertive and tough while men in strongly feminine societies are expected to join women in being modest and tender. As a result, according to Hofstede, the stereotype of the attributes of the ideal leader will vary between masculine and feminine societies—in strongly masculine societies conditions for being an effective leader include decisiveness, assertiveness and aggressiveness (sometimes referred to as “machismo style” management) while the most admired leaders

---

41 G. Hofstede, “Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?,” Organization Dynamics, 9 (1980), 42-63, 49 (which includes a more extensive list of beliefs most likely to be seen in strongly feminine societies). See also the list appearing in G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture. Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).
in feminine societies are those who seek consensus, act intuitively and cooperatively and maintain a low profile (i.e., less visibility).\textsuperscript{42}

Researchers in the US and in other foreign countries have identified various leadership attributes thought to be necessary for effective and successful management including leadership ability, self-confidence, ambition, assertiveness and forcefulness and have noted that gender stereotypes in those countries have traditionally associated those attributes with men more so than women.\textsuperscript{43} Obviously these attributes correspond to the characteristics that Hofstede has associated with masculinity; however, it is by no means a settled issue that these attributes are only found among men and it is not difficult to find leaders from both genders who naturally incorporate these attributes into their management styles. In addition, one study involving two countries that differed substantially with respect to masculinity—the US and Denmark—found that participants in both countries rated feminine leaders as more collegial and effective, a finding that was at odds with the expectation that the participants would give higher marks with respect to collegiality and effectiveness to the leaders that most closely fit their national culture profile (i.e., participants from a masculine society would rate male leaders as more collegial and effective).

\textbf{§1:7 --Long-term orientation}

Hofstede’s long-term orientation dimension is related to the time frame associated with the choices that are made by individuals in the society with respect to the focus of their efforts: the future or the present and past. Hofstede explained that long-term orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented toward future rewards, particularly perseverance and thrift, while short-term orientation emphasizes virtues related to the past and present such as tradition, preservation of “face” and fulfillment of “social obligations”.\textsuperscript{44} Simply put, in long-term oriented societies the most important events in life are expected to occur in the future while in short-term oriented societies the most important events have either already occurred in the past or are taking place at the present moment.\textsuperscript{45} While many have attempted to tie long-term orientation to Confucianism (in

\textsuperscript{42} G. Hofstede, Culture’s Consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2d ed.) (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 2001). See also H. Triandis, “Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism”, In U. Kim, J. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi and G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994), 41-51 (noting that achievement motivation and an acceptance of “machismo style” management should be more accepted in strongly masculine countries than in less masculine countries).

\textsuperscript{43} V. Schein, “A global look at psychological barriers to women’s progress in management,” Journal of Social Issues, 57 (2001), 675-688. The countries studied included China, Germany, Great Britain, Japan and the US.

\textsuperscript{44} G. Hofstede, Culture’s Consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2d ed.) (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 2001), 359.

\textsuperscript{45} The belief that the most important events have already occurred in the past explains the respect for traditions in short-term oriented societies since traditions act as principles of truth and understanding that can be used as reliable guides for decision regarding present actions and planning for the future (since the future will simply repeat what has already happened in the past and everything that can possibly happen has already occurred in the past). In contrast, long-term oriented societies expect that new events will occur in
fact, it was originally referred to as “Confucian dynamism”), Hofstede asserts that this is not correct and that the teachings and writings of Confucius contain both past- and future-oriented maxims. Hofstede also argues that this dimension has empirically supported explanatory value in all societies and not just in Asian countries where Confucian principles have been widely studied and followed.\textsuperscript{46}

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in long-term oriented societies include the following\textsuperscript{47}:

- Need gratification is deferred until a future date and members of society expect and accept that results will be slow in coming.
- Members of society are respected for their willingness to subordinate their immediate personal needs and desires for a purpose.
- Relationships are ordered by status and the ordering is dutifully observed; however, social demands and status pressures are limited.
- The definition of good and evil is fluid and depends upon the specific circumstances.
- Traditions can and should be adapted to changing circumstances and personal adaptability is considered to be important.
- Problem solving is conducted in a structured and mathematical fashion.
- Business strategies and actions focus on future market position and long-term relationships.

Some of the other beliefs that Hofstede suggested are most likely to be seen in short-term oriented societies include the following\textsuperscript{48}:

- Immediate need gratification is expected and pursued.
- Status is not considered to be a major issue in relationships; however, members of society tend to focus on social and status obligations at any cost.
- Universal guidelines exist that can be used to determine what is good and what is evil.
- Traditions are sacrosanct and should not be changed or adapted regardless of circumstances.
- Personal steadfastness and stability are considered to be important.

the future and that the future will bring improvements and progress that will upset societal traditions and require that members of society adapt to changing conditions.

\textsuperscript{46} G. Hofstede, “Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context”, In W.J. Lonner, D.L. Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2: Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Psychology and Culture (Bellingham, WA: Center for Cross Cultural Research, 2006).

\textsuperscript{47} Id. See also D. Workman, “Long-Term Orientation Countries Encourage Large Savings,” http://internationalbusiness.suite101.com/article.cfm/trade_culture_time_horizons [accessed June 25, 2010].

• Problem solving methods are unstructured and there is pressure to resolve problems as soon as possible.
• Business strategies and actions focus on short-term profits and quick results.

Hofstede found the highest long term orientation indexes in East Asian countries such as China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan and South Korea and short-term orientation was often found in Africa and the Islamic countries. Most Western countries were categorized as having medium-term orientation although it should be noted that the US and Great Britain were relatively closer to the short-term pole.

§1:8 Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner

In 1998 Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner defined a set of cultural dimensions using an extensive database with over 30,000 survey results collected during the course of multiple studies over several years involving questionnaires sent to thousands of managers from Shell and other companies in 28 countries. In general, respondents were given dilemmas or contrasting tendencies and were asked to respond to basic questions that the researchers believed would provide insights into basic cultural attitudes and values. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner identified seven dimensions, which they referred to as the “Seven Dimensions of Culture” model, which they believed explained distinctions between national cultures and which are described in the following sections. Five dimensions pertained to ways in which the members of a society relate to one another (i.e., universalism/particularism, individualism/collectivism, achievement/ascription, neutral/affective and specific/diffuse); one dimension, appropriately referred to as “internal/external”, addressed how societal members relate to their environment and the last dimension addressed various aspects of time orientation.

Notice should be taken of the fact that Hofstede criticized the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner model by arguing first that their dimensions were borrowed from the work of others, rather than original, and then going on to assert that an analysis of their empirical data did not support seven dimensions and that at best the country scores they suggested correlated with Hofstede’s individualism dimension. This led Hofstede to


50 Hofstede argued that the first five cultural dimensions posited by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, based on “values”, were borrowed from Parsons and Shils and that the remaining two dimensions, based on “relationships”, had their roots in the prior work of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck. See T. Parsons and E. Shils, Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1951); and F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtbeck, Variations in Value Orientations (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1961). See also the discussion of the theories of Parsons and Shils and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck in the chapter on “Cross-Cultural Studies” in this Library.

conclude that there was a lack of empirical support for the claims of seven cultural dimensions made by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner.\textsuperscript{52}

\section{Universalism/particularism}

Universalism/particularism distinguishes societies based on the relative importance they place on formal and standardized rules and laws as opposed to personal relationships. The basic question is: “What is more important: rules or relationships?” Members of universalistic societies focus more on formal rules, codes, values and standards and believe that they take precedence over the needs and claims of friends and other personal relationships; believe that rules or laws can be applied to everyone and should be used to determine what is right; use precisely defined agreements and contracts as the basis for conducting business; tend to define global standards for company policies and human resources practices; and believe that agreements and contracts should not be changed. Members of more particularistic, sometimes referred to as pluralist, societies focus more on human friendships and personal relationships than on formal rules and laws; place emphasis on friendships and look at the situation to determine what is right or ethically acceptable; believe that deals are made based on friendships and that contracts can be adapted to satisfy new requirements in specific situations; and permit local variations of company and human resources policies to adapt to different requirements. In summary, particularistic societies allow for rules to be tempered, and exceptions made, based on the nature of the situation and the people involved. Austria, Germany, Switzerland and the US would be examples of strongly universalistic societies while China, Indonesia, Korea, Russia and Venezuela would be examples of strongly particularistic societies.

\section{Individualism/collectivism}

Individualism/collectivism (communitarianism) distinguishes societies based on the relative weight given to individual versus group interests. The basic question is: “Do we function as a group or as individuals?” In individualist societies members derive their identity from within themselves and place the individual before the group or community and one finds frequent use of the term “I”; “on the spot” decisions made by representatives of the organization; people ideally achieve alone and assume personal responsibility; and vacations are taken in pairs or even alone rather than as part of a group. Individual happiness, achievement, independence, fulfillment and welfare are the most important in individualist societies and members are expected to take care of themselves first. In contrast, in collectivist societies members place the group or community before the individual and collectivist, sometimes called communitarian, societies are characterized by frequent use of the term “we”; decisions are referred back

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
to the organization by the representatives; people ideally achieve objectives in groups and assume joint responsibility; and vacations are taken in organized groups or with extended family. Members of a collectivist society are expected to act in ways that serve the best interests of the society and by doing so their individual needs will also be served. Group achievement and welfare is the primary focus in collectivist societies. The US would be an example of a strongly individualistic society and individualism was also found to be strong in Argentina, Nigeria and Mexico. On the other hand, Japan, Singapore and Thailand would be examples of strongly collectivist societies.

§1:11 --Achievement/ascription

Achievement/ascription distinguishes societies on the basis of how they distribute status, respect and authority and is quite similar to the power distance dimension in other models. The basic question is: do we have to prove ourselves to receive status or is it given (ascribed) to us based on inheritance or other factors unrelated to achievement?” In achievement-oriented societies status is based on what members have accomplished or “earned” and characteristics of such societies include the following: use of titles only when relevant to the competence brought to the task; respect for superiors in the hierarchy is based on previous achievements, demonstrated adequacy of their knowledge and good performance of their jobs; and companies where most senior managers are of varying ages and genders and have obtained their positions through accomplishments rather than just seniority. In contrast, ascription-oriented societies ascribes status based upon social, position, age, gender, wealth and similar factors and is characterized by extensive use of titles, especially when these clarify status in the organization; respect for superiors in the hierarchy; and companies where most senior managers are male, middle-age and promoted based on primarily on seniority. Austria, Switzerland and the US would be examples of strongly achievement-oriented societies while China, Egypt, Hungary, Indonesia, Hungary and Russia would be examples of strongly ascription-oriented societies.

§1:12 --Neutral/affective

Neutral/affective distinguishes societies based on how they view the display of emotions by their members. The basic question is: “Are we free to display our emotions?” Neutral societies are characterized by not overtly revealing what one is thinking or feeling; only accidental revelation of tension in face and posture; hidden emotions that may occasionally explode out; cool and self-possessed conduct and control over feelings; lack of physical contact, gesturing or strong facial expressions; and monotone oral delivery of written materials. In contrast, affective societies are characterized by nonverbal and verbal display of thoughts and feelings; transparency and expressiveness in release of tensions; easy flow of emotions sometimes effusively, vehemently and without inhibition; the admiration and display of heated, vital, animated expressions; and fluent and dramatic delivery of statements. In fact, emotional expressions are accepted and encouraged in affective societies. Great Britain, Japan and Singapore would be examples of strongly neutral societies while Brazil, Italy and Mexico would be examples of strongly affective societies.
§1:13  --Specific/diffuse

Specific/diffuse distinguishes societies based on how their members engage colleagues in specific or multiple areas of their lives (i.e., the extent to which societal members keep their personal and working lives separate). The basic question is: “How far do we get involved?” Members of more specific-oriented societies tend to clearly separate their personal and working lives—keep them “compartmentalized”—and have a completely different relation of authority in each social group. This follows from the fact that members of specific-oriented societies tend to first analyze all elements of their lives individually before putting them together and thus it is not surprising that only a single component of a member’s personal life can be entered at any one time and that interactions between members are well-defined. In diffuse-oriented societies members see the individual elements of their lives as interrelated and integrated and thus there is no clear distinction between personal lives and work and the hierarchy of authority at work can reflect into social areas outside of work hours. Canada, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden and the US would be examples of highly specific societies while China, Japan, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela would be examples of highly diffuse societies.

§1:14  --Internal/external

Internal/external (sometimes referred to as inner-directed/outer-directed) distinguishes societies on the degree to which members believe they can exert control over their environment as opposed to believing that their environment controls them. The basic question is “Do we control our environment or work with it?” In an internal, or inner-directed, society, members have a mechanistic view of nature and while they believe that nature is complex it can be controlled by people who make the effort and have the appropriate expertise. In an external, or outer-directed, society members have an organic view of nature and rather than trying to control nature the preferred approach for members is to learn how to live in harmony with nature and adapt themselves to external circumstances. Not surprisingly, members of internal societies have more dominating attitudes and are uncomfortable with change while members of external societies are more flexible and comfortable with change and more willing to compromise in order to achieve harmony. Australia, Great Britain and the US would be examples of internal, or inner-directed, societies while China, Egypt, India, Korea and Sweden would be examples of external, or outer-directed, societies.

§1:15  --Time orientation

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner suggested two ways that cultures responded to time. The first distinction was between sequential and synchronic societies and was based on whether members prefer to do one thing at a time or work on several things at the same time. The basic question is: Do we do things one at a time or several things at once?” Members of sequential societies prefer to do one activity at a time and follow plans and schedules strictly. In contrast, members of synchronic societies see time as flexible and intangible and are comfortable doing several activities in parallel, loosely following
schedules and agendas and selecting current activities based on the priorities among all of the individual activities that are in the queue.

The second issue with respect to time focused on distinctions between societies with respect to the importance they assigned to the past, present and future. Past-oriented societies view the future as a repetition of past events and experiences and are characterized by talk about history, origin of family, business and nation; motivation to recreate a golden age; respect shown for ancestors, predecessors and older people; and everything is viewed in the context of tradition or history. Present-oriented societies do not assign much weight to either the past or future and are characterized by a sharp focus on current activities and enjoyments as being the most important; good planning and poor execution; intense interest in present relationships, focus on here and now; and assessment of everything in terms of its contemporary impact and style. Future-oriented societies are focused on future prospects and do not see the past as being terribly significant in determining what is to come and are characterized by much talk of prospects, potentials, aspirations, future achievements; enthusiasm for planning and strategizing; great interest in the youthful and future potentials; and use and exploitation of the present and past for future advantage. Arab countries, France, Portugal and Spain would be examples of past/present oriented societies while China, Japan, Korea, Sweden and the US would be examples of future oriented societies.

§1:16 Schwartz

It has also been suggested that cultural dimensions, dimensions that can be used to differentiate societies from one another, are a series of basic questions or problems that individuals in each society must address and resolve during the course of their activities and that individuals rely on their cultural value orientations to assist them in distinguishing and resolving problems and issues and motivating other members of the society with respect to coping with those same problems and issues. Shalom Schwartz was particularly intrigued by the role of values in culture and, in fact, his guiding definition of culture was that it was a rich complex of meanings, beliefs, practices, symbols, norms and values. Schwartz argued that those values that could be identified as prevalent among the members of a society expressed the “cultural ideals” of the society—all that was considered good and desirable by the members of the society—and that these ideals defined the central traits of the societal culture. In turn, these core elements of societal culture shape and justify individual and group beliefs, actions, and goals within the society and the institutional arrangements and policies, norms and daily practices of a society express its underlying cultural value emphases.

54 Id.
55 Id. Schwartz explained by noting that “. . . a cultural value emphasis on success and ambition may be reflected in and promote highly competitive economic systems, confrontational legal systems, and child-rearing practices that pressure children to achieve. A cultural emphasis on success and ambition may also justify the prevalence of symbols of status (e.g., a Porsche) and of norms that encourage assertiveness (e.g., Don’t stop ’til you reach the top!).”
Schwartz began by identifying a number of distinct universal human values that he believed reflected needs, social motives and social institutional demands and could be found in all cultures:

- **Power**: Social status and prestige, dominance or control over people and resources.
- **Achievement**: Demonstrating competence according to social standards.
- **Hedonism**: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
- **Stimulation**: Challenge, excitement and novelty in life.
- **Self-direction**: Independent thought and action.
- **Universalism**: Being broadminded and having an appreciation, understanding, and tolerance for the welfare of all people and for nature.
- **Benevolence**: Preserving and enhancing the welfare of all people with whom one is frequently in contact.
- **Tradition**: Commitment, respect and acceptance of the ideas and customs that traditional culture and religion provide.
- **Conformity**: Restraining actions or impulses that would likely upset or harm others and violate social expectations.
- **Security**: Harmony, stability and safety of society, relationships and self.

Schwartz, like Hofstede, then suggested that individual and cultural levels of analysis are conceptually independent—individual-level dimensions come into play as individuals act on their values in day-to-day life while dimensions at the cultural level are a function of the responses that societies take in order to solve problems that they must confront. Schwartz suggested three main problems that societies are universally challenged to address and resolve and corresponding cultural dimensions that can be used to describe alternative methods for resolving these problems that distinguish societies from one another: to what extent are individuals autonomous or dependent upon (integrated into) the groups to which they belong (conservatism versus autonomy); to what extent equality is valued and expected and personal responsibility is guaranteed in order to preserve the

---


social order (hierarchy versus egalitarianism); and to what extent do members of the society seek to change their relationship with nature and the social world in order to advance personal or group interests (mastery versus harmony).  

