



12-2011

Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context

Geert Hofstede

Universities of Maastricht and Tilburg, The Netherlands, hofstede@bart.nl

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc>

Recommended Citation

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>

This *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* Article is brought to you for free and open access (provided uses are educational in nature) by IACCP and ScholarWorks@GVSU. Copyright © 2011 International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-0-9845627-0-1

Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context

Abstract

This article describes briefly the Hofstede model of six dimensions of national cultures: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism/Collectivism, Masculinity/Femininity, Long/Short Term Orientation, and Indulgence/Restraint. It shows the conceptual and research efforts that preceded it and led up to it, and once it had become a paradigm for comparing cultures, research efforts that followed and built on it. The article stresses that dimensions depend on the level of aggregation; it describes the six entirely different dimensions found in the Hofstede et al. (2010) research into organizational cultures. It warns against confusion with value differences at the individual level. It concludes with a look ahead in what the study of dimensions of national cultures and the position of countries on them may still bring.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Introduction

Culture has been defined in many ways; this author's shorthand definition is: "*Culture is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others*". It is always a collective phenomenon, but it can be connected to different collectives. Within each collective there is a variety of individuals. If characteristics of individuals are imagined as varying according to some bell curve; the variation between cultures is the shift of the bell curve when one moves from one society to the other. Most commonly the term culture is used for tribes or ethnic groups (in anthropology), for nations (in political science, sociology and management), and for organizations (in sociology and management). A relatively unexplored field is the culture of occupations (for instance, of engineers versus accountants, or of academics from different disciplines). The term can also be applied to the genders, to generations, or to social classes. However, changing the level of aggregation studied changes the nature of the concept of 'culture'. Societal, national and gender cultures, which children acquire from their earliest youth onwards, are much deeper rooted in the human mind than occupational cultures acquired at school, or than organizational cultures acquired on the job. The latter are exchangeable when people take a new job. Societal cultures reside in (often unconscious) values, in the sense of *broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others* (Hofstede, 2001, p. 5). Organizational cultures reside rather in (visible and conscious) practices: the way people perceive what goes on in their organizational environment.

Classifying Cultures: Conceptual Dimensions

In an article first published in 1952, U.S. anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn (1962) argued that there should be universal categories of culture:

In principle ... there is a generalized framework that underlies the more apparent and striking facts of cultural relativity. All cultures constitute so many somewhat distinct answers to essentially the same questions posed by human biology and by the generalities of the human situation. ... Every society's patterns for living must provide approved and sanctioned ways for dealing with such universal circumstances as the existence of two sexes; the helplessness of infants; the need for satisfaction of the elementary biological requirements such as food, warmth, and sex; the presence of individuals of different ages and of differing physical and other capacities. (pp. 317-18).

Many authors in the second half of the twentieth century have speculated about the nature of the basic problems of societies that would present distinct dimensions of culture (for a review see Hofstede, 2001, pp. 29-31). The most common dimension used for ordering societies is their degree of economic evolution or modernity. A one-dimensional ordering of societies from traditional to modern fitted well with the nineteenth- and twentieth-century

belief in progress. Economic evolution is bound to be reflected in people's collective mental programming, but there is no reason why economic and technological evolution should suppress other cultural variety. There exist dimensions of culture unrelated to economic evolution.

U.S. anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1976) divided cultures according to their ways of communicating, into high-context (much of the information is implicit) and low-context cultures (nearly everything is explicit). In practice this distinction overlaps largely with the traditional versus modern distinction.

U.S. sociologists Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils (1951, p. 77) suggested that all human action is determined by five *pattern variables*, choices between pairs of alternatives:

1. *Affectivity* (need gratification) versus *affective neutrality* (restraint of impulses);
2. *Self-orientation* versus *collectivity-orientation*;
3. *Universalism* (applying general standards) versus *particularism* (taking particular relationships into account);
4. *Ascription* (judging others by who they are) versus *achievement* (judging them by what they do);
5. *Specificity* (limiting relations to others to specific spheres) versus *diffuseness* (no prior limitations to nature of relations).