§1:17 --Conservatism/autonomy

The first of Schwartz’s dimensions, which he has actually referred to as autonomy versus embeddedness, deals with the nature of the relation or the boundaries between the person and the group and asks to what extent are people autonomous versus embedded in their groups. Schwartz explained that embeddedness (conservatism) appears in situations where individuals are embedded in a collectivity (group) and find meaning through social relationships, through identifying with the group, participating in its shared way of life, and striving toward its shared goals. In conservative societies personal interests are not seen as different from those of the group and high value is placed on preserving the status quo and avoiding individual actions or attitudes that might undermine the traditional order of things. Important values in such societies are social order, respect for tradition, security, obedience, and wisdom. In conservative societies groups tend to take responsibility for their members in all domains of life and in exchange, loyalty and identification are expected. In turn, autonomy refers to the situation where individuals are viewed as autonomous, bounded entities that are expected to cultivate and express their own preferences, feelings, ideas, and abilities, and find meaning in their own uniqueness. Autonomy is further broken down into two categories or types: intellectual autonomy, which refers to the independent pursuit of ideas, intellectual directions and rights (e.g., creative work and curiosity); and affective autonomy, which refers to the independent pursuit of “affectively positive experiences” such as varied life, pleasure and enjoyment of life. Schwartz’s research identified Bulgaria, Israel and Malaysia as examples of conservative societies while autonomy was dominant in societies such as France, Germany and Switzerland.

§1:18 --Hierarchy/egalitarianism

Schwartz’s next cultural dimension addresses the societal problem of guaranteeing responsible behavior by members of the society that will support preservation of the social fabric of the society. Schwartz argues that members of the society must be

---


motivated to consider the welfare of other members and coordinate their activities with those of other members in order to efficiently manage the inevitable interdependencies among them. In hierarchical societies individuals and the resources associated with society (e.g., social power, wealth, authority and influence) are organized hierarchically and individuals within those societies are socialized to comply with the roles assigned to them in the hierarchy and subjected to sanctions if they fail to comply. In hierarchical societies ascribed roles are used to insure responsible behavior and unequal distribution of power, roles, and resources is accepted as legitimate and taken for granted by members of the society who willingly comply with the obligations and rules attached to their roles. Values like social power, authority, humility and wealth are highly important in hierarchical societies. Modesty and self-control are values also associated with hierarchy, a finding consistent with the underlying assumption that individuals must accept their hierarchical roles and the distribution of resources and the need for conformity with laws and rules. In turn, in egalitarian societies individuals are seen as moral equals and everyone shares the same basic interests as human beings. In egalitarian societies people are socialized to internalize a commitment to cooperate and to feel concern for everyone’s welfare. Values associated with egalitarian societies include social justice and caring for the weaker members of the society, honesty, equality, sympathy and working for the good of others, social responsibility and voluntary cooperation in the pursuit of well-being or prosperity for others within the society. Schwartz’s research identified China, Thailand and Turkey as examples of hierarchical societies while egalitarianism was dominant in societies such as Australia, Hungary, Italy, Portugal and Spain.\(^61\)

§1:19 --Mastery/harmony

Schwartz’s third cultural dimension incorporates ideas about how societies cope with problem of regulating how their members manage their relations to the natural and social world. Mastery refers to the situation where individuals value succeeding and getting ahead through “self-assertion” and proactively seek to master, direct and change the natural and social world to advance their personal interests and/or the interests of the groups to which they belong. Specific values associated with mastery include independence (self-reliance and personal choice of individual aims and intentions), fearlessness and daring (risk-taking), ambition and hard work, drive for success and competence. In turn, harmony refers to the situation where individuals are content to accept and fit into the natural and social world as they find it and seek to understand, preserve and protect it rather than change, direct or exploit it. Important values in societies where harmony is valued include world at peace, unity with nature, and protecting the environment. Values related to harmony are not opposed to individual autonomy but rather are concerned with resisting attempts to change the natural order through self-enhancement and the exploitation of individuals and/or resources. Schwartz’s research identified Brazil, Hong Kong, Israel, Spain, Switzerland and the US.

as examples of mastery societies while harmony was dominant in societies such as Finland, France, Italy and Mexico.\textsuperscript{62}

\section*{§1:20 --Cultural dimensions as an integrated system}

One of the interesting observations that Schwartz made about his proposed model of cultural dimensions, which would presumably be applicable to other models, is that while the various dimensional poles are identified and described separately there are also indications of compatibility among them. Schwartz explained that because certain polar types, which he referred to as cultural “orientations”, shared the same underlying assumptions and values it could be expected that those orientations would simultaneously appear in the cultural profile of a society. For example, in societies where the widespread and accepted assumption is that people can and should take individual responsibility for their actions and make decisions based on their own personal understanding of situations it can be expected that both egalitarianism and intellectual autonomy, which share that assumption, will be among the cultural orientation for those societies and, in fact, Schwartz ultimately found this to be the case among societies in Western Europe. Similarly, embeddedness and hierarchy could be expected to appear simultaneously in societies, such as those in Southeast Asia, where it is assumed that a person’s roles in and obligations to collectivities are more important than that person’s unique ideas and aspirations.\textsuperscript{63} Schwartz concluded that rather than conceptualizing cultural dimensions as independent, which he claimed was the way that Hofstede approached the process, the more appropriate and accurate view was that cultural dimensions formed an integrated system and that the shared and opposing assumptions that were inherent in the various cultural orientations yielded a coherent circular structure of relations among them that could be depicted in a circle—reproduced below—in which compatible cultural orientations were adjacent to one another and incompatible orientations were placed distant from one another around the circle.\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{62} Id.


\textsuperscript{64} One example of interpreting the chart is to note that in societies where hierarchy is preferred the predominant values in those societies are also likely to support a preference for conservatism while egalitarianism is not only opposite to hierarchy but is also likely to be apparent in societies where harmony is preferred over mastery.
§1:21 --Analysis and assessment

The values that eventually were associated with Schwartz’s cultural orientations were first derived from a survey of the literature that yielded an extensive list of 56 or 57 single value items (e.g., social justice, humility, creativity, social order, pleasure, ambition etc.) from which he formulated the seven cultural value orientations and relations among them. Schwartz then proceeded to analyze and test the validity of those orientations and relations through the collection of data from 1988 to 2000 from samples of elementary school teachers and college students in more than 50 countries.\textsuperscript{65} The

\textsuperscript{65} According to Schwartz, participants were 80 samples of school teachers (K-12) from 58 national groups and 115 samples of college students from 64 national groups, together constituting 67 nations and 70 different cultural groups. Samples taken in ethnically heterogeneous nations came from the dominant, majority group; however, separate samples were also drawn of French and English Canadians, Israeli Arabs and Jews and black and white South Africans. In most cases, 180 to 280 respondents were included in a sample group. S. Schwartz, “Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World”, in H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004).
survey that he used included questions for each respondent, in their native language, regarding the importance of each of the values to them as “a guiding principle in MY life”. While all of the originally identified value items were included in the surveys Schwartz was mindful of the possibility that the meaning of some of the values might differ across cultures and thus it would not be appropriate to use those values for cross-cultural comparison and separate multidimensional scaling analysis of the value items led him to identify 45 of the items that did have reasonably equivalent meanings across all of the societies in the survey and only these items were used in the analyses that Schwartz conducted in order to validate his proposed cultural dimensions. Schwartz specified in advance sets of three to eight value items that he expected to indicate an emphasis on each of the seven cultural dimensions that he was analyzing.66

Schwartz generated scores on each of his cultural value orientations for all 67 of the national groups identified and included in his survey work and then analyzed those scores to determine whether they provided for support for the existence of “culturally distinct world regions”. He concluded that, with few exceptions, spatial mapping of the national groups based on their scores on the various cultural value orientations revealed seven transnational cultural groupings that he named West European, East European, English-speaking, Latin American, South Asian, Confucian-influenced and sub-Saharan African. He noted the relation of these groupings to geographical proximity and conceded the probable influence of diffusion of values, norms, practices and institutions across national borders and the role of shared histories, religion and level development.67 He also suggested that his findings were strikingly similar to the groupings found or suggested by Hofstede and others and that, in fact, this finding alone was particularly noteworthy given that the scholars admittedly used different methods of measuring culture, different sampling techniques and conducted their work and gathered their data in periods that extended from the late 1960s to the early 21st century.68 Schwartz summarized his

---


67 Schwartz noted that social and historical analyses of specific nations and transnational regions would be needed in order to augment the quantitative cultural profiles and more fully explain the composition and distinctiveness of the transnational cultural groups. See, e.g., S. Schwartz and M. Ros, “Values in the West: A theoretical and empirical challenge to the Individualism-Collectivism cultural dimension”, World Psychology, 1 (1995), 99-122; and S. Schwartz and A. Bardi, “Influences of adaptation to communist rule on value priorities in Eastern Europe”, Political Psychology, 18 (1997), 385-410.

findings regarding the cultural orientations that characterize each of these transnational cultural groupings as follows:

- **West European culture** emphasized egalitarianism, autonomy and harmony more than any other region and national groups in that grouping tended to score very low on hierarchy, mastery and embeddedness. Schwartz asserted that “[t]his is the appropriate cultural profile for a region of democratic, welfare states where concern for the environment is especially high”.

- The **culture of the English-speaking grouping**, including the US, was especially high in mastery compared with the rest of the world and average in intellectual autonomy and egalitarianism. Schwartz noted that “[t]his profile points to a cultural orientation that encourages an assertive, pragmatic, entrepreneurial, and even exploitative orientation to the social and natural environment.” While this group was particularly homogenous it was interesting to note that US samples emphasized mastery even more and autonomy and egalitarianism even less than the other (non-US) samples from the group.

- The **Confucian-influenced group** exhibited what Schwartz referred to as a “pragmatic, entrepreneurial orientation” along with heavy emphases on hierarchy and embeddedness and a rejection of egalitarianism. The area of largest difference within the group was intellectual autonomy.

- The culture in the **sub-Saharan African group** emphasized mastery rather than harmony and also emphasized embeddedness. Schwartz argued that the preference for mastery was an indication of what he referred to as “the current struggle to overcome poverty in these nations” that was pushing members of this group toward change that often included exploitation of the environment. The emphasis on embeddedness was consistent with conclusion of anthropological studies in this area that identified the strong need for social relationships, protection of group solidarity and traditional order.

- The **culture in the South Asian group** strongly emphasized hierarchy and embeddedness, a finding that Schwartz explained “. . . points to an emphasis on fulfilling one’s obligations in a hierarchical system—obeying expectations from those in roles of greater status or authority and expecting humility and obedience from those in inferior roles.” Variations within the group typically occurred with respect to mastery and harmony.

- The **culture in the East European group** was notable for the emphasis on harmony and de-emphasis of mastery, a situation that Schwartz attributed to the impact of having to

---

69 Schwartz believed that the cultural profile of the Confucian-influenced group was consistent with prior analyses of Confucian culture. See, e.g., M. Bond, “Chinese values”, in M. Bond (Ed.), Handbook of Chinese psychology (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1996).

adapt to live under totalitarian communist regimes (i.e., avoiding trouble and refraining from embarking on change initiatives). \(^{71}\)

- The culture in the Latin American group was average on all three dimensions and the largest differences within the group were associated with mastery and harmony.

Schwartz offered a cautionary note regarding excessive reliance on the transnational cultural groups and ideas for further research. Specifically, he noted what each of the groups were quite homogenous and distinctive on at least three or four of his seven cultural orientations there was also consideration “within group” variation on one or two orientations and he thus cautioned that “whether regions can be used as a unit of analysis is therefore a matter of which orientations are of interest”. Schwartz suggested that it would be appropriate to conduct further studies on the degree of cultural homogeneity within each group and the extent to which it differs from others. In addition, the long-term utility of these types of cultural groups as analytical tools depends on a fuller understanding of the cultural orientations that characterize each of the groups and this would require additional exploration of the different models of cultural orientations to understand what the meaning of each cultural value dimension.

Schwartz and his colleagues tested the validity of his dimensions in various surveys involving respondents from multiple national cultures. For example, they found that highly individualistic societies, such as the US and many countries in Western Europe, were characterized by autonomy, egalitarianism, low power distance, harmony and femininity and that collectivist societies that relied on authority and rules tended to be characterized by hierarchy, power distance, mastery and masculinity. They also found differences within Western Europe based on language and differences between the English-speaking regions of Western Europe and the US. Specifically, English-speaking societies in general were characterized by high mastery and moderate levels of intellectual autonomy and egalitarianism and the preference for mastery in relation to autonomy and egalitarianism was even more pronounced in the US than in the other English-speaking societies included in the survey. \(^{72}\) Another interesting finding was that striking differences between the cultures of Western Europe and US called into question the traditional view that all of “Western” culture was individualistic. Comparison of Western Europe and US samples uncovered large and significant differences on six of the seven cultural orientations—egalitarianism, intellectual autonomy and harmony were higher in Western Europe while the US scored higher on mastery, hierarchy and embeddedness. The emphasis on egalitarianism and harmony and de-emphasis on mastery in the Western Europe cultural profile is clearly inconsistent with traditional notions of the meaning of individualism. The US, with its emphasis on affective

---

\(^{71}\) Schwartz and his colleagues undertook extensive additional research on various aspects of culture in East-Central Europe. See, e.g., S. Schwartz and A. Bardi, “Influences of adaptation to communist rule on value priorities in Eastern Europe”, Political Psychology, 18 (1997), 385-410; and A. Bardi and S. Schwartz, “Relations among socio-political values in Eastern Europe: Effects of the communist experience?”, Political Psychology, 17 (1996), 525-549. Schwartz predicted that cultural orientations within this group should be expected to change in the years to come as indigenous modes of social organization reemerge following the end of the Cold War.

autonomy and mastery at the expense of harmony, does appear to fit the generally accepted mold of individualism; however, all is not that simple given that the US scores on hierarchy and embeddedness, which are associated with collectivism, are higher than the scores on those dimensions in the Western Europe group.73

Hofstede has argued that the Schwartz model adds little beyond Hofstede’s dimensions since Hofstede’s analysis of Schwartz’s results uncovered significant correlation with Hofstede’s scores for individualism, masculinity and uncertainty avoidance.74 In response, Schwartz undertook a comparison of conceptual similarities between his dimensions and certain of the dimensions proposed by Hofstede and also analyzed and reported on empirical associations between the two sets of dimensions.75 For example, Schwartz noted some degree of conceptual overlap between his embeddedness/autonomy dimension and Hofstede’s well-known individualism/collectivism dimension given that both dimensions focus on the relationships between individuals and collectives in the society and both contrast an autonomous view of people with an interdependent view of people. However, Schwartz also pointed out what he believed to be several important differences—embeddedness/autonomy contrasts openness to change with maintaining the status quo while Hofstede’s dimension does not and while many theorists have associated individualism with self-interested pursuit of personal goals76 Schwartz’s autonomy dimension does not include that sort of selfish behavior by individuals as a characteristic since it would impede the overriding societal objective of ensuring that families and societal institutions run smoothly.77 Schwartz also conceded some degree of conceptual overlap between his hierarchy/egalitarianism dimension and Hofstede’s power distance dimension at least to the extent that both dimensions were concerned with “legitimizing”

75 The comparisons were done based on 57 nations or groups for which scores were available both from Hofstede (i.e., either in his original IBM data, in his re-analysis of national subcultures or in his estimates for nations not in the IBM set) and from Schwartz’s own work. S. Schwartz, “Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World”, in H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004). See also L. Sagiv and S. Schwartz, “National cultures: Implications for organizational structure and behavior”, in N. Ashkanasy, C. Wilderom and M.F. Peterson (Eds.), The Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 2000), 417-436.
77 Schwartz calculated correlations between the scores of nations on Hofstede’s individualism dimension and Schwartz’s own embeddedness, affective autonomy and intellectual autonomy dimensions and found that while there appeared to be considerable empirical overlap between individualism/collectivism and embeddedness/autonomy there was a large percentage of cross-national variance that was not shared leading to significant differences in national rankings. For example, while it is well-known that the US stood first among nations on Hofstede’s individualism dimension it came in at 30th on the autonomy/embeddedness dimension just three places higher than Venezuela which had ranked last among the 57 nations with respect to individualism. S. Schwartz, “Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World”, in H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004).
inequalities within societies. However, Schwartz argued that power distance referred to the acceptance of inequality by less powerful people and their fear of authority and that this was very different from the issue he was attempting to address with his hierarchy/egalitarianism dimension, namely assuring responsible, cooperative behavior among members of society in order to ensure that necessary societal tasks will get done. For Schwartz, the use of hierarchical structures with ascribed roles was not intended to create fear in the hearts of ordinary people. Schwartz also noted that certain key elements of egalitarianism (i.e., the moral equality of individuals, their capacity to internalize commitments to the welfare of others and to cooperate voluntarily with them) were not characteristics of low power distance societies. Other dimensions from both models that might be expected to have some significant level of conceptual overlap (e.g., mastery with masculinity and harmony with uncertainty avoidance) were also tested and were found to differ conceptually and empirically in significant ways.

§1:22 GLOBE

Several of the GLOBE cultural dimensions were already well-known and had their own extensive history of research and critical assessment; however, even in those instances the GLOBE researchers carefully evaluated whether it was necessary to redefine their meanings and/or modify the measurement tools associated with them. Other cultural dimensions were newly developed although they typically had some relation to one or more of the dimensions included in traditional cultural dimension frameworks such as the one developed by Hofstede.

In order to understand the process that the GLOBE researchers used in collecting the information necessary for their analysis and measurement of the applicable cultural dimensions each of the sections below include examples of the questions posed to respondents. It should be recalled that respondents were asked to provide their

78 Schwartz found a moderate degree of empirical overlap between power distance and hierarchy/egalitarianism; however, the distinctiveness of the dimensions remained pronounced as evidenced by differences in country rankings such as China’s high placement on power distance (9th) compared to its last place (low) position on hierarchy/egalitarianism. Power distance was negatively correlated with autonomy and positively correlated with embeddedness. S. Schwartz, “Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World”, in H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004).

79 For example, while mastery, like masculinity, implies active and assertive behavior it does not imply the selfishness associated with the masculine characteristic of disregarding the interests of others. Harmony stresses co-existence among people and between people and nature without attempting to assert control while uncertainty avoidance seeks “certainty” through institutions and beliefs that focus on controlling ambiguity and unpredictability. S. Schwartz, “Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World”, in H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004).

80 While designing the nine cultural dimensions used in their study the GLOBE researchers relied upon, among the others, the prior research work of Hofstede, Schwartz and Inglehart.

responses to the questions in the actual GLOBE survey on a scale of 1-to-7 in order to
measure the level of their intensity of belief regarding the subject matter of the questions
(e.g., when a respondent was asked whether he or she agreed or disagreed with a
particular statement a response of “1” signaled “strong disagreement” while a response of
“7” signaled “strong agreement”). As an initial point of reference the global mean score
for each cultural dimension taking into account the responses from all societies has been
included along with the mean score for that dimension for selected “clusters” of two or
more societies—“societal clusters”—that shared various characteristics in the eyes of the
GLOBE researchers. A society’s score on a cultural dimension was computed by
aggregating the assessments (i.e., scores) provided by all of the respondents from that
society—for example, the actual practices score with respect to humane orientation in the
US was computed as the mean of the scores provided by all Americans in the respondent
group to the questions relating to actual humane orientation practices in the US.

§1:23 --Power distance

As noted above, the power distance dimension appears in both the Hofstede and GLOBE
models. The GLOBE researchers defined power distance as the extent to which a
collective accepts and endorses authority, power differences and status privileges.82
Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension
would include the following:

Power Distance  
[Global Mean: 5.17]

1. In this society, followers are expected to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question their leaders when in disagreement</th>
<th>Obey their leaders without question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In this society, power is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared throughout the society</th>
<th>Concentrated at the top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The GLOBE researchers also identified characteristics of high power distance societies that were similar to those explained by Hofstede\textsuperscript{83} including differentiation of members of the society into classes; stable and scarce power bases; a perception that power provides social order; limited upward social mobility; resources are available only to a select few; information is localized and hoarded; and more stratification among members of the society with regard to power, authority, prestige, status, wealth, and material possessions.\textsuperscript{84} The GLOBE researchers also concluded that the survey data provided sufficient support to confirm the hypothesis that high power distance societies tend to have less transparent governments. Some of the characteristics of lower power distance societies identified by the GLOBE researchers included existence of a large middle class, linkage of power to corruption and coercion, upward mobility is common, resources are available to almost all members of the society, power bases are transient and sharable and information is widely shared among members of the society.\textsuperscript{85}

The following chart shows the highest and lowest power distance societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Power Distance Societies</th>
<th>Medium Power Distance Societies</th>
<th>Highest Power Distance Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (3.89)</td>
<td>England (5.15)</td>
<td>Russia (5.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (4.11)</td>
<td>France (5.28)</td>
<td>Spain (5.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa—Black Sample (4.11)</td>
<td>Brazil (5.33)</td>
<td>Thailand (5.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel (4.73)</td>
<td>Italy (5.43)</td>
<td>Argentina (5.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica (4.74)</td>
<td>Portugal (5.44)</td>
<td>Morocco (5.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the GLOBE societal clusters had particularly high scores on power distance and the one cluster with a significantly lower score than the others was the Nordic Europe cluster, which included Denmark, Finland and Sweden. Of interest was the fact that the GLOBE researchers found a substantial gap between the average societal score for actual power distance practices, which was relatively high, and the average societal score for the values of middle managers around the world on this dimension, which was much lower. With respect to the power distance dimension, the US was similar to most of the other societies in the survey and, in fact, the variance between actual practices and values for this dimension was the largest for the US on any of the cultural dimensions. The lesson appears to be that most middle managers in the GLOBE survey felt that there was a large

\textsuperscript{83} Researchers have used different adjectives to describe the intensity of how societies scored on the various cultural dimensions. For example, societies with a high score on the power distance dimension have been described as strong, high and/or large power distance societies while societies with a low score on that dimension have been described as weak, low and/or small power distance societies. The text in this chapter generally uses the adjective favored by the particular researcher under discussion; however, there is no meaningful difference between the terms and they are typically used interchangeably.


\textsuperscript{85} Id.
divide in status and power between themselves and their superiors and that those middle managers had a strong desire to see that gap narrowed.

§1:24 --Uncertainty avoidance

As noted above, the uncertainty avoidance dimension appears in both the Hofstede and GLOBE models. The designers of the GLOBE project survey defined uncertainty avoidance as the extent to which a society, organization, or group relies on established social norms, rituals, rules, laws, institutions and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of future events (i.e., avoid uncertainty). Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**Uncertainty Avoidance**  
[Global Mean: 4.16; Anglo Mean: 4.42; Latin America Mean: 3.62]

1. In this society, orderliness and consistency are stressed, even at the expense of experimentation and innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In this society, societal requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail so citizens know what they are expected to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of high uncertainty avoidance societies identified by the GLOBE researchers included use of formality in social interactions with others; documentation of agreements in legal contracts; maintenance of orderly and meticulous records; reliance on formalized policies and procedures; strong resistance to change and preference for moderate and carefully calculated risks. The GLOBE researchers also concluded that the survey data provided sufficient support to confirm the hypothesis that high uncertainty avoidance societies tend to have more transparent governments. The GLOBE researchers observed that low uncertainty avoidance societies use informality in social interactions with others; are less orderly and keep fewer records; are willing to make agreements based on the word of people thought to be trustful as opposed to formal contracts; rely on informal norms of behavior for most matters; are less calculating when taking risks; and show only moderate resistance to change.

---

86 Id. at 30.  
87 Id. at 618.  
88 Id. at 618.
The following chart shows the highest and lowest uncertainty avoidance societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Uncertainty Avoidance Societies</th>
<th>Medium Uncertainty Avoidance Societies</th>
<th>Highest Uncertainty Avoidance Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia (2.88)</td>
<td>Israel (4.01)</td>
<td>Austria (5.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (3.12)</td>
<td>US (4.15)</td>
<td>Denmark (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (3.35)</td>
<td>Mexico (4.18)</td>
<td>Germany—Former West (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (3.39)</td>
<td>Kuwait (4.21)</td>
<td>Sweden (5.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela (3.44)</td>
<td>Ireland (4.30)</td>
<td>Switzerland (5.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on uncertainty avoidance included the Germanic Europe and Nordic Europe clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Eastern Europe, Latin America and Middle East clusters. There was a good deal of variability among the various societal clusters with respect to the alignment of values and practices on the uncertainty avoidance dimension. For example, the values score was higher than the practices score for this dimension in the Latin America, Indigenous Africa, Arab, South Asia and East Europe clusters while the opposite was true in the Nordic and Germanic clusters. The average scores among all surveyed societies, including the US, with respect to actual practices and values were fairly close and high uncertainty avoidance societies tended to support and endorse the team oriented, humane oriented and self-protective leadership styles and strongly disapprove of the participative leadership style.

§1:25  --In-group collectivism

In-group collectivism, one of two “collectivism” dimensions used by the GLOBE researchers, is the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, cohesiveness and interdependence in their organizations or families. Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**In-Group Collectivism**

[Global Mean: 5.13; Anglo Mean: 4.30; Southern Asia: 5.87]

1. In this society, children take pride in the individual accomplishments of their parents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 Id. at 30.
2. In this society, parents take pride in the individual accomplishments of their children:

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree
1                    2                    3                    4                    5                    6                    7

3. In this society, children live with their parents until they are married.

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree
1                    2                    3                    4                    5                    6                    7

In high in-group collectivist societies, duties and obligations are important determinants of social behavior; a strong distinction is made between in-groups and out-groups; people emphasize relatedness with groups and are strongly devoted to those groups; the pace of life is slower; and love is assigned little weight in marriage. Other characteristics of high in-group collectivist societies include a basic assumption by people that they are highly interdependent and thus are required to make important personal contributions to their groups; long-term employment relationships and an obligation on organizations to assume major responsibility for employee welfare; and a tendency for major decisions to be made following group deliberations.\textsuperscript{90} High in-group collectivist societies tended to support and endorse the charismatic/value-based and team oriented leadership styles. The GLOBE researchers also concluded that the survey data provided sufficient support to confirm the hypothesis that stronger family oriented societies (i.e., high in-group collectivist societies) tend to have less transparent governments. In contrast, in a low in-group collectivist society personal needs and attitudes are important determinants of social behavior; little distinction is made between in-groups and out-groups; people emphasize rationality in behavior; the pace of life is faster; and love is assigned great weight in marriage. Other characteristics of low in-group collectivist societies include a basic assumption by people that they are independent and thus are required to pursue individual achievements in order to distinguish themselves; short-term employment relationships; and organizational focus on employee performance and completion of work activities as opposed to caring for their personal welfare.\textsuperscript{91}

The following chart shows the highest and lowest in-group collectivism societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest In Group Collectivist Societies</th>
<th>Medium In Group Collectivist Societies</th>
<th>Highest In Group Collectivist Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on in-group collectivism included the Confucian Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Middle East and Southern Asia clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Anglo, Germanic Europe and Nordic Europe clusters. The values scores with respect to in-group collectivism were all relatively high across all of the societal clusters and the Anglo, Nordic, Germanic and Latin Europe clusters had the biggest gaps between practices and values among all of the clusters (i.e., the values scores were higher than the practices scores). The average scores among all surveyed societies with respect to practices and values were generally fairly close; however, while the average of practice scores among US middle managers was at the lower end of all of the societies in the survey the average of values scores for US middle managers was significantly higher and, in fact, put the US in the middle of all of the surveyed societies in a group that included Russia, Spain, Thailand, Turkey and Zambia.

§1:26  --Institutional collectivism

Institutional collectivism, the second collectivism dimension used by the GLOBE researchers, is the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action. Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

Institutional Collectivism
[Global Mean: 4.25; Anglo Mean: 4.46; Latin America Mean: 3.86]

1. In this society, leaders encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The economic system in this society is designed to maximize:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual interests</th>
<th>Collective interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In high institutional collectivist societies one finds that members assume that they are highly interdependent with strong cohesive groups, group goals generally take precedence over individual goals and group loyalty is encouraged even in instances where it will undermine the pursuit of individual goals, the society’s economic system tends to maximize the interests of collectives, rewards are driven by seniority, personal needs and/or within-group equity and critical decisions are made by groups. While high institutional collectivist societies did not strongly endorse any particular style of leadership as effective they strongly disapproved of the autonomous leadership style, a finding that makes intuitive sense since a leader who engaged in autonomous behaviors would certainly not be trusted or celebrated in a cultural environment that placed such a high value on the group and collaboration within the group. In contrast, in low institutional collectivist societies one finds that members assume that they are largely independent of any group and responsible for themselves, the ‘self’ is viewed as autonomous, individual goals often take precedence over group goals and the pursuit of individual goals is encouraged even at the expense of group loyalty, the society’s economic system tends to maximize the interests of individuals, rewards are driven largely by the contribution that an individual makes to successful completion of a task and critical decisions are made by individuals.93

The following chart shows the highest and lowest institutional collectivism societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Societies</th>
<th>Individualist Societies</th>
<th>Medium Societies</th>
<th>Individualist Societies</th>
<th>Highest Collectivist Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece (3.25)</td>
<td>Hong Kong (4.13)</td>
<td>US (4.20)</td>
<td>Denmark (4.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (3.53)</td>
<td>US (4.20)</td>
<td>Egypt (4.50)</td>
<td>Japan (5.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany—Former East (3.56)</td>
<td>Poland (4.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Korea (5.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (3.68)</td>
<td>Indonesia (4.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden (5.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on institutional collectivism included the Nordic Europe and Confucian Asia clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Germanic Europe, Latin America and Latin Europe clusters. In general the values and practices scores among the various societal clusters with respect to institutional collectivism were quite similar; however, Latin America was noteworthy for a relatively large gap between its values and practices score (i.e., the practices score was approximately 4 and the values score was over 5).94

93 Id. at 459. See also L. Nardon and R. Steers, “The culture theory jungle: divergence and convergence in models of national culture”, in R. Bhagat and R. Steers (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009).
94 With respect to institutional collectivism, the average of actual practice scores and the average of values scores among US middle managers was quite similar and, as the table in the text indicates, fell at the midpoint of the range of possible scores (4.20).
§1:27 --Gender egalitarianism

Gender egalitarianism was defined by the GLOBE researchers as the degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality and promotes gender equality. Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**Gender Egalitarianism**

[Global Mean: 3.37; Anglo Mean: 3.40; Middle East Mean: 2.95]

1. In this society, boys are encouraged more than girls to attain a higher education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In this society, who is more likely to serve in a position of high office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In high gender egalitarian societies there is an effort to minimize gender role differences and one finds more women in the workforce and in positions of authority, less occupational sex segregation, similar levels of educational attainment for males and females, women being afforded greater decision-making roles in community affairs and a general feeling that women should be accorded equal status in society. In low gender egalitarian societies, sometimes referred to as gender differentiated societies, differences in gender roles are maximized and one finds fewer women in the workplace and in positions of authority, more occupational sex segregation, a lower level of education attainment for women as opposed to men, little or no opportunities for women to achieve decision-making roles in community affairs and a general feeling that women should not be accorded equal status in society. Other commentators have noted that in high gender egalitarian societies the stereotype of women is more positive and one finds higher levels of gender equality in those societies in areas such as the labor force and politics.

---

95 R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 30. It is noteworthy that even though about three-quarters of the respondents to the survey were male the average societal value score for this dimension was significantly higher than the average societal score with respect to current practices; a finding that appears to indicate that middle managers around the world realize that work still needs to be done, and should be done, to reduce gender differentiation in the workplace and community as a whole.

96 Id. at 359. See also L. Nardon and R. Steers, “The culture theory jungle: divergence and convergence in models of national culture”, in R. Bhagat and R. Steers (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009).

GLOBE study, high gender egalitarian societies supported and endorsed both charismatic/value-based and participative leader attributes such as foresight, enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, egalitarianism, delegation and collective orientation.  

The following chart shows the highest and lowest gender egalitarian societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Gender Egalitarian Societies</th>
<th>Medium Gender Egalitarian Societies</th>
<th>Highest Gender Egalitarian Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Korea (2.50)</td>
<td>Italy (3.24)</td>
<td>Sweden (3.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (2.81)</td>
<td>Brazil (3.31)</td>
<td>Denmark (3.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (2.84)</td>
<td>Argentina (3.49)</td>
<td>Slovenia (3.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (2.90)</td>
<td>Netherlands (3.50)</td>
<td>Poland (4.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (3.05)</td>
<td>Venezuela (3.62)</td>
<td>Hungary (4.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on gender egalitarianism included the Eastern Europe and Nordic Europe clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Middle East cluster. All of the societal clusters had higher values scores than practices scores with respect to gender egalitarianism with the East Europe cluster being the closest to alignment and the largest gaps in the Latin America, Anglo, Germanic and Latin Europe clusters. With respect to gender egalitarianism, the average of actual practice scores for US middle managers was below the midpoint of the scores for all societies in the survey and comparable to “medium” gender egalitarian societies in the chart above; however, the average of the value scores for US middle managers on this dimension was among the highest of all of the societies in the survey.

§1:28  --Assertiveness

Assertiveness was defined by the GLOBE researchers as the degree to which individuals in a society are determined, assertive, confrontational and aggressive in their social relationships with others. Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**Assertiveness**

[Global Mean: 4.14; Anglo Mean: 4.14; Southern Asia Mean: 3.86]

1. In this society, people are generally:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonassertive</th>
<th>Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


99 Id. at 30.
2. In this society, people are generally:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tender</th>
<th>Tough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In high assertiveness societies one finds that competition, forcefulness, aggressiveness, toughness, determination, success and progress is valued for all members of the society, sympathy and praise for the stronger members of the society, communications are direct and unambiguous, members try to have control over their environment, subordinates are expected to take the initiative, trust is built on the basis of calculation and a belief that success can be achieved through hard work. High assertiveness societies did not strongly endorse or disapprove any particular style of leadership. In contrast, in low assertiveness societies one finds that cooperation and warm relationships are valued, modesty and tenderness are preferred over assertiveness and forcefulness, sympathy for the weaker members of the society, communications are indirect and an effort is made to try and “save face” in communications and actions, members try to be and act in harmony with their environment, competition is associated with defeat and punishment, subordinates are expected to be loyal and trust is build on the basis of predictability.\(^{100}\)

The following chart shows the highest and lowest assertiveness societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Societies</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Medium Societies</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Highest Societies</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (3.38)</td>
<td>Egypt (3.91)</td>
<td>New Zealand (3.42)</td>
<td>Ireland (3.92)</td>
<td>Spain (4.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (3.47)</td>
<td>Philippines (4.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US (4.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (3.59)</td>
<td>Ecuador (4.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greece (4.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France (4.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Austria (4.62)</td>
<td>Germany—Former East (4.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on assertiveness included the Eastern Europe and Germanic Europe clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Nordic Europe cluster. In general there was fairly closely alignment across the societal clusters with respect to their values and practices scores relating to assertive orientation with the Germanic cluster being the sole exception due to a practices score that was materially higher than its values score on this dimension. Societal differences in the preferred level of conversational directness, which is associated with “assertiveness”, have been identified in several studies. For example, the US is one of the societies where directness is valued and indirecetedness is perceived as socially undesirable while societies such as

\(^{100}\) Id. at 405. L. Nardon and R. Steers, “The culture theory jungle: divergence and convergence in models of national culture”, in R. Bhagat and R. Steers (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009).
Korea tend to be more indirect.\textsuperscript{101} With respect to assertiveness, the average of actual practice scores for US middle managers was among the highest of all of the societies in the survey and the average of values scores for US middle managers on this dimension was slightly lower than the average of actual practice scores.