Parsons and Shils (1951) claimed that these choices are present at the individual (personality) level, at the social system (group or organization) level, and at the cultural (normative) level. They did not take into account that different variables could operate at different aggregation levels.

U.S. anthropologists Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck (1961, p. 12) ran a field study in five geographically close, small communities in the Southwestern United States: Mormons, Spanish Americans, Texans, Navaho Indians, and Zuni Indians. They distinguished these communities on the following value orientations:

1. An evaluation of *human nature* (evil - mixed - good);
2. The relationship of man to the surrounding *natural environment* (subjugation - harmony - mastery);
3. The orientation in *time* (toward past - present - future);
4. The orientation toward *activity* (being - being in becoming - doing); and
5. *Relationships among people* (linearity, i.e., hierarchically ordered positions – collaterality, i.e., group relationships – individualism).

Others have extrapolated Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) classification to all kind of social comparisons, without concern for their geographic limitations without considering the effect of levels of aggregation, and without empirical support.

British anthropologist Mary Douglas (1973) proposed a two-dimensional ordering of ways of looking at the world:

1. '*Group*' or inclusion - the claim of groups over members, and
2. '*Grid*' or classification - the degree to which interaction is subject to rules.

Douglas saw these categories as relating to a wide variety of beliefs and social actions: Views of nature, traveling, spatial arrangements, gardening, cookery, medicine, the meaning of time, age, history, sickness, and justice. She seemed to imply that these dimensions are applicable to any level of aggregation.

The one- or more-dimensional classifications above represent subjective reflective attempts to order a complex reality. Each of them is strongly colored by the subjective choices of its author(s). They show some overlap, but their lack of clarity about and mixing of levels of analysis (individual-group-culture) are severe methodological weaknesses.

These weaknesses were avoided in an extensive review article by U.S. sociologist Alex Inkeles and psychologist Daniel Levinson (1969, first published 1954). The authors limited themselves to culture at the level of nations, and they summarized all available sociological and anthropological studies dealing with what was then called *national character*, which they interpreted as a kind of modal (most common) personality type in a national society. What I have labelled *dimensions* they called *standard analytic issues*. From their survey of the literature Inkeles and Levinson (1969) distilled three standard analytic issues that met these criteria:

1. Relation to authority;
2. Conception of self, including the individual's concepts of masculinity and femininity;
3. Primary dilemmas or conflicts, and ways of dealing with them, including the control of aggression and the expression versus inhibition of affect.

As will be shown below, Inkeles and Levinson's (1969) standard analytic issues were empirically supported in a study by this author more than 20 years later.

Empirical Approaches and the Hofstede Dimensions

In 1949 U.S. psychologist Raymond Cattell published an application of the new statistical technique of factor analysis to the comparison of nations. Cattell had earlier used factor analysis for studying aspects of intelligence from test scores of individual students. This time he took a matrix of nation-level variables for a large number of countries, borrowing from geography, demographics, history, politics, economics, sociology, law, religion and medicine. The resulting factors were difficult to interpret, except for the important role of economic development. Replications of his method by others produced trivial results (for a review see Hofstede, 2001, pp. 32-33). More meaningful were applications to restricted facets of societies. U.S. political scientists Phillip Gregg and Arthur Banks (1965) studied aspects of political systems; U.S. economists Irma Adelman and Cynthia Taft Morris

(1967) studied factors influencing the development of poor countries, and Irish psychologist Richard Lynn (1971; Lynn & Hampson, 1975) studied aspects of mental health.

In the 1970s this author – more or less by accident – got access to a large survey database about values and related sentiments of people in over 50 countries around the world (Hofstede, 1980). These people worked in the local subsidiaries of one large multinational corporation: IBM. Most parts of the organization had been surveyed twice over a four-year interval, and the database contained more than 100,000 questionnaires. Initial analyses of the database at the level of individual respondents proved confusing, but a breakthrough occurred when the focus was directed at correlations between mean scores of survey items at the level of countries. Patterns of correlation at the country level could be strikingly different from what was found at the individual level, and needed an entirely different interpretation. One of the weaknesses of much cross-cultural research is not recognizing the difference between analysis at the societal level and at the individual level; this amounts to confusing anthropology and psychology. From 180 studies using my work reviewed by Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson (2006), more than half failed to distinguish between societal culture level and individual level differences, which led to numerous errors of interpretation and application.