\textbf{§1:29 --Humane orientation}

Humane orientation was defined by the GLOBE researchers as the degree to which an organization or society encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others.\textsuperscript{102} Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**Humane Orientation**

\[\text{[Global Mean: 4.09; Anglo Mean: 4.20; Latin Europe Mean: 3.71]}\]

1. In this society, people are generally:

Not at all concerned about others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Very concerned about others

2. In this society, people are generally:

Not at all sensitive to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Very sensitive toward others


3. In this society, people are generally:

Not at all tolerant of mistakes by others

Very tolerant of mistakes by others

In high humane orientation societies one finds the interests of others are important; people are motivated primarily by a need for belonging and affiliation; members of society feel that they are responsible for promoting the well-being of others; child labor is limited by public sanctions; people are urged to be sensitive to all forms of racial discrimination; there is an emphasis on social support and community values; and altruism, benevolence, kindness and generosity are valued. There is also a high need for belonging and affiliation in high humane orientation societies coupled with a lower incidence of psychological and pathological problems.\(^\text{103}\) High humane orientation societies tended to support and endorse the humane orientation leadership style. In contrast, one finds in low humane orientation societies that one’s own self-interest is important; people are motivated by a need for power and material possessions; the state provides social and economic support for individuals’ well-being; child labor is an issue of low importance; people are not sensitive to all forms of racial discrimination; and pleasure, comfort and self-enjoyment are highly valued. One also finds a higher need for power and possessions and a higher incidence of psychological and pathological problems in low humane oriented societies.\(^\text{104}\)

The following chart shows the highest and lowest humane orientation societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Humane Orientation Societies</th>
<th>Medium Humane Orientation Societies</th>
<th>Highest Humane Orientation Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany—Former West (3.18)</td>
<td>Hong Kong (3.90)</td>
<td>Indonesia (4.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (3.32)</td>
<td>Sweden (4.10)</td>
<td>Egypt (4.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (3.40)</td>
<td>Taiwan (4.11)</td>
<td>Malaysia (4.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore (3.49)</td>
<td>US (4.17)</td>
<td>Ireland (4.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (3.66)</td>
<td>New Zealand (4.32)</td>
<td>Philippines (5.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on humane orientation included the Southern Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa clusters while the lowest scores were found in the


Germanic Europe and Latin Europe clusters. The gap between values and practices scores among the various societal clusters with respect to humane orientation was fairly consistent; however, the South Asia, Arab and Indigenous Africa clusters were noticeably better at aligning values and practices on this dimension. Given the stark differences between high and low humane orientation societies it is not surprising to find the average societal score of humane orientation values was much higher than the score for actual current practices with respect to this dimension. For example, with respect to humane orientation, the average of actual practice scores for US middle managers fell within the middle of the range for all of the societies in the survey but the average of values scores for US middle managers on this dimension was much higher.

Among the societal scores for actual practices, humane orientation was positively related to institutional and in-group collectivism and negatively related to assertiveness. Schlösser explained the relevance of these relationships as follows: “In other words, a society who’s members were friendly and caring to others was also characterized by a strong emphasis on the collective and a non-confrontational manner in social interactions. On the other hand, a society who’s members were not very kind and helpful to others tended to be a place where people were very individualistic and assertive in social interactions.”

§1:30  --Performance orientation

The performance orientation dimension developed by the GLOBE researchers reflects the extent to which a community encourages and rewards innovation, setting and meeting high standards, excellence, and performance improvement. Typical questions for

---

105 Id. at 569. For a detailed discussion of research activities relating to the humane orientation dimension, see O. Schlösser, Humane Orientation–A cross-cultural study in 26 countries (Dissertation, Department of Psychology, Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen), October 2006, http://geb.uni-giessen.de/geb/volltexte/2006/3681/pdf/SchloesserOliver-2006-10-18.pdf [accessed October 23, 2010].

106 Id.

107 Id. (noting that humane orientation practices were found to correlate negatively with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita and the Human Development Index. See also H. Kabasakal and M. Bodur, “Humane Orientation in Societies, Organizations, and Leader Attributes,” in R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 564-601.

respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**Performance Orientation**
* [Global Mean: 4.10; Anglo Mean: 4.37; Latin America Mean: 3.85]

1. In this society, students are encouraged to strive for continuously improved performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In this society, people are rewarded for excellent performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High performance orientation societies have characteristics such as value training and development; value assertiveness, competitiveness and materialism; view formal feedback as necessary for performance improvement; value what one does more than who one is (i.e., performance over people); expect direct and explicit communication; and believe that members of the society have control over their own destinies. The GLOBE researchers also concluded that the survey data provided sufficient support to confirm the hypothesis that high performance oriented societies tend to have governments that are more supportive of economic development. Low performance orientation societies value and emphasize societal and family relationships, seniority, loyalty and belongingness; value harmony with the environment over control of the environment; view formal feedback as judgmental and discomfiting; value who one is more than what one does; and expect indirect and subtle communication.¹⁰⁹

The following chart shows the highest and lowest performance oriented societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Performance Oriented Societies</th>
<th>Medium Performance Oriented Societies</th>
<th>Highest Performance Oriented Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia (2.88)</td>
<td>Sweden (3.72)</td>
<td>US (4.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (3.08)</td>
<td>Israel (3.85)</td>
<td>Taiwan (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (3.20)</td>
<td>Spain (4.01)</td>
<td>New Zealand (4.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Venezuela (3.32)  England (4.08)  Hong Kong (4.80)
Italy (3.58)  Japan (4.22)  Singapore (4.90)

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on performance orientation included the Anglo, Confucian Asia and Germanic Europe clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Eastern Europe and Latin America clusters. The values and practices scores with respect to performance orientation were fairly closely aligned among all of the societal clusters and there was a significant gap between values and practice scores for all of the clusters (i.e., the values scores were noticeably higher than the practices scores), prompting the researchers to comment that the “[r]espondents’ aspirations about how much their societies should focus on performance are far beyond their perceptions of the level of their societies’ current practices”. With respect to performance orientation, the average of values scores among US middle managers was significantly higher than the average of actual practice scores; however, when compared to all of the other societies in the survey the US value score was only slightly above the middle range of all value scores. For example, countries that had value scores with respect to performance orientation that were significantly higher than the US included Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Namibia, Nigeria, the Philippines, Portugal, Slovenia, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Performance orientation is particularly noteworthy for the fact that it had the highest value average of all of the nine cultural dimensions and that even the lowest value score for any society was well above the midpoint on the measurement scale. All this provided exciting evidence of a strong sentiment across the globe for high performance orientation. High performance orientation was found to have a strong and positive correlation with charismatic/value-based leadership and the researchers commented: “A major finding was the large influence of the Performance Orientation cultural dimension as the most important predictor of the Charismatic/Value-Based leadership dimension. Societies and organizations that value excellence, superior performance, performance improvement, and innovation will likely seek leaders who exemplify Charismatic/Value-Based qualities, and such leaders are likely to be effective.” The researchers advised that leaders can contribute to instilling a high value on performance orientation by setting ambitious goals, communicating high expectations for their subordinates, building their subordinates’ self-confidence and intellectually challenging their subordinates. In addition, the researchers noted that high performance societies “seem to look to charismatic leaders who paint a picture of an ambitious and enticing future, but leave it to the people to build it”. Other leadership styles found to be strongly and positively correlated with high performance orientation included participative and autonomous leadership.

---

111 Id at 251.
112 Id at 711.
113 Id at 277.
114 Id at 278.
§1:31 --Future orientation

The designers of the GLOBE project survey defined their time oriented dimension, referred to as “future orientation,” as the degree to which a collectivity encourages and rewards future-oriented behaviors such as planning, delaying gratification and investing in the future. Typical questions for respondents in the GLOBE survey with regard to this dimension would include the following:

**Future Orientation**

[Global Mean: 3.85; Anglo Mean: 4.08; Latin America Mean: 3.54]

1. In this society the accepted norm is to:
   - Accept the status quo
   - Plan for the future
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. In this society, people place more emphasis on:
   - Solving current problems
   - Planning for the future
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. In this society, more people:
   - Live for the present
   - Live for the future
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

The GLOBE researchers also identified characteristics of future orientation societies similar to those of Hofstede’s long-term orientation dimension discussed above including a propensity to save now for the future, an emphasis on working for long-term success, organizations that tend to be flexible and adaptive and a general view of material success and spiritual fulfillment as an integrated whole. There is also a greater emphasis on economic success and value of intrinsic motivation in high future orientation societies. High future orientation societies did not strongly endorse or disapprove any particular style of leadership. Some of the characteristics of low future orientation societies identified by the GLOBE researchers included less emphasis on economic success; a

---

115 Id. at 282.
116 Id. at 302.
propensity to spend now rather than save for the future; a preference for immediate gratification and acting spontaneously; organizations that tend to be inflexible, bureaucratic and maladaptive; and a general view that material success and spiritual fulfillment are separate and thus require tradeoffs.\textsuperscript{118}

The following chart shows the highest and lowest future orientation societies in the GLOBE study, as well as a select group of societies that fell into the mid-range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Future Orientation Societies</th>
<th>Medium Future Orientation Societies</th>
<th>Highest Future Orientation Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia (2.88)</td>
<td>Slovenia (3.59)</td>
<td>Denmark (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (3.08)</td>
<td>Egypt (3.86)</td>
<td>Canada—English-Speaking (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (3.11)</td>
<td>Ireland (3.98)</td>
<td>Netherlands (4.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (3.25)</td>
<td>Australia (4.09)</td>
<td>Switzerland (4.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait (3.26)</td>
<td>India (4.19)</td>
<td>Singapore (5.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBE societal clusters with the highest scores on future orientation included the Germanic Europe and Nordic Europe clusters while the lowest scores were found in the Eastern Europe, Latin America and Middle East clusters. The values scores of all of the societal clusters were higher than their practices scores on the future orientation dimension with significant gaps between values and practices identified for the Latin America, Indigenous Africa, Arab, South Asia, East Europe and Latin Europe clusters. The average societal score for actual future orientation practices was much lower than the average societal score for the values of middle managers around the world on this dimension. For example, the average of actual practice scores for US middle managers fell within the middle of the range for all of the societies in the survey but the average of values scores for US middle managers on this dimension was much higher.

\textsection{1:32} \textbf{Analysis and assessment}

Clearly one of the notable contributions of the GLOBE study was derived from the decision of the researchers to look beyond cultural dimensions to explore the credibility of the belief that systematic differences in preferences regarding leadership styles and in leadership behaviors existed across cultures. For example, as discussed elsewhere in this publication, the more individualistic societies in the West tended to embrace participatory leadership styles (e.g., leadership seek out and consider the opinions of their subordinates when make decisions) that were generally less effective in Eastern societies where collectivism is a predominant feature of the system of cultural values. Paternalistic leadership practices along with group maintenance activities flourished in Asian societies. Charismatic leadership of some type was widely endorsed; however, key behavioral traits of charismatic leaders needed to be tailored to the cultural values in local

societies. For example, in some cases leaders needed to demonstrate high levels of assertiveness while in other societies passive leadership behaviors—humility, dignity and modesty—were expected and appreciated by subordinates. Some societies, such as many of the Arab countries, firmly rejected charismatic and participative leadership styles and behaviors in favor of a preference for autocratic leadership that was more consistent with the strongly held familial and tribal values in those societies. Leadership profiles for individual societal cultures were also derived from the GLOBE survey data (e.g., in order to be perceived as an effective leader in India one should be assertive, morally principled, ideological, bold and proactive).¹¹⁹

§1:33 Research studies based on most popular cultural dimensions

The cultural dimensions described above were test and “confirmed” by their principal proponents in a variety of research studies. In addition, however, other researchers used the cultural dimensions as the basis for their own work to test the validity of the dimensions and apply the dimensions to different contexts such as countries that may not have been included in the original surveys conducted by Hofstede and others. In the sections that follow we discuss just a few of the research studies that have been completed based on the popular cultural dimensions proposed by Hofstede: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, individualism-collectivism and long-term (future) orientation. The selection of these dimensions is a matter of convenience given the extensive amount of research activities that Hofstede has spawned; however, as described below, the empirical evidence appears to be quite clear that, for the time being, almost all of the instruments used by researchers rely on at least some measures of cultural dimensions that are conceptually similar to the dimensions proposed by Hofstede.¹²⁰ Nonetheless, notice should be taken of other choices that have been made by researchers in their studies. For example, Ardichvili, when studying leadership styles and work-related values of managers and employees in post-Communist countries in Eastern Europe, opted to focus on fatalism and paternalism as cultural dimensions,¹²¹ and a number of researchers have also relied on the well-known Universalism-Particularism and Affective-Neutral dimensions proposed by Trompenaar and the dimensions that Schwartz included in his model.

§1:34 --Power distance

Not surprisingly, the relationship between power distance and preferred leadership styles has attracted a good deal of attention in the research community. In one case it was found that subordinates in large power distance countries were more hesitant to challenge

the authority of their supervisors and were fearful of disagreeing with the decisions made or orders issued by their managers. Others have frequently commented that strong and autocratic leadership is accepted, expected and effective in large power distance countries where subordinates want more guidance and expect to receive from those in authority. Support for this proposition is provided by findings from the GLOBE project that indicated that leader attributes appreciated within cultures varied depending on the level of power distance in that culture and that the following leader attributes were valued and appreciated in large power distance countries but not in small power distance countries: “status-conscious,” “class-conscious,” “elitist,” and “domineering.” High power distance societies tended to support and endorse the self-protective leadership style and the researchers commented that the high power distance values and practices of Asian societies are often associated with face-saving and status-consciousness, both of which are elements of the self-protective leadership dimension. The GLOBE researchers also observed that endorsement of participative leadership styles in various “country clusters” was significantly predicted by the level of power distance among the countries in those clusters. For example, participative leadership was endorsed in country clusters where small power distance was the norm—Anglo, Germanic and Nordic European—while it was not embraced as strongly in country clusters where large power distances were more prevalent such as the Confucian Asian, East European, Middle Eastern and Southern Asian clusters. Finally, a number of other researchers have noted large power distance countries, particularly in the developing world, often prefer directive and supportive leadership styles, sometimes referred to as “paternalistic”, that are characterized by high levels of status-orientation, support and involvement by leaders in the non-work lives of their subordinates.

126 See P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, “Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership”, in R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). See also M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, “Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions”, The Leadership Quarterly, 14 (2003), 729-768, 737-738 (“People tend to prefer leadership that is more egalitarian when power distance is low. Where power distance is high, leaders tend to be less participative and more authoritarian and directive. Such directive leadership is also more effective in a high power distance context.”).
127 Id. at 739. Other cultural characteristics conducive to accepting and embracing paternalistic leadership include strong family bonds, a sense of fatalism and the expectation among subordinates that their organizations will take care of them and their families. See also P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, “Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures”, The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274 (directive leadership had a positive effect in terms of satisfaction and commitment of subordinates in large power distance countries).
Dickson et al. summarized some of the important findings regarding the relationship between power distance and leadership practices as follows: “Summarizing, research shows that power distance in society has an impact on different aspects of leadership. People tend to prefer leadership that is more egalitarian when power distance is low. Where power distance is high, leaders tend to be less participative and more authoritarian and directive. Such directive leadership is also more effective in a high power distance context. In addition, a stronger emphasis on the use of rules and procedures is seen when power distance is high and people are more inclined to gain support from those in authority before carrying out new plans.”

A good deal of research work has also been conducted on the relationship between power distance and managerial practices and it is not surprising to find that organizations in large power distance countries rely more heavily on formal rules and procedures established at the top of the organizational hierarchy to direct subordinates and that managers in large power distance countries are less inclined to seek input from subordinates before making decisions and tend to rely heavily on their own experiences when seeking solutions to operational issues. In turn, employees in larger power distance countries, such as China and Taiwan, have been found to be more likely to be willing to accept direction from supervisors without question than employees in smaller power distance countries such as the US. So-called “innovation champions” (i.e., persons looking to gain support for a new product or idea) in large power distance countries are expected to seek the approval of those in authority rather than trying to initiate change by soliciting support among persons working at lower levels in the hierarchical structure of the organization. In addition, research indicates that participatory management schemes, such as employee stock ownership plans, are much more effective in countries with a smaller power distance such as Mexico and Taiwan but did not have a positive effect in countries with a smaller power distance such as Japan, South Korea and the US.

---

129 P. Smith, M. Peterson, S. Schwarz, A. Ahmad, D. Akande, J. Andersen, et al., “Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior—A 47-nation study,” Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(2) (2002), 188-208; P. Smith, M. Peterson and J. Misumi, “Event management and work team effectiveness in Japan, Britain and the USA,” Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67 (1994), 33-43. Other researchers have examined high power distance societies and also confirmed that communication is mostly one-way, top to bottom, and that it is expected that leaders will know more than their subordinates and that input from subordinates is neither solicited nor welcomed. See M. Javidan and R. House, “Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE,” Organizational Dynamics, 29(4) (2001), 289-305.
130 N. Bu, T. Craig and T. Peng, “Acceptance of supervisory direction in typical workplace situations: A comparison of US, Taiwanese and PRC employees”, International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 1(2) (2001), 131-152. See also D. Adsit, M. London, S. Crom and D. Jones, “Cross-cultural differences in upward ratings in a multinational company,” International Journal of Human Resource Management, 8 (1997), 385-401 (subordinates in large power distance countries were more hesitant to challenge the authority of their supervisors and were fearful of disagreeing with the decisions made or orders issued by their managers).
more effective in small power distance countries\textsuperscript{132} and job title/status is less important as a determinant of job satisfaction in those countries.\textsuperscript{133}

Related to the issue of power distance is the value of power and a study conducted by Morris et al. covering four countries—China, India, the Philippines and the US—concluded that the value of power is rated much more highly by managers in China, India and the Philippines than by managers in the US and that openness to change is valued more highly by managers in the US than by managers in China, India and the Philippines.\textsuperscript{134}

§1:35 --Uncertainty avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance has been a factor in a variety of research activities focusing on a diverse range of topics including leadership traits, managerial career development, business and strategic planning, innovation and the expectations of leaders regarding the preferences of their customers and the actions of their subordinates.\textsuperscript{135} Research conducted as part of the GLOBE project appeared to confirm that the level of uncertainty avoidance impacted the degree to which certain leadership attributes (i.e., being habitual, procedural, risk-taking, able to anticipate, formal, cautious and orderly) were perceived as being effective by middle managers in different societies.\textsuperscript{136} Another study of the actual behavior of managers in different countries confirmed the prediction that managers in high uncertainty avoidance countries would be more controlling, less delegating and less approachable than their colleagues in low uncertainty avoidance countries.\textsuperscript{137} A study of career management activities of young managers in Germany and the United Kingdom found that the managers in Germany, a high uncertainty avoidance country, tended to stay in one job longer (i.e., greater career stability) and that there training focused on attaining specialized expertise while managers in Great Britain, a low uncertainty avoidance country, were more likely to be “generalists” who took on a number of different jobs with varying responsibilities.\textsuperscript{138} One researcher concluded that


societies that are more accepting of uncertainty tend to be more innovative than society where uncertainty avoidance is strong.\(^\text{139}\)

Many of the elements associated with the uncertainty avoidance dimension also appear in cultural models that distinguish between societies that are “tight” or “loose”. Features of tight societies include extensive reliance on rules, norms and standards for correct behavior and severe sanctions for those members of the society who break a rule or ignore a standard. In contrast, there are few rules, norms and standards in loose societies and violations of those norms or standards that do exist will generally be greeted with “it does not matter”. Certain requirements appear to be necessary in order for a society to be “tight” including agreement regarding rules and norms, something that is more likely to occur when a society is isolated and cultural homogeneity is high. Triandis has also noted that tightness is prevalent, and functional, in societies, such as Japan, where the population density is high since “it helps regulate behavior so that people do the right thing at the right time and can thus interact smoothly and with little interpersonal conflict.”\(^\text{140}\) Interestingly, studies have also found a correlation between tightness and collectivism.\(^\text{141}\)

Finally, the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and preferences for planning and detailed agreements has also been evaluated by researchers. For example, a study of planning activities of leaders of small businesses in two countries—Germany and Ireland—identified differences based on the level of uncertainty avoidance in the country. In Germany, where uncertainty avoidance is high, detailed planning was perceived as essential for success by managers while managers in Ireland, a low uncertainty avoidance country, perceived too much planning as being risky and preferred to take a more flexible approach to enable them to be more responsive to the changing needs and requirements of their customers.\(^\text{142}\) To the extent that flexibility can be equated with innovation the results of this study are consistent with the findings noted above regarding the positive relationship between innovation and societal acceptance of uncertainty. Finally, the results of one study indicate that uncertainty avoidance appears to be relevant to explaining why leaders may have different expectations regarding the actions of their subordinates—managers in the United Kingdom, a low uncertainty avoidance country, expected their subordinates to demonstrate resourcefulness and improvisation while German managers operating in a high uncertainty avoidance societal environment expected their subordinates to be punctual and reliable.\(^\text{143}\)


\(^{142}\) A. Rauch, M. Frese and S. Sonnentag, “Cultural differences in planning/success relationships: A comparison of small enterprises in Ireland, West Germany, and East Germany,” Journal of Small Business Management, 38 (2000), 28-41. The differences were also reflected in the managers’ beliefs regarding expectations of customers—in Germany managers believed that customers focused on “on-time delivery” while in Ireland managers believed that that customers were more concerned about the ability of their vendors to be flexible and able to respond rapidly to unforeseen changes in their requirements.

Masculinity—femininity has drawn the most criticism of all of Hofstede’s dimensions due, in part, to his frequent attempts to link the dimension to gender differences. Dickson et al. summed up a number of the concerns as follows: “. . . critics have asserted that it is not well measured and that the dimension includes too many very different topics that are not necessarily related. These potentially separate topics include gender role division, assertiveness, dominance and toughness in social relationships, being humane or focused on quality of life, and being performance or achievement oriented.”

A somewhat different criticism of the masculinity-femininity dimension was explained by Taras et al. as follows: “Another construct that often causes confusion is that of Masculinity-Femininity. … The confusion may have been caused by the varying definitions of the construct provided by Hofstede (citations omitted) and the wide range of characteristics he posited about the cultures that represent different poles of the dimension. For example, in his definitions of Masculinity, Hofstede focused on achievement orientation. However, further in the text he supplemented his definition with a set of assumption about the difference in gender roles and the extent to which gender roles are defined in masculine versus feminine societies.”

As described above, researchers involved in the GLOBE project took the criticisms of the Hofstede model into consideration and experimented with creating separate measurements for different aspects of the masculinity-femininity dimension and eventually replaced it with “gender egalitarianism” and “assertiveness”, which they believed were identifiable and severable aspects of Hofstede’s dimensions that could be independently measured and analyzed. In addition, the GLOBE researchers felt that two of their other cultural dimensions, “performance orientation” and “human orientation,” which had their roots in the works of scholars other than Hofstede, would also do a better...
job of isolating and measuring different aspects of certain elements of the masculinity-femininity dimension.\textsuperscript{146}

Hofstede himself was quite aware of the debate surrounding masculinity-femininity and even went so far as to publish a separate book on the subject in 1998.\textsuperscript{147} Dickson et al. acknowledged that some cross-cultural studies do appear to confirm that the various characteristics that make up Hofstede’s masculinity dimension are correlated and that they provide support for Hofstede’s argument that there is no need to complicate matters by using sub-dimensions such as those created by the GLOBE researchers; however, they ultimately concluded the GLOBE approach is appropriate especially when studying the efficacy and acceptance of certain types of leadership practices.\textsuperscript{148} Moreover, the results from the GLOBE research do appear to support the potential explanatory value of the additional dimensions. For example, there does appear to be societal differences with respect to the level of gender differentiation and the degree to which gender role differences are emphasized (i.e., societies can meaningfully be classified as “gender egalitarian” or “gender differentiated”).\textsuperscript{149} Whether or not gender egalitarianism should be studied independent of broader societal issues relating to power distribution is a matter of debate and, as explained below, Nardon and Steers opted to rely in a single dimension referred to as hierarchical versus egalitarian.

\textbf{§1:37 \textit{--Individualism—collectivism}}

Collectivism has been widely studied in cross-cultural research.\textsuperscript{150} Triandis, who has studied the topic extensively, noted that the individualism-collectivism dimension identified by Hofstede was consistent with observations that he had made in earlier studies of samples from traditional Greece and Illinois where he found differences between the samples in their behaviors during interactions with “in-groups” (e.g., family members) and “out-groups” (e.g., strangers). Specifically, the observed behavior of the Greeks was more strongly included by norms (i.e., “what should I do?”) as opposed to


\textsuperscript{149} Id. at 746.

attitudes (i.e., “what would I like to do?”), which were more important to the persons in the American sample.\footnote{151} Triandis is also on record as believing that the differences on the individualism-collectivism dimension constitute the most significant differences between cultures.\footnote{152} Individualism has also been extensively studied at the individual level, especially in the US where the individualism has been found to be particularly strong at the societal level.\footnote{153}

Taras et al., who referred generally to “confusing construct definitions” that often lead to “questionable integrations of seemingly different measures into a single construct”, have focused specifically on issues created by the extensive list of suggested implications of cultural differences offered by Hofstede in his explanation of his individualism-collectivism dimension.\footnote{154} For example, the descriptions offered by Hofstede of this construct were not consistent over the years. In one instance, Hofstede operationalized the construct by focusing on items such as concern for working conditions, employment security and the need for the adventure element of the job while later defining the construct somewhat differently and more vaguely as “the relationship between the individual and the collectivity [and] the way people live together”. Adding to the confusion was Hofstede’s list of the traits of an individualistic society that included encouragement of initiative, job autonomy and self-minded pursuit of individual goals.\footnote{155} Taras et al. noted that there has been similar confusion regarding the definition and measurement of this dimension in surveys conducted by others and they have taken issue with bundling what they believe to be distinct constructs—social responsibility, self-


\footnote{153} For a review of the research activity on this topic, see D. Oyserman, H. Coon and M. Kemmelmeier, “Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses”, Psychological Bulletin, 128(1) (2002), 3-72. While individualism and collectivism are generally seen as opposite poles at the “culture level”, when the unit of analysis is the individual it has been recognized that persons can have both individual and collectivist “tendencies”. At the individual level individualism has been broken out into several facts such as “distance from in-groups”, “hedonism” and “competition” and collectivism has been broken out into “family integrity” and “sociability”. H. Triandis, “The many dimensions of culture”, Academy of Management Executive, 18(1) (2004), 88-93, 89. See also A. Yamada and T. Singelis, “Biculturalism and self-construal”, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23 (1999), 697–709 (individuals who lived in both individualistic and collectivist cultures for several years were found to be high both individualism and collectivism).


reliance, independent-interdependent self-perception and preference for teamwork—into a single facet labeled “individualism” and thus rendering the measure imprecise and “useless for rigorous empirical analysis”. Interestingly, as described below, respondents to a survey of cross-cultural management scholars did not rank measures related to the individualism-collectivism construct highly on a list of dimensions that could be classified as both determined by culture and related to the workplace, further highlighting the care that should be taken when using the construct/dimension to study specific issues.

The characteristics described in the sections above for individualistic and collectivist societies have been confirmed by other studies. For example, several researchers have found that persons in collectivist societies have a strong attachment to their organizations and are more willing to subordinate their own personal goals to the goals established for their organizations. Similarly, studies have found that collectivists tend to identify with the goals of their leaders and the common purposes and objectives established for their group or organization and also evidence strong loyalties to their groups. Research conducted with respect to persons from individualist societies confirms their preferences for pursuing and satisfying their own personal goals and self-interest.

It should be noted that a number of studies have identified a strong and consistent correlation between high individualism scores and national wealth. For example, in a large study involving 47 countries researchers concluded that as socioeconomic development and democratization increased in societies they attached greater importance to individualistic characteristics such as independent thought and action, concern for the welfare of others in general (as opposed to just specific persons such as family members and other persons in a particular group), openness to change, self-indulgence and pleasure and less importance to collectivist characteristics such as conformity, tradition and security. Triandis has also noted that “[a]s countries become more affluent, their


populations become more individualist. However, this change requires several generations.”

Tang and Koveos have argued that changes in economic conditions are the source of cultural dynamics and found that national wealth, measured by GDP per capita, had a curvilinear relationship with individualism as well as with long-term orientation and power distance scores. These results have led to the suggestion that promotion of individualism in poorer countries could lead to accelerated economic development; however, Hofstede cautioned that the data did not support this strategy and that, in fact, the more likely connection was that the accrual of wealth was a pre-condition to societal movement toward more individualistic values.

The individualist-collectivist dimension has also been widely studied in relation to a variety of leadership and management strategies within organizations. For example, organization of work activities around groups appears to be an effective strategy in collectivist societies given that studies have generally confirmed that group efficacy and group performance are positively related in those instances where collectivism is strong and are not related in situations where collectivism is weak. Similarly, cooperation within teams is higher in collectivist societies and this provides support for research findings that confirm that team-based rewards are more readily embraced in strongly collectivist societies. In turn, individualists are most concerned about themselves and more interested in individual initiative and achievement and more motivated by individual rewards.

In their survey of MBA students enrolled in highly regarded graduate programs in four countries—China, India, the Philippines and the US—Morris et al. found that the managers from China and the Philippines scored higher than their counterparts in India and the US with respect to social conservatism, which meant that managers in China and the Philippines placed a higher value on conformity and adherence to tradition.

The placement of societies on the individualist-collectivist continuum has also been found to be predictive of the most often used and most effective human resources

---

practices in those societies. Triandis summarized some of the major results of the research as follows:\textsuperscript{169}:

- In individualist societies, people were selected on the basis of individual attributes, while in collectivist cultures they were selected on the basis of their group memberships.
- In general, more training occurs in collectivist societies than in individualist societies because employees in collectivist societies are more loyal to the organizations for which they work and thus have higher levels of organizational commitment which make it less likely that they will leave the organization causing the organization to lose the benefits of its investment in training.
- Collectivist societies are more likely than individualist societies to embrace paternalistic leaders and leaders in collectivist societies tend to be much more involved in the lives of their followers, know more about their followers and engage in activities to help their followers.
- Managers in individualistic societies are more concerned about performance than managers in collectivist societies; however, when it comes to interpersonal relationships managers in collectivist societies pay much greater attention than their counterparts in individualistic societies.

One of the most interesting debates regarding the individualism-collectivism dimension is based on the suggestion by Triandis that both individualism and collectivism can be constructively subdivided into two categories—horizontal and vertical.\textsuperscript{170} Based on an analysis of survey data collected in 15 countries Triandis argued that there were seven factors that related to either individualism or collectivism: the three factors relating to individualism included self-reliance and independence, competition and hedonism; the four factors relating to collectivism included interdependence, family integrity, closeness to in-groups and sociability. Triandis further asserted that there were actually various kinds of individualism and collectivism and that there were four dimensions that were universal attributes of individualism and collectivism\textsuperscript{171}:

- Definition of self: Independent versus interdependent;
- Structure of goals: Compatible with in-group goals versus independent of in-group goals;
- Emphasis on norms versus attitudes: Social behavior in collectivist societies is based on norms, duties and obligations while social behavior in individualistic societies is based on attitudes, personal needs, perceived rights and contracts; and
- Emphasis on relatedness versus rationality: Collectivist societies emphasize relatedness, giving priority to relationship and taking into consideration the needs of

others even when the relationships are not personally advantageous while members of individualistic societies emphasize rationality and calculate the benefits associated with a prospective relationship before proceeding with that relationship.

After evaluating his findings Triandis noted that societies differed based on whether differences among members were minimized (homogenous societies) or emphasized (heterogeneous societies). All this led him to conclude that there were horizontal and vertical patterns within both individualism and collectivism and that societies could be measured and categorized based on their relative emphases on horizontal or vertical social relationships—horizontal patterns assume that one self is more or less like every other self while vertical patterns consist of hierarchies and one self is different from other selves. The result is four cultural patterns that have been briefly summarized by Dickson et al. as follows:

- **Horizontal individualism**, a pattern in which people generally want to be unique and distinct from non-kin groups and are highly self-reliant; however, the desire for uniqueness is focused on standing among equals and people are especially interested in obtaining high status or distinction. Sweden is an example of a horizontal individualistic society.

- **Vertical individualism**, a pattern in which people are highly self-reliant; strive for status, distinction and uniqueness; and engage in competitive activities with the goal of outperforming other people. France is an example of a vertical individualistic society.

- **Horizontal collectivism**, a pattern in which people emphasize connectedness, social cohesiveness, common goals and interdependence and see themselves as similar to others; however, they do not easily submit themselves to authority. An Israeli kibbutz is an example of a horizontal collectivist society.

- **Vertical collectivism**, a pattern in which people value the integrity of the “in-group” to which they belong and are therefore willing to subordinate their own personal goals to the goals of their “in-group”, to lend support to the efforts of their “in-group” in competitions with “out-groups” and to unquestioningly follow the directions of authorities to act in ways that those authorities believe are in the best interests of the “in-group” (i.e., behave as a “good citizen”). China and India are examples of a vertical collectivist society.

Triandis provided a useful “Plain English” description of the “four boxes” of a model in which individualism and collectivism are presented with horizontal and vertical aspects: “Horizontal individualism (HI) is found most commonly in Scandinavia, where people want to do their own thing but do not want to “stick out.” Vertical individualism (VI) is more common in the US, especially in competitive situations, where people want to be “the best” and to be noticed by others. Americans often want to be on television and to be mentioned in the newspapers (see the crowds in front of NBC in the morning, waving at

---

Horizontal collectivism (HC) is typical of the Israeli kibbutz. Vertical collectivism (VC) is found in traditional cultures such as rural China or India. Hofstede rejected Triandis’ additional categories as unnecessary because he believed that the horizontal/vertical aspect of individualism was already adequately covered by his large versus small power distance dimension. In fact, several of the characteristics associated with vertical collectivism are similar to those mentioned in discussions of large power distance including traditionalism, respect for authority and following the will of superiors even when subordinates are not convinced of the wisdom of the orders or would personally prefer to follow another course of action. Nonetheless, several researchers have used horizontal/vertical individualism and collectivism to explore various issues relating to management and leadership. For example, one group of researchers identified differences in achievement values between the US and Denmark by using the horizontal/vertical distinctions within the individualistic-collectivistic cultural characteristics and determined that the US was more vertically oriented than Denmark while Denmark was more horizontally oriented than the US. These differences were said to explain why more importance is placed on achievement and displays of success in the US than in Denmark and why Americans mentioned the importance of setting and achieving goals more often than Danes. Other researchers claim to have isolated correlations between authoritarianism—deference to and respect for authority—and vertical individualism and collectivism and have reported reported empirical support for the proposition that individualism and collectivism are unique constructs and should be separated into their own continua rather than following the Hofstede view that they are poles of a single continuum. Dickson et al. have suggested that further research on the horizontal and vertical aspects of individualism and collectivism would be useful since it is likely that different leadership traits will be required to effectively lead and manage persons in each of the four groups.

180 M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, “Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions”, The Leadership Quarterly, 14 (2003), 729-768, 744. This belief is supported in part by observations made by various researchers regarding the beliefs and actions of persons falling into each of the four groups. For example, Triandis and Gelfand found vertical collectivists...
§1:38 --Long-term (future) orientation

In their survey of MBA students enrolled in highly regarded graduate programs in four countries—China, India, the Philippines and the US—Morris et al. found that the managers from China and the Philippines scored higher than their counterparts in India and the US with respect to social conservatism, which meant that managers in China and the Philippines placed a higher value on conformity and adherence to tradition. Sensitivity to cultural values with respect to long-term orientation is particularly important when discussing and negotiating business relationships as to which the parties may have differences of opinion regarding timing. Outsiders to a long-term oriented society need to understand that business opportunities may take longer to develop and must be prepared to act with patience and respect for the local flows and traditions. In contrast, members of short-term oriented societies may be more comfortable with adapting to and implementing change and recasting traditional methods of thinking to suit new circumstances. Time orientation may also correlate with the receptivity of subordinates to long-term planning—in long-term time oriented societies strategic and development plans that extend out for several years are likely to be more accepted than in short-term time oriented societies.

§1:39 Assessing efforts to define and measure culture

Taras et al. examined 121 instruments for measuring culture focusing on describing the work done by other researchers and a variety of fundamental issues and questions including culture definition, dimensionality of culture models, collection and analysis of data for measuring culture, levels of culture measurement, issues of cross-cultural survey equivalence and the reliability and validity of culture measures. Among other things, they provided a useful summary of the specific types of measures that were included in the reviewed materials grouped based on a comparison of names and definitions of specific dimensions and on an analysis of the original items included in the reviewed instruments. Their analysis identified what they called “the twenty-six most popular to be more authoritarian and traditional, but also stressed sociability, while horizontal collectivists stressed sociability, interdependence and hedonism. As for individualists, they found that vertical individualists stressed competition and hedonism more than horizontal individualists and that self-reliance was a trait that horizontal individualists consistently found to be important. H. Triandis and M. Gelfand, “Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism,” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(1) (1998), 118-128, 119.