My hunch that the IBM data might have implications beyond this particular corporation was supported when I got the opportunity to administer a number of the same questions to nearly 400 management trainees from some 30 countries in an international program unrelated to IBM. Their mean scores by country correlated significantly with the country scores obtained from the IBM database. So it seemed that employees of this multinational enterprises – a very special kind of people – could serve for identifying differences in *national* value systems. The reason is that from one country to another they represented almost perfectly matched samples: they were similar in all respects except nationality, which made the effect of national differences in their answers stand out unusually clearly.

Encouraged by the results of the country-level correlation analysis I then tried country-level factor analysis. The latter was similar to the approach used earlier by Cattell and others, except that now the variables in the matrix were not indices for the country as a whole, but mean scores and sometimes percentages of survey answers collected from individuals in those countries. Analyses of data at higher levels of aggregation are called *ecological*. Ecological factor analysis differs from the factor analysis of individual scores in that a usual caution no longer applies: the number of cases does not need to be (much) larger than the number of variables. The stability of the results of an ecological factor analysis does not depend on the number of cases, but on the number of individuals whose scores were aggregated into these cases. Ecological factor analysis may even be performed on matrices with fewer cases than variables.

Factor analyzing a matrix of 32 values questions for initially 40 countries, I found these values to cluster very differently from what was found at the individual level. The new factors revealed common problems with which IBM employees in all these societies

had to cope, but for which their upbringing in their country presented its own profile of solutions. These problems were:

1. Dependence on superiors;
2. Need for rules and predictability, also associated with nervous stress;
3. The balance between individual goals and dependence on the company;
4. The balance between ego values (like the need for money and careers) and social values (like cooperation and a good living environment); the former were more frequently chosen by men, the latter by women, but there were also country differences.

These empirical results were strikingly similar to the *standard analytical issues* described in Inkeles and Levinson's 1969 article. Dependence on superiors relates to the first, need for predictability to the third, the balance between the individual and the company to the conception of self, and the balance between ego and social values to concepts of masculinity and femininity, which were also classified under the second standard analytic issue.

The four basic problem areas defined by Inkeles and Levinson (1969) and empirically supported in the IBM data represent dimensions of national cultures. A dimension is an aspect of a culture that can be measured relative to other cultures. The four dimensions formed the basis for my book *Culture's Consequences* (Hofstede, 1980).

The main message of the 1980 book was that scores on the dimensions correlated significantly with conceptually related external data. Thus Power Distance scores correlated with a dimension from Gregg and Banks' (1965) analysis of political systems and also with a dimension from Adelman and Morris' (1967) study of economic development; Uncertainty Avoidance correlated with a dimension from Lynn and Hampson's (1975) study of mental health; Individualism correlated strongly with national wealth (Gross National Product per capita) and Femininity with the percentage of national income spent on development aid. The number of external validations kept expanding, and the second edition of *Culture's Consequences* (Hofstede, 2001, Appendix 6, pp. 503-520) lists more than 400 significant correlations between the IBM-based scores and results of other studies. Recent validations show no loss of validity, indicating that the country differences these dimensions describe are, indeed, basic and enduring.

In the 1980s, on the basis of research by Canadian psychologist Michael Harris Bond centered in the Far East, a fifth dimension 'Long-Term versus Short-Term Orientation' was added (Hofstede & Bond, 1988; see also Hofstede, 1991; Hofstede, 2001).