183 V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”, Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75. The researchers noted that their search for instruments included all available sources, including scholarly journals, books, electronic databases, theses, conference presentations and personal archives and they also emphasized that the search was not confined to particular journals or fields of study.
facets of culture” which they then grouped using construct, content and criterion analysis into major blocks relating either to one of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions or “unique measures”. These 26 measures and related dimensional blocks were as follows\(^\text{184}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self versus Group Interest</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Loyalty</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork and Cooperation</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel-Reliance</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Integration</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Seeking</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perception</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Independence</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identity</td>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/Competitiveness</td>
<td>Masculinity-Femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Masculinity-Femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation Avoidance</td>
<td>Masculinity-Femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality</td>
<td>Masculinity-Femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted Inequality</td>
<td>Power Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of/Preference for Authoritative Decision Making</td>
<td>Power Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity Avoidance</td>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Avoidance</td>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long- versus Short-Term Orientation</td>
<td>Long- versus Short-Term Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Long- versus Short-Term Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional versus Neutral</td>
<td>Unique Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure-seeking</td>
<td>Unique Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Environment</td>
<td>Unique Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinism/Fate</td>
<td>Unique Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellism</td>
<td>Unique Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Unique Measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taras et al. acknowledged the tremendous influence that Hofstede’s dimensional model has had on the field citing various reasons including limited availability of alternatives, convenience, popularity and simply habit and their analysis of all of the measures they reviewed during their examination of the various instruments led them to conclude that 97.5% of those instruments contained at least some measures that were conceptually similar to the dimensions that had been proposed by Hofstede. A further breakdown by dimension confirmed the view of many others regarding the popularity of the individualism-collectivism dimension, evidence of which was found in 65.3% of the reviewed instruments.\(^\text{185}\) 51.2% of the instruments did contain non-Hofstede, or “unique”, measures—the well-known Universalism-Particularism and Affective-Neutral

\(^\text{184}\) Derived from V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”, Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75 (“Table 1: Measures of Culture Included in the Reviewed Instruments”).

\(^\text{185}\) Id. Comparable percentages for the other four Hofstede dimensions were as follows: masculinity-femininity (29.8%), power distance (19.0%), uncertainty avoidance (9.1%) and long- versus short-term orientation (5.8%).
dimensions proposed by Trompenaar and the dimensions that Schwartz included in his model, each of which are discussed elsewhere in this publication; however, very few of the instruments, generally from non-management literature, failed to include measures that could be linked to at least one of the Hofstede dimensions. Taras et al. made several other interesting observations regarding the various dimensional models that they had observed and evaluated. First of all, several of the models, although not many, used sub-dimensions that teased out finer points of one or more of the primary dimensions. One illustration of this was the use of various sub-dimensions by Hui and others that were related to Individualism-Collectivism including Spouse, Mother, Sibling, Relative, Friend, Co-Worker, Neighbor, Acquaintance, Stranger and Foreigner.

Second, while most of the models were unidimensional and bipolar (e.g., individualism and collectivism were opposite extremes of one dimension or the positioning of societies with respect to uncertainty avoidance occurred on a continuum from “high” to “low”) there have been attempts to describe constructs using multiple dimensions (e.g., vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism and establish more than just two descriptive categories for a particular dimension (e.g., the value orientations of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, which are generally represented on a three-point continuum such as mastery, harmony and subjugation for their value orientation of the relationship of individuals and groups with nature). Third, in many cases the instruments appeared to mix questions regarding “practices” and “beliefs”, a practice that Taras et al. cautioned might lead to “possible construct contamination”. Finally, Taras et al. argued that what they referred to as “confusing construct definitions” often led to “questionable

---

186 V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”, Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75. Taras et al. noted that one example of a dimensional structure that was very different than Hofstede was the one derived from the World Value Survey and promoted by Inglehart et al. See R. Inglehart, M. Basañez and A. Moreno, Human Values and Beliefs: A Cross-Cultural Sourcebook. Political, religious, sexual, and economic norms in 43 societies. Findings from the 1990-1993 World Values Survey (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998); and R. Inglehart, M. Basañez, J. Diez-Medrano, L. Halman and R. Luijkkx, Human Beliefs and Values (Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores, 2004).


190 Taras et al. pointed out that “[w]hile it has been traditionally assumed that there is a positive relationship between different layers of culture (e.g., values and behaviors) it is not necessarily true” and went on with a reminder that the GLOBE researchers had actually demonstrated empirically that there was a possibility of no relationship or even a strong negative relationship between values and practices. V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”, Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75 (citing R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004)).
integrations of seemingly different measures into a single construct”. They noted, for example, issues created by the extensive list of suggested implications of cultural differences offered by Hofstede in his explanation of the individualism dimension as well as the well-documented debate surrounding Hofstede’s masculinity-femininity dimension described elsewhere in this publication and also commented that uncertainty avoidance is often confused with risk aversion and power distance is confused with power seeking.

Taras et al. noted that it was important for researchers to step back and reevaluate whether all of the societal differences they had identified in their studies with respect to “values” or “practices” were, in fact, determined by culture as opposed to being driven by factors that were not culturally related. In other words, Taras et al. suggested that “simply finding a statistical difference between two national averages is not sufficient to conclude that the construct is a facet of culture or is culture-bound”. To shed more light on this question Taras et al. put together a list of the cultural dimensions they had found in their review of the instruments used by other researchers and sent it to 36 leading cross-cultural management scholars with a request that they evaluate, based on their experience, the extent to which each of the dimensions included on the list were determined by culture and the extent to which they affected the behavior of individuals in the workplace. Participants in the survey provided their evaluations using a 5-point Likert-type scale with “5” being “very relevant” and “1” being “very irrelevant” and the results of the survey are summarized as follows (the first score after each dimensional name and summary is the average for “relevance to workplace”, the second score is the average for “relevance to culture” and the third score combines the first two scores):

191 The descriptions offered by Hofstede of the construct of individualism-collectivism were not consistent over the years. In one instance Hofstede operationalized the construct by focusing on items such as concern for working conditions, employment security and the need for the adventure element of the job while later defining the construct somewhat differently and more vaguely as “the relationship between the individual and the collectivity [and] the way people live together”. Adding to the confusion was Hofstede’s list of the traits of an individualistic society that included encouragement of initiative, job autonomy and self-minded pursuit of individual goals. See G. Hofstede, Culture’s Consequences: International differences in work-related values (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1980); and G. Hofstede, Culture’s Consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2d ed.) (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 2001).

192 As discussed elsewhere in this publication, the GLOBE researchers ultimately concluded that certain items traditionally embedded in the masculinity-femininity construct, such as achievement orientation and gender egalitarianism, are theoretically separate factors that warrant measurement on their own as distinguishable constructs or dimensions. See R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). Other researchers also appeared to mix achievement and gender egalitarianism items when testing and measuring masculinity. See, e.g., O. Furrer, B. Liu and D. Sudharshan, “The relationships between culture and service quality perceptions: Basis for cross-cultural market segmentation and resource allocation”, Journal of Service Research, 2(4) (2000), 355-371 (including both of the following items in their measurement of masculinity: “Money and material things are important” and “Both men and women are allowed to be tender and to be concerned with relationships”).


194 Derived from V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”,
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Achievement Orientation: Willingness to win advance get a better position earn more and succeed at any cost even if it means harmed interpersonal relations and/or sacrifice of personal life 3.14 3.87 7.01

Ambiguity Avoidance: The degree to which people are made nervous by uncertain situations and ambiguity and prefer to have clear rules guidance bureaucratic practices and rituals for every situation 3.61 3.73 7.33

Assertiveness: The extent to which an individual exhibits assertive self-confident and tough behavior and values 3.87 3.25 7.12

Attitude to Ritual Suicide: The degree to which individuals can accept or even encourage suicide performed as a point of honor or for a perceived higher purpose (e.g. suicide bombing or hara-kiri ) 1.85 3.76 5.62

Believing in Evil/Good Basic Human Nature: Believing that people are essentially bad or good and as a result always expect people to behave badly (avoid work steal lie) or well (work hard be helpful be honest). 3.09 2.91 5.99

Believing in Changeable/Unchangeable Basic Human Nature: Believing that people’s nature/character does not change with time 3.11 2.89 6.00

Conformity: The degree to which individuals restrain their actions inclinations and impulses that are likely to upset or harm others 3.32 3.45 6.77

Conservatism: The degree to which people resist quick change and try to preserve the traditional way of doing things 3.29 3.49 6.78

Determinism: The degree to which people believe that their paths are predetermined by the forces they cannot control and what has to happen will happen regardless of their efforts 2.64 3.45 6.10

Family Integration: The degree to which individuals maintain close ties with their extended families consult their family members when making important decisions and believe that family members should live as close to each other as possible 2.70 4.17 6.87

Gender Equality: Perceiving roles and abilities of men and women as equal and believing that men and women have the same rights and responsibilities and are capable of performing equally well on most work-related tasks including managing people 3.61 4.17 7.78

Pleasure-Seeking: The extent to which people emphasize pleasure and enjoyment of life and attribute secondary role to the work life; belief that people work to live not live to work 3.09 2.88 5.97

Humane Orientation: The degree to which individuals encourage and reward fairness altruism generosity caring and being kind to others 3.15 3.14 6.29

Inclination to Teamwork: Preference to work in a team rather than work alone willingness to share responsibilities rewards and punishments with the team members and being ready to put interests of the team before personal interests 3.87 3.08 6.95

Independent-Interdependent Self-Perception: The extent to which individuals include close relationships in their representation of self. In other words, the extent to which individuals feel that their relatives, friends, and organizations they belong to are an important part of themselves 3.46 3.68 7.14

---

Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75 (“Table 2: The Results of Expert Opinion Survey”).
Emotional vs. Neutral: The degree to which people believe that displaying feelings at work is unprofessional and inappropriate 3.25 3.62 6.87

Machiavellism: The extent to which a person is manipulative deceiving and willing to use dirty tricks when dealing with others 3.62 2.10 5.73

Personal Independence: The degree to which individuals value their privacy believe what happens to them is their own doing and prefer to struggle through personal problems or enjoy personal achievement by themselves 3.36 3.51 6.86

Power Distance: The extent to which people expect and accept that power in organizations is distributed unequally; degree of inequality among people which the individual accepts as normal 3.91 3.99 7.90

Relationship Depth: The degree to which individuals develop close relationships with their co-workers and remain close friends and interact frequently outside the workplace settings 3.41 3.26 6.67

Relationship to Environment: Subjugation vs. mastery; the extent to which people feel they can and should change the environment vs. they should adjust themselves to the environment 3.28 3.09 6.37

Risk Avoidance: The extent to which people are reluctant to take risk or make risky decisions 3.80 2.70 6.50

Self-Identity: The extent to which individuals emphasize their personal identity independent of others strive to be original and different and do not like to be identified with their groups such as families or organizations 2.96 3.28 6.25

Self-Reliance: The degree to which individuals tend to rely on themselves in difficult situations rather than expect help from others 3.65 3.35 7.00

Short- vs. Long-Term Orientation: Seeking quick gains even if it means losses in the future vs. focusing on the future outcomes and being ready to suffer losses in the short-run for the sake of future gains 3.57 3.13 6.70

Status by Ascription vs. Status by Achievement: Perceiving status based on who the person is (son of a famous or wealthy person royalty older person man) vs. perceiving status based on person’s personal achievement and skills 3.61 4.07 7.68

Universalism vs. Particularism: People with universalism orientation believe that rules must apply equally to everyone and under every circumstance; while people with particularism orientation believe that some exceptions from rules can be made depending on the person (e.g., close friend) and mitigating circumstances 3.65 3.73 7.38

Several interesting observations can be made regarding the results. First of all, several dimensions, notably Machiavellism and interestingly “risk avoidance”, scored significantly lower than the other dimensions with respect to their perceived relationship to culture. On the other hand, the survey provided support for the influence of cultural differences on country values and practices relative to achievement orientation, ambiguity avoidance (i.e., uncertainty avoidance), family integration (i.e., in-group collectivism), gender equality, independent-interdependent self-perception (i.e., individualist-collectivist), power distance and status ascription (i.e., status by ascription versus status by achievement). Second, to the extent that cross-cultural management scholars are primarily interested in what goes on in the workplace, there were relatively few dimensions that were perceived to be strongly relevant for their work such as assertiveness, inclination to teamwork, power distance and risk avoidance. Notably,
many of the dimensions that were tabbed as culture-based were not considered very relevant for analyzing and understanding what happens in the workplace (e.g., “family integration”) and, by the same token, dimensions important to studying the workplace were often not relevant to culture (e.g., “risk avoidance”). Focusing on the combined scores, Taras et al. concluded that very few of the dimensions on the list could be classified as both determined by culture and related to the workplace—ambiguity avoidance, gender equality, power distance, status ascription and universalism-particularism—and they counseled that scholars interested only in workplace behavior might do well to consider this when designing their surveys and exclude other dimensions that are more relevant to other issues such as politics or family.\footnote{V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”, Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75. Taras et al. noted that “[u]nexpectedly, the measures related to the immensely popular Individualism-Collectivism construct did not score highly, with the possible exception of Independent-Interdependent Self-Perception that came out in the sixth position with a combined score of 7.14”.}

### §1:40 Suggestion for convergence: Nardon and Steers

As part of their extensive survey of the relevant research, Taras et al. noted the steady increase in the number of dimensions that researchers included in their models in an effort to capture all aspects of a complex phenomenon such as “culture” but concluded that “despite the great variety of dimensions, it is still too early to claim that every aspect of culture is captured by a single model or even by all existing models taken together”. However, they want on to say that even though there are almost certainly pieces of the puzzle that are missing and/or which might require more dimensions, “the marginal utility of additional measures is probably diminishing” and researchers must strive to achieve “a balance between comprehensiveness and parsimony”.\footnote{V. Taras, J. Rowney and P. Steel, “Half a century of measuring culture: Approaches, challenges, limitations and suggestions based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture”, Journal of International Management, 15(4) (2009), 50-75.} In other words, it is time to take a closer look at ways to achieve some sort of convergence among all the suggested dimensional models so that the information generated from the research can be effectively digested and put into practice by managers.

Nardon and Steers praised the various models of cultural dimensions referred to and described above for their functionality in facilitating an orderly comparison of societal cultures based on dimensions that were generally well reasoned and supported by empirical evidence generated from studies carried out in numerous societies around the world. They noted that without the ability to break down their assessments of various societies based on criteria such as power distance and uncertainty avoidance researchers seeking to make order out of why and how people act in societies would likely be overwhelmed in details. Nardon and Steers also noted the utility of the scores and rankings for societies provided as part of several of the models as a means for identifying and understanding cultural differences among societies even if the measurements are not highly precise or only generally indicative of the societies. However, the biggest concern of Nardon and Steers was what they referred to as a “lack of convergence” among the
models of cultural dimensions caused by what they explained was a “focus on different aspects of societal believes, norms, or values”. In their eyes the lack of convergence undermined the utility of the models and forced researchers to fit their research questions and findings into models that might not be the best fit and subject them to criticism based on their selection of model rather than the content or quality of their empirical work.\textsuperscript{197}

As the discussion above of the debate between Hofstede and the GLOBE researchers regarding the processes and findings of the GLOBE study illustrates there is often a tendency in the field to identify the one “best model” of cultural dimensions and advocate for its use in lieu of any of the others. Nardon and Steers argued for a quite different approach based on the fundamental and intuitively reasonable assumption that “all of the models have important factors to contribute to our understanding of culture as it relates to management practices” and that it would therefore make sense to “integrate and adapt the various models based on their utility for better understanding business and management in cross-cultural settings.”\textsuperscript{198} They then went on to suggest the use of the following five “common themes” that they identified based on their comparisons of the major cultural dimension models:\textsuperscript{199}

- **Relationship with the Environment**, which focuses on the relationship of people with their natural and social environment and the extent to which people seek to change and control or live in harmony with their natural and social surroundings. Scale anchors for this dimension would be “mastery” versus “harmony”. Nardon and Steers argued that this theme ran through the models proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, Schwartz and GLOBE.

- **Social Organization**, which focuses on the role of individuals and groups in the society and the extent to which social relationships emphasize individual rights and responsibilities or group goals and collective action. Scale anchors for this dimension would be “individualism” versus “conservatism”. Nardon and Steers argued that this theme ran through all of the major cultural dimension models.

- **Power Distribution**, which focuses on distribution of power within a society and the extent to which it is distributed hierarchically or in an egalitarian or participative manner. Scale anchors for this dimension would be “hierarchical” versus “egalitarian”. Nardon and Steers argued that this theme ran through the models proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, Schwartz and GLOBE.

- **Rule Orientation**, which focuses on the relative importance of rules in a society and the extent to which behavior in a society is regulated by rules, laws and formal procedures or by other factors such as unique circumstances and relationships. Scale anchors for this dimension would be “rule-based” versus “relationship-based”. Nardon and Steers argued that this theme ran through the models proposed by Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner and GLOBE.


\textsuperscript{198} Id.

\textsuperscript{199} Id.
- Time Orientation, which focuses on perceptions of time and strategies for processing of tasks in a society and the extent to which people organize their time based on sequential attention to single tasks or simultaneous attention to multiple tasks. Scale anchors for this dimension would be “monochromic” versus “polychromic”. Nardon and Steers argued that this theme ran through the models proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Hall, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner and GLOBE.

The characteristics of what Nardon and Steers referred to as the “Big Five” cultural dimensions are explained in the following sections, which also include a discussion of their rationale in constructing each of the dimensions and how they incorporate specific elements of the other models. Narson and Steers conceded the limitations of their efforts caused, in part, by their overriding goal to simplify the area and, in effect, clear the “cultural jungle”. For example, they noted that they needed to attempt to merge multiple dimensions in the original models into a single more general or unifying cultural dimension and that they also tried to focus on the “deeper meaning” of the concepts embedded in the dimensions in the original models rather than the descriptive adjectives that the originators of those models may have selected for their dimensions. It is also important to emphasize that the Nardon and Steers model is not based on the collection and analysis of empirical data but rather represents an honest and interesting attempt to interpret and integrate the substantial work that has already been done by the researchers responsible for the original models in order to create a paradigm that Nardon and Steers believed would be “more relevant for the contemporary workplace”.

The suggestions made by Nardon and Steers are consistent with the view of Hofstede and others that it is best to limit the number of cultural dimensions to avoid unnecessary complexity and redundancy. Taras et al. noted the steady increase in the number of dimensions that researchers included in their models in an effort to capture all aspects of a complex phenomenon such as “culture” but also concluded that “despite the great variety of dimensions, it is still too early to claim that every aspect of culture is captured by an single model or even by all existing models taken together”. However, they went on to say that even though there are almost certainly pieces of the puzzle that are missing and/or which might require more dimensions, “the marginal utility of additional measures is probably diminishing” and researchers must strive to achieve “a balance between comprehensiveness and parsimony”. Schwartz has also opined that as few as three or

---

200 For example, Nardon and Steers specifically noted several other “themes” that they chose not to included in their “Big Five” since they were only related to one of the major cultural dimension models including “human nature” (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck), “physical space” (Hall), “emotion displays” (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner) and “role integration” (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner). See L. Nardon and R. Steers, “The culture theory jungle: divergence and convergence in models of national culture”, in R. Bhagat and R. Steers (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009).

201 Id.

202 They noted, for example, that Hofstede had begun with four dimensions and the added one more and that subsequent researchers had offered solutions that included seven (Trompenaars), ten (Schwartz) and eighteen (GLOBE) dimensions.

four dimensions, each comprising a pair of nearly opposite orientations, might suffice to capture the broad differences in cultural values among societies. Based on his own work and studying the correlations of his findings to the work of others he suggested that a workable, yet robust, model might include a dimension dealing with the desirable degree of independence of the person from in-groups versus embeddedness in these groups (i.e., Schwartz’s autonomy/embeddedness and elements of Hofstede’s individualism); a dimension dealing with the desirability of equal versus hierarchical allocation of resources, roles, rights and obligations among persons and groups (i.e., Schwartz’s egalitarianism/hierarchy and elements of Hofstede’s power distance); and a dimension concerned with the relative desirability of assertively using or changing the social and natural environment in the active pursuit of goals versus maintaining harmony in relations to this environment (i.e., Schwartz’s mastery/harmony and Hofstede’s masculinity).

§1:41 --Mastery—harmony

All of the major cultural dimension models other than the one proposed by Hall placed some importance on the how societies approached their relationship with their environment and specifically the degree to which societies either tried to exert control over their environment or accept environmental conditions and adapt to them. Nardon and Steers argued, however, that while some models specifically focused on the issue of individual control over nature or the environment other models took a somewhat different approach by using dimensions based on whether members of society valued achievement as opposed to accommodation with nature. Nardon and Steers believed that the highest level of clarity could be achieved by combining all this under a general issue or problem of a society’s relationship with its environment and asking whether the “overarching societal goal ... [was] either controlling or accommodating one’s natural and social surroundings.” The themes associated with this dimension were derived from the following aspects of the major cultural dimension models:

- Two of the dimensions in the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck model—the Relationship of Individuals and Groups with Nature (i.e., mastery, subjugation and harmony) and the Orientation Regarding Preferred Forms of Activities (i.e., being, becoming and doing): In mastery societies, individuals have a duty to try and control nature while individuals in harmony societies focus on working with nature to maintain harmony or balance. Doing societies encourage individuals to act on the environment to achieve specific goals and accomplishments.

---

204 S. Schwartz, “Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World”, in H. Vinken, J. Soeters and P. Ester (Eds.), Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004). Schwartz noted that he was referring only to “value” dimension and conceded that there were other dimensions of cultural difference that were important and should be studied and understood including things such as the tightness or looseness of normative systems, degree of emotional expressiveness and time perspective.

205 Id.

• Hofstede’s masculinity-femininity dimension: Nardon and Steers noted that one of the main values in masculine societies was “control over the environment” while feminine societies valued “harmony with the environment”. Other related values found in masculine societies included assertiveness and achievement.

• The Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner internal/external (inner-directed/outer-directed) dimension: This dimension distinguishes societies on the degree to which members believe they can exert control over their environment as opposed to believing that their environment controls them and thus they should simply learn how to adapt to it.

• Schwartz’s mastery/harmony dimension: This dimension focuses on how societies cope with problem of regulating how their members manage their relations to the natural and social world. In mastery societies, individuals value succeeding and getting ahead through “self-assertion” and proactively seek to master, direct and change the natural and social world. In harmony societies, individuals are content to accept and fit into the natural and social world as they find it and value “unity with nature”.

• Three dimensions from GLOBE that Nardon and Steers claimed were interrelated and could be subsumed under a general topic of goal orientation—assertiveness, performance orientation and humane orientation: Assertiveness and performance orientation tracked mastery while humane orientation tracked harmony. Relevant values associated with the listed GLOBE dimensions include assertiveness and aggressiveness (assertiveness dimension), innovation, change and performance improvement (performance orientation) and caring and kindness to others (humane orientation).

Nardon and Steers noted, quite correctly, that there is substantial evidence to support the general proposition that there is variation among societies with respect to how individuals in those societies relate to one another and with their external environment (“nature”). They argued that the main issue seems to be whether these universal societal issues or problems should be analyzed using one dimension, as is the case with the models proposed by Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner and Schwartz, or whether it is more appropriate and helpful to accept the premise underlying the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck and GLOBE models that there are several independent dimensions (e.g., assertiveness, performance orientation and humane orientation) that should be used to understand the behaviors that are being studied. Nardon and Steers suggest that for a better and more practical understanding of cross-cultural management issues “it is logical to focus on a small number of critical dimensions that account for most of managerial behavior instead of cutting the cultural pie into several smaller slices”. They then conclude that Schwartz’s mastery/harmony dimension is the preferred way to describe and measure differences among societies with respect to two important issues or problems: the extent to which individuals in societies seek achievement at the expense of relationships and the extent to which individuals in societies seek control over the natural and social world as opposed to coping through accommodation and harmony. Nardon and Steers also borrowed the terms “mastery” and “harmony” from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck and Schwartz and used them as the preferred descriptor for this dimension in their model.
The following table describes how Nardon and Steers integrated the findings from other models of cultural dimensions to create a comparative list of characteristics of mastery and harmony societies for their “relationship with environment” dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on changing or controlling one’s natural and social environment</td>
<td>Focus on living in harmony with nature and adjusting to one’s natural and social environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement valued over relationships</td>
<td>Relationships valued over achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on competition in the pursuit of personal or group goals</td>
<td>Emphasis on social progress, quality of life and the welfare of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on material possessions as symbols of achievement</td>
<td>Emphasis on economy, harmony and modesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on assertive, proactive, “masculine” approach</td>
<td>Emphasis on passive, reactive, “feminine” approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency toward the experimental; receptivity toward change</td>
<td>Tendency toward the cautious; skepticism toward change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for performance-based extrinsic rewards</td>
<td>Preference for seniority-based intrinsic rewards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nardon and Steers also suggested several additional areas for future research relating to this dimension including exploration of the degree to which beliefs about control and “need for achievement” are actually correlated and the relationship between gender differences across societies and perceptions of control.²⁰⁷

§1:42 --Individualism--collectivism

All of the major cultural dimension models placed some importance on social organization and recognized that a fundamental question for all societies is how they select the structures that govern social relations among their members. Moreover, Nardon and Steers, following the lead of others mentioned above, have noted that the individualism-collectivism dimension, which they also incorporated into their model, has probably received the greatest amount of attention among cross-cultural researchers and that it is widely accepted that some societies address social organization through reliance on groups and emphasis of social harmony over individual rights (collectivism) while the organization of other societies is based on preservation of individual rights and freedom of individuals to pursue their own goals and achievements (individualism). Nardon and Steers commented that they felt that the fundamental difference among the major models with respect to this dimension was how it related to the issue of power distribution—in some cases researchers suggested a single “relationships among people” dimension that

²⁰⁷ Nardon and Steers noted that while there appears to be evidence of differences across societies with regard to “gender differences” it is unclear how those societal differences relate to other cultural characteristics such as assumptions regarding control, achievement needs or power distribution. All this is central to the ongoing debate about Hofstede’s masculinity-femininity dimension described above.
dealt with both social organization and power while other researchers separated those two areas into separate and independent dimensions (i.e., individualism-collectivism and hierarchical-egalitarianism (power distance)). The themes associated with this dimension were derived from the following aspects of the major cultural dimension models:

- The Relationships Among Individuals dimensions in the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck model: This dimension included three categories. The first two, individualistic and collateral (group), focused on the issue of how the social structure of a society should be organized; however, the third category, lineal (hierarchical), focused on the power distribution issue with hierarchical societies accepting that social structure should be organized based on groups (i.e., collaterally) that were also placed in a clear and rigid hierarchical relationship.

- Hofstede’s individualistic-collectivistic dimension: In individualistic societies individuals are raised to be responsible for their own interests while in collectivist societies the interests of the group are emphasized over the interests of individuals and personal relationships and the central roles of the family in both personal and business affairs are emphasized. Group decision making is the norm in collectivist societies and groups protect their members from outsiders in exchange for absolute loyalty to the group from those members. Hofstede is generally credited with coining the terms generally associated with this dimension.

- The Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner individualism/collectivism (communitarianism) dimension: Like Hofstede’s dimension, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner also distinguished societies based on the relative weight given to individual versus group interests although for reasons that were unclear to Nardon and Steers application of the two models led to different characterizations of various countries such as Argentina and Mexico.

- Schwartz’s autonomy/embeddedness (conservatism) dimension: This dimension deals with the nature of the relation or the boundaries between the person and the group and categorizes societies based on the extent to which people are autonomous as opposed to embedded in their groups. While other models distinguished among various types of collectivism Schwarz argued that there are two types of autonomy (individualism)—intellectual, referring to self-direction and independence of thought, and affective, referring to the pursuit of individual interests and desires.

- GLOBE’s institutional collectivism dimension: This dimension, one of two collectivism dimensions in the GLOBE model, focuses on the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action. Nardon and Steers noted in-group

---


209 Hofstede’s analysis of these two societies led him to characterize them as “collectivist” while they were placed in the “individualistic” group by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner. Nardon and Steers wondered whether this difference could be attributed to different measurement techniques or changes in the cultural characteristics of the two societies during the ten-year gap between the data collection and empirical analysis conducted by the different researchers. See L. Nardon and R. Steers, “The culture theory jungle: divergence and convergence in models of national culture”, in R. Bhagat and R. Steers (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009).
collectivism, the other GLOBE collectivism dimension (the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, cohesiveness and interdependence in their organizations or families), but felt that it was more related to the individual level of analysis and that institutional collectivism and its focus on the societal level of analysis was the most relevant to cross-cultural studies of management practices.

- Hall’s context dimension: This dimension focuses on the extent to which the context of a message is as important as the content of the message itself. Nardon and Steers noted that low context societies, where the content of message contains all or most of the information intended to be part of the communication, tended to be more individualistic, while high context societies, where the context surrounding transmission of the content message also carries significant information regarding the communication, tended to be more collectivist. Members of high context societies seek to develop and maintain a number of significant relationships and maximize the use of “people networks” and one sees clear divisions between in-groups and out-groups in high context societies with respect to psychological and physical space. On the other hand, members of low context societies do not invest as much effort in relationships and it is difficult to identify significant divisions between in-groups and out-groups in low context societies.

Nardon and Steers concluded that the fundamental issue addressed by this dimension was how societal and interpersonal relationships are organized and that the answer would come from the following series of basic questions:

- Do people achieve self-identity through their own efforts or through group membership?
- Are individual or group goals more important?
- Do group sanctions reinforce personal responsibility or conformity to group norms?
- Is individual or group decision making preferred?
- Is business conducted primarily based on written contracts or based on personal relationships and trust?

---

210 Nardon and Steers cited several other interest characteristics of low and high context societies which they believed to grounded in fundamental solutions to the problem of societal organization. For example, in low context societies a premium is placed on practices that enhance message clarity such as written contracts while in high context societies the way something is said is often more important than what is said and communication of information is based on long-term personal relationships and mutual trust rather than formalization of words. The strength of relationships in high context societies minimizes the need seen in low context societies to use an abundance of spoken or written words.

211 Triandis, noting that there are key differences between individualist and collectivist cultures regarding perceptions and behaviors of people, also specifically observed that in collectivist cultures “context” is much more important than “content” (i.e., people in collectivist cultures pay more attention to how something is said—focusing on tone of voice and gestures—than to the finer points of what is included in the communication). H. Triandis, “The many dimensions of culture”, Academy of Management Executive, 18(1) (2004), 88-93, 90. For further discussion of Hall’s cultural dimensions model and specific characteristics of low and high context societies, see the chapter on “Cross-Cultural Studies” in this Library.

Is communication characterized primarily by low context (where the message contains all or most of the intended message) or by high context (where the context surrounding transmission of the message also carries significant information)?

The following table describes how Nardon and Steers integrated the findings from other models of cultural dimensions to create a comparative list of characteristics of individualism and collectivism societies for their “social organization” dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-centered approach valued; primary loyalty to oneself</td>
<td>Group-centered approach valued; primary loyalty to the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for preserving individual rights over social harmony</td>
<td>Preference for preserving social harmony over individual rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that people achieve self-identity through individual accomplishment</td>
<td>Belief that people achieve self-identity through group membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on accomplishing individual goals</td>
<td>Focus on accomplishing group goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions reinforce independence and personal responsibility</td>
<td>Sanctions reinforce conformity to group norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract-based agreements</td>
<td>Relationship-based agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency toward low-context (direct, frank) communication</td>
<td>Tendency toward high-context (subtle, indirect) communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency toward individual decision making</td>
<td>Tendency toward group or participative decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nardon and Steers suggested that it might be useful for future research on individualism-collectivism to delve into learning more about how this dimension related to the other dimensions included in their model. Nardon and Steers noted specifically the theories of Triandis discussed above and one example of a pathway for further inquiry would be additional evaluation of the relationship between individualism-collectivism and power distribution (i.e., the hierarchical-egalitarian dimension—which clearly has horizontal and vertical elements to it—explained immediately below).

§1:43  **Hierarchical—egalitarian**

The distribution of power within a society and the extent to which it is distributed hierarchically or in an egalitarian or participative manner is another common theme among the major cultural dimension models and can clearly be seen in various ways in the models proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, Schwartz and GLOBE. As noted above, Hofstede argued that inequality within groups is a fundamental condition of society and all societies have some degree of inequality; however, research using this dimension appears to illustrate and confirm that some societies are more unequal than others. Schwartz did not necessarily accept the inevitability of inequality but did note that societal structuring in a hierarchical or egalitarian manner was important to coping with the societal problem of guaranteeing responsible behavior by members of the society that will support preservation of the
social fabric of the society and promote efficient management of the inevitable interdependencies among members of the society. The themes associated with this dimension were derived from the following aspects of the major cultural dimension models:\(^{213}\):

- One of the dimensions in the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck model focused on relationships among individuals and the beliefs in the society regarding the preferred and generally accepted as legitimate form of social structure and their model distinguished among social structures organized based on relative equality (collateral or group societies) and structures based on placement of individuals and groups in a clear and rigid hierarchical relationship (lineal or hierarchical societies).
- Hofstede coined the now well used term of “power distance” to describe this dimension and meant for the term to indicate the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations (e.g., for-profit business firms) is distributed unequally. In large power distance societies there is a belief in order of inequality in the world in which everybody has a rightful place while smaller power distance societies believe that inequality in society should be minimized and everyone should have equal rights. Those in power do not necessarily need to exercise control in an abusive fashion and power may be accompanied by benevolent control over the welfare of all members of society.
- Schwartz suggested that societies can be placed on a continuum between “hierarchical” and “egalitarian”. The chain of authority and hierarchical organizational structures are important elements in hierarchical societies, which are similar to large power distance societies, and it can be expected that leaders and subordinates in those societies accept unequal distribution of power and status as legitimate, necessary and expected and that subordinates will passively and unquestionably comply with directives received from those vested with power and authority. Egalitarian societies stand at the opposite end of the spectrum—similar to low power distance societies—and all persons, regardless of their formal titles and positions, view one another as moral equals and expect that subordinates will have an opportunity to provide meaningful input with respect to decisions that impact their activities and the goals that are set for their organization.
- The achievement/ascription dimension in the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner model distinguishes societies on the basis of how they distribute status and authority and has a good deal of similarity to power distance. The basic question is: do we have to prove ourselves to receive status or is it given (ascribed) to us based on inheritance or other factors unrelated to achievement?”
- The GLOBE researchers followed Hofstede in using the term power distance for their version of this dimension and defined the term as the extent to which a collective accepts and endorses authority, power differences and status privileges. The GLOBE

researchers also identified characteristics of high and low power distance societies that were similar to those explained by Hofstede.\textsuperscript{214}

Nardon and Steers concluded that the fundamental issue addressed by this dimension was whether societies chose to structure power relationships, and distribute power, vertically or horizontally and selected hierarchical and egalitarian as the names for the scale anchors of this dimension. They also suggested the orientation of societies on this dimension could be derived from their answers to the following series of basic questions\textsuperscript{215}:

- Should authority ultimately reside in institutions such as dictatorships or absolute monarchies or in the people themselves?
- Should organizations be structured vertically (e.g., tall organizational structures) or horizontally (e.g., flat organizational structures or network structures)?
- Is decision making generally autocratic or participatory?
- Are leaders within the society selected based on their qualification or based on the preexisting status and standing within the community?
- Are leaders within the society elected or appointed?
- Are members of society willing to question authority or reluctant to challenge those who are in charge?