In the 2000s, research by Bulgarian scholar Michael Minkov using data from the World Values Survey (Minkov, 2007) allowed a new calculation of the fifth, and the addition of a sixth dimension (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). The six dimensions are labelled:

1. *Power Distance*, related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequality;
2. *Uncertainty Avoidance*, related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future;
3. *Individualism* versus *Collectivism*, related to the integration of individuals into primary groups;
4. *Masculinity* versus *Femininity*, related to the division of emotional roles between women and men;
5. *Long Term* versus *Short Term Orientation*, related to the choice of focus for people's efforts: the future or the present and past.
6. *Indulgence* versus *Restraint*, related to the gratification versus control of basic human desires related to enjoying life.

Each country has been positioned relative to other countries through a score on each dimension. The dimensions are statistically distinct and do occur in all possible combinations, although some combinations are more frequent than others.

After the initial confirmation of the country differences in IBM in data from management trainees elsewhere, the Hofstede dimensions and country scores were validated through replications by others, using the same or similar questions with other cross-national populations. Between 1990 and 2002 six major replications (14 or more countries) used populations of country elites, employees and managers of other corporations and organizations, airline pilots, consumers and civil servants (see Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 35).

In correlating the dimensions with other data, the influence of national wealth (Gross National Product per capita) should always be taken into account. Two of the dimensions, Individualism and small Power Distance, are significantly correlated with wealth. This means that all wealth-related phenomena tend to correlate with both these dimensions. Differences in national wealth can be considered a more parsimonious explanation of these other phenomena than differences in culture. In correlating with the culture dimensions, it is therefore advisable to always include the wealth variable. After controlling for national wealth correlations with culture usually disappear.

Of particular interest is a link that was found between culture according to the Hofstede dimensions and personality dimensions according to the empirically based Big Five personality test (Costa & McCrae, 1992). After this test had been used in over 30 countries, significant correlations were found between country norms on the five personality dimensions (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness) and national culture dimension scores. For example, 55% of country differences on Neuroticism can be explained by a combination of Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity, and 39% of country differences on Extraversion by Individualism alone (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004). So culture and personality are linked but the link is statistical; there is a wide variety of individual personalities within each national culture, and national culture scores should not be used for stereotyping individuals.

Validating the dimensions is of course not only and not even mainly a quantitative issue. Equally important is the qualitative interpretation of what differences on the dimensions mean for each of the societies studied, which calls for an *emic* approach to each society, supporting the *etic* of the dimensional data.

The Hofstede Dimensions in a nutshell

In this section I will summarize the content of each dimension opposing cultures with low and high scores. These oppositions are based on correlations with studies by others, and because the relationship is statistical, not every line applies equally strongly to every country.

Power Distance

Power Distance has been defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. This represents inequality (more versus less), but defined from below, not from above. It suggests that a society's level of inequality is endorsed by the followers as much as by the leaders. Power and inequality, of course, are extremely fundamental facts of any society. All societies are unequal, but some are more unequal than others.

Table 1
Ten Differences Between Small- and Large- Power Distance Societies

Small Power Distance	Large Power Distance
Use of power should be legitimate and is subject to criteria of good and evil	Power is a basic fact of society antedating good or evil: its legitimacy is irrelevant
Parents treat children as equals	Parents teach children obedience
Older people are neither respected nor feared	Older people are both respected and feared
Student-centered education	Teacher-centered education
Hierarchy means inequality of roles, established for convenience	Hierarchy means existential inequality
Subordinates expect to be consulted	Subordinates expect to be told what to do
Pluralist governments based on majority vote and changed peacefully	Autocratic governments based on co-optation and changed by revolution
Corruption rare; scandals end political careers	Corruption frequent; scandals are covered up
Income distribution in society rather even	Income distribution in society very uneven
Religions stressing equality of believers	Religions with a hierarchy of priests

Table 1 lists a selection of differences between national societies that validation research showed to be associated with the Power Distance dimension. For a more complete review the reader is referred to Hofstede (2001) and Hofstede et al. (2010). The statements refer to extremes; actual situations may be found anywhere in between the extremes, and the association of a statement with a dimension is always statistical, never absolute.

In Hofstede et al. (