The following table describes how Nardon and Steers integrated the findings from other models of cultural dimensions to create a comparative list of characteristics of hierarchical and egalitarian societies for their “power distribution” dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchical</th>
<th>Egalitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief that power should be distributed hierarchically</td>
<td>Belief that power should be distributed equally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in ascribed or inherited power with ultimate authority residing in institutions</td>
<td>Belief in shared or elected power with ultimate authority residing in the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on organizing vertically</td>
<td>Emphasis on organizing horizontally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for autocratic or centralized decision-making</td>
<td>Preference for participatory or decentralized decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on who is in charge</td>
<td>Emphasis on who is best qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for authority; reluctance to question authority</td>
<td>Suspicious of authority; willingness to question authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{214} Nardon and Steers noted that the GLOBE researchers also identified a specific dimension, gender egalitarianism, dealing with a slightly different aspect of the general issue of distribution of power—minimization of gender differences; however, Nardon and Steers apparently were comfortable that most of the issues associated with gender egalitarianism could be succumbed within their hierarchical/egalitarian dimension.

As noted above, Nardon and Steers believed that it would be fruitful to conduct further research on the relationship between power distribution and social organization/relationship orientation (i.e., the individualism-collectivism dimension). Taking a position similar that of Dickson et al. discussed above, Nardon and Steers argue for further research on the four cultural types suggested by Triandis to more clearly identify how power distribution and social organization fit together in the workplace and influence leadership behaviors and the reactions of subordinates to the leadership styles and actions of their managers.

§1:44 --Rule-based—relationship-based

Risk tolerance and the use of rules, laws and formal procedures to cope with and avoid uncertainty are themes found in the models proposed by Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner and GLOBE; however, Nardon and Steers detected variations in emphasis among the models. As noted above, the uncertainty avoidance dimension appears in both the Hofstede and GLOBE models; however, Nardon and Steers argued that Hofstede and GLOBE focused on somewhat different issues. Hofstede, they said, was more concerned with societal “risk tolerance” and, in fact, Hofstede did define uncertainty avoidance in his model as the degree to which members in a society feel comfortable with ambiguous and uncertain situations, and take steps to avoid them. In strong uncertainty avoidance societies, where there is a compelling need to cope with and avoid uncertainty, there is an attempt to provide greater career stability, a tendency to establish more formal rules and intolerance of deviant ideas and behaviors. Hofstede believed that strong uncertainty avoidance societies needed clarity and structure and that there was an emotional need for rules even if the rules are sometimes ignored or disobeyed. In contrast, in countries where uncertainty avoidance is low there tended to be more flexibility in jobs and roles, more job mobility and emphasis on general as opposed to specialized skills. The GLOBE researchers, in the opinion of Nardon and Steers, were more concerned with the level of reliance that societies placed on rules and regulations to reduce uncertainty and, in fact, the designers of the GLOBE project survey defined uncertainty avoidance as the extent to which a society, organization, or group relies on established social norms, rituals, rules, laws, institutions and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of future events (i.e., avoid uncertainty). The GLOBE researchers did indeed appear to be more concerned than Hofstede about such thing as the use of formality in social interactions and reliance on legal contracts and formalized policies and procedures; however, resistance to change and preferences regarding risk-taking were also elements of the GLOBE dimension. The universalism/particularism dimension in the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner model focused on the relative importance that societies placed on formal and standardized rules and laws as opposed to personal relationships. Members of universalistic societies focus more on formal rules, codes, values and standards and believe that they take precedence over the needs and claims of friends and other personal relationships; however, members of more particularistic societies focus more on human friendships and personal relationships than on formal rules and laws.
While discussing what they perceived as differences among the three models Nardon and Steers also concluded that they were all in agreement that societies could be differentiated based on their use of rules to control behavior. Nardon and Steers went on to take the position that “rather than comparing cultures on the extent to which they attempt to ignore or tolerate uncertainty, it is better to compare cultures based on how they try and deal with it.” This led them to suggest that rule orientation was a more meaningful contribution to a model of cultural dimensions since it dealt not only with coping with uncertainty but also with what they called “other critical managerial action” and they decided that the clearest way to express the factors associated with this dimension was to distinguish between rule-based and relationship-based societies.

As the name implies, rule-based societies depend heavily on the laws, rules, regulations, bureaucratic procedures and strict social norms as tools that the society and its members can depend upon to control unanticipated events or behaviors. Members of rule-based societies conform to officially-sanctioned rules and limitations without question out of a sense of moral duty to the rule of law and rules are generally universally applied with few exceptions for individual circumstances. On the other hand, relationship-based societies rely on influential people rather than objective rules and regulations to achieve social control. The requisite “influence” can come from a number of different sources including parents, peers, supervisors or government officials. In addition, relationship-based societies are more “particularistic” and application of whatever formal rules there might be is often tailored to individual circumstances. Examples of rule-based societies include Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries and the US while relationship-based societies include Greece, Italy, Japan, Russia, Spain and Venezuela.

The following table describes how Nardon and Steers integrated the findings from other models of cultural dimensions to create a comparative list of characteristics of rule-based and relationship-based societies for their “rule orientation” dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule-based</th>
<th>Relationship-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual behavior largely regulated by rules, laws, formal policies, standard operating procedures and social norms that are widely supported by societal members</td>
<td>While rules and laws are important, individual behavior often regulated by unique circumstances or influential people, such as parents, peers or superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalistic: Laws and rules designed to be applied uniformly to everyone</td>
<td>Particularistic: Individual circumstances often require modifications in rule enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on legal contracts and meticulous record keeping</td>
<td>Emphasis on interpersonal relationships and trust; less emphasis on record keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and procedures spelled out clearly and published widely</td>
<td>Rules and procedures often ambiguous or not believed or accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules internalized and followed without</td>
<td>Rules sometimes ignored or followed only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nardon and Steers noted that the distinction between rule-based and relationship-based societies followed J. Hooker, Working across cultures (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003). Hooker examined and described the roles of authority, individualism, competition, security, negotiation, contracts, supervision, lifestyle and humor in different societies.
question and even when it is known that violations will not be detected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis on doing things formally, by the book</th>
<th>Emphasis on doing things through informal networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low tolerance for rule breaking</td>
<td>Tolerance for rule breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions based largely on objective criteria (e.g., rules, policies)</td>
<td>Decisions often based on subjective criteria (e.g., hunches, personal connections)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When discussing further research with respect to the factors underlying this dimension Nardon and Steers returned to their fundamental decision to focus on rule orientation rather than on how societies perceive and cope with “uncertainty”. They noted that the inclusion of “uncertainty avoidance” in the widely respected and followed Hofstede and GLOBE models should not be ignored and that additional research should be conducted on each of the cultural dimensions to see how they influenced perceptions and methods of dealing with uncertainty. In that regard, Nardon and Steers suggested that each of the dimensions they included in their model already had addressed different issues relating to the broader question of uncertainty:

- Mastery societies, with their emphasis on control, would seem to be more likely than harmony societies to devise proactive strategies for changing their environment in ways that would reduce risk and uncertainty.
- Members of individualistic societies will likely take uncertainty avoidance into their own hand while members of collectivist societies will typically look to their groups to device strategies that will shelter all of the group members from uncertainty.
- Members of hierarchical societies would be expected to rely more heavily on the opinions and protections of their superiors with respect to uncertainty while members of egalitarian societies would be expected to be more self-reliant and assume personal responsibility for identifying and coping with uncertainty in their lives.
- Perceptions regarding the flow of time and how tasks should be organized may influence how members of a society perceive the discomfort associated with uncertainty and how they plan the actions they elect to take to cope with uncertainty.\(^{217}\)
- Interest and acceptance of formal rules, policies and procedures can reasonably seen as a society’s way of bring order to perceived chaos and reducing uncertainties associated with social relationships.

\section{1:45 --Monochronic--polychronic}

---

\(^{217}\) Planning, which is another aspect of time orientation for those cultural dimension models that focus on how societies plan for and focus on the future, is also arguably related to uncertainty avoidance at least to the extent that members of a society believe that planning is a tool that can be used to organize future events and reduce anxiety from not knowing what will occur in the future. There are societies in which planning is not that important due in part to the general belief that it is not possible to have control over the future and the uncertainty regarding what will happen in the future is just something that members of society need to live with and accept.
Time orientation is an important element of the cultural dimension models proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Hall, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner and GLOBE; however, Nardon and Steers point out that “[w]hile there is widespread agreement that societies vary considerably in how they view or use time, there is less convergence concerning which perception of time is most salient”. For example, Nardon and Steers took note of the fact that one finds two different ways of looking at time—the degree to which societies plan for and focus on the future and how members of societies perceive the flow of time and manage their activities—and that there are diverging opinions as to which one is most important. In addition, Nardon and Steers argued that researchers had failed to reach agreement on the best way to measure either aspect of time. The themes associated with this dimension were derived from the following aspects of the major cultural dimension models:

- Hall’s time-based dimension distinguished between “monochromic” and “polychromic” societies. In monochromic societies, such as Germany, the Scandinavian countries and the US, one finds sequential attention to individualistic goals, separation of work and personal life and precise concepts of time. On the other hand, simultaneous attention to multiple goals is the norm in polychromic societies such as the Arab societies, Brazil, France, Mexico and Spain along with integration of work and personal life and a relative concept of time.

- One of the dimensions in the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck model focused on the relationship that members of societies have with time and the extent to which individuals and groups in the society allow “past”, “present” and “future” to influence their actions and decisions. Members of past-oriented societies make decisions based on past events and traditions while members of future-oriented societies are primarily influenced by future prospects when making decisions.

- Similar to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede’s long-term orientation dimension related to the time frame associated with the choices made by individuals in the society with respect to the focus of their efforts: the future or the present and past. Hofstede explained that long-term (future) orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented toward future rewards, particularly perseverance and thrift, while short-term (past/present) orientation emphasizes virtues related to the past and present such as tradition, preservation of “face” and fulfillment of “social obligations”.

- Nardon and Steers pointed out that Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner blended the earlier approaches and incorporated both distinctions between societies with respect to the importance they assigned to the past, present and future and distinctions between “sequential” and “synchonic” societies based on whether members prefer to do one thing at a time or work on several things at the same time.

- The designers of the GLOBE project survey defined their time oriented dimension, referred to as “future orientation,” as the degree to which a collectivity encourages and rewards future-oriented behaviors such as planning, delaying gratification and investing in the future, and also identified characteristics of future orientation societies similar to those of Hofstede’s long-term orientation dimension including a

---

propensity to save now for the future, an emphasis on working for long-term success, organizations that tend to be flexible and adaptive and a general view of material success and spiritual fulfillment as an integrated whole.

Nardon and Steers acknowledged the contributions of each of the approaches taken in the various models; however, they concluded that Hall’s monochromic/polychromic distinction provided the greatest amount of additional value to the study of cultural differences beyond what was already succumbed within the other dimensions described above. They argued that issues regarding societal concerns about the future were closely related to needs for achievement and assumption about the utility of planning as a means for controlling events that are to occur in the future. Nardon and Steers asserted that societies that believed that they can have control over what the future brings are more likely to stress planning and be future oriented while societies that do not believe they can influence the future will not waste their time on planning and similar activities and simply focus on living in the present and resolving current problems without regard to the future. In light of all this, Nardon and Steers believed that the central issue with respect to time orientation was “whether people approach their work one task at a time in a somewhat linear fashion or attempt to perform multiple tasks simultaneously”. They also suggested the orientation of societies on this dimension could be derived from their answers to the following series of basic questions:

- Do members of the society have a precise concept of time and tend to be very punctual or do they have a relative concept and tend to be late?
- Do members of the society need a steady flow of information to do their jobs?
- Are members of the society more committed to their jobs or to the groups to which they belong (e.g., family and friends)?
- Do members of the society separate work and family life or see them as an integrated whole?
- Do members of the society take a linear or nonlinear approach to planning?
- Are members of the society focused and impatient or unfocused and patient?

The following table describes how Nardon and Steers integrated the findings from other models of cultural dimensions to create a comparative list of characteristics of monochronic and polychronic societies for their “time orientation” dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monochronic</th>
<th>Polychronic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequential attention to individual tasks</td>
<td>Simultaneous attention to multiple tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear, single-minded approach to work, planning and implementation</td>
<td>Nonlinear, interactive approach to work, planning and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise concept of time; punctual</td>
<td>Relative concept of time; often late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach is job-centered; commitment to the job and often to the organization</td>
<td>Approach is people-centered; commitment to people and human relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of work and personal life</td>
<td>Integration of work and personal life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

219 Id.
Approach is focused but impatient  |  Approach is unfocused but patient

As was the case with their rule orientation dimension, Nardon and Steers recognized that their time orientation dimension was based on a fundamental decision to emphasize the monochronic-polychronic distinction over the future orientation distinction favored by several of the major cultural dimensional models. They recommended that further research would be appropriate to gather additional information on whether perceptions of the flow of time and task organization are correlated with future orientation or whether it really is appropriate to separate them as independent dimensions.

§ 1:46 --Assessing cultural differences

Having compared and assessed the major cultural dimension models in order to create their own synthesis of the most useful elements of cultural dimensions Nardon and Steers then turned to the thorny question of actually assessing cultural differences among societies.\(^{220}\) They noted that several of the major models—Hofstede, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner and GLOBE—came with numeric scores for large numbers of societies; however, they also explained the usual cautions: cultures are qualitative, not quantitative; cultures are not monolithic; and the underlying research methods, as well as the accuracy of the results obtained by the researchers, have all been frequently questioned. Equally problematic has been the fact that measurements (scores) for specific societies derived by the various models often vary substantially. Nardon and Steers pointed to the fact that while Hofstede found Germany to be egalitarian on his power distance dimension the GLOBE researchers assigned Germany to the hierarchical category for their dimension of the same name. A similar situation arose with respect to Hofstede’s finding of highly collectivistic for Italy while Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner found that society to be moderately collectivistic. A final issue that tended to undercut the reliability of the various societal scores and rankings was that assessments made by the same researchers changed from time-to-time as they redid their studies of the same societies (e.g., the 1998 categorization of Thailand as collectivistic by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner differed from the finding of Trompenaars in 1993 that Thailand was individualistic).\(^{221}\)

Nardon and Steers noted the use of qualitative, or ethnographic, measures as an alternative means of identifying and assessing cultural differences. One of the most common, albeit problematic, tools for ethnographers is participant observation as part of the overall process of collecting and interpreting information regarding a society and the actions and beliefs of its members.\(^{222}\) In most cases the researcher will attempt to

\(^{220}\) Id. For additional background on the efforts of Nardon and Steers to estimate cultural differences using multiple measures and multiple methods see R. Steers and L. Nardon, Managing in the global economy (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2006).

\(^{221}\) The reference for the work of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner appearing in 1998 is in the notes above. The earlier work of Trompenaars is detailed in F. Trompenaars, Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business (London: Economists Books, 1993).

\(^{222}\) Methods of participant observation include direct observation, unstructured interviewing and case studies and researchers need to understand how to effectively enter the context and their roles as
become solidly embedded in the society as an active participant in day-to-day activities and will record his or her experiences in detailed field notes that are eventually used to compile the ultimate summary of findings. Ethnographic studies, typically by anthropologists raised and educated in the US, dominated early cross-cultural research; however, this method has been roundly criticized based on the potential for serious errors due to inevitable cultural biases of the researchers in spite of their efforts to be impartial. Simply put, it is not reasonable to expect that an American researcher thrust into a very different cultural environment could possibly notice all the subtle nuances and pick up all the cultural traits in the society that he or she is attempt to study. Nardon and Steers also pointed out that the long-discussed problems with ethnographic studies had been confirmed as researchers coming from non-Western backgrounds had applied different cultural perspectives in their ethnographic studies and come up with different cultural dimensions as recommended devices for identification and measurement of differences among societies.  

In spite of the limitations and methodological issues discussed above Nardon and Steers pushed forward with their own attempt to organize societies based on their cultural profile since they believed that in order to “operationalize” their suggested cultural dimensions it was “necessary to have a means of classifying cultures so general country comparisons can be made”. They noted that they chose to rely on multiple measures, both quantitative and qualitative, and methods including existing quantitative measures provided from several of the major cultural dimension models and ethnographic data from cultural anthropological studies of specific cultures or geographic regions. Nardon and Steers disclaimed the notion that their method would eliminate all errors and conceded that in some cases areas of disagreement were resolved by discussions between them leading to “best-guess estimates” that might be susceptible to their potential rater biases. Nonetheless, they felt that there were several advantages to their approach including reliance on multiple sources of data regarding societies and use of conservative ordinal rating scales that dismissed the notion of specific “scores” in favor of clustering societies into four categories based on their relative strength on the various dimensions compared to other societies (e.g., Harmony, Harmony+, Mastery and Mastery+ for the Relationship with the Environment dimension). Their assessment scheme, using a representative sample of societies (countries), is illustrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Relationship with the Social Organization</th>
<th>Power Distribution</th>
<th>Rule Orientation</th>
<th>Time Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

participants in the society. Other factors relevant to the accuracy and utility of participant observation include how field notes are collected and stored and how the data collected in the field is analyzed.  


224 A complete table of “Country Ratings of National Cultures” covering 56 societies (countries) appears in L. Nardon and R. Steers, “The culture theory jungle: divergence and convergence in models of national culture”, in R. Bhagat and R. Steers (Eds.), Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2009). Nardon and Steers took special pains to point out that individual and regional differences within a particular country should not be overlooked and that while it was common to find that the cultural ratings for countries in the same geographic region of the world appeared to be similar there are still important cultural differences within geographic regions. These caveats are similar to those announced by Hofstede and others when described their models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
<th>Collectivist</th>
<th>Hierarchical</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Polychronic+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>Individualist+</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Monochronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist+</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Hierarchical+</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Rules+</td>
<td>Monochronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>Mastery+</td>
<td>Individualist+</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Monochronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Monochronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist+</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Monochronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist+</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Monochronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships+</td>
<td>Monochronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Harmony+</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Egalitarian+</td>
<td>Rules+</td>
<td>Monochronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Polychronic+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>Mastery+</td>
<td>Individualist+</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Monochronic+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Nardon and Steers noted that all ratings are comparative in nature and that use of a “+” sign is intended to highlight what they believe to be a stronger tendency toward a particular dimension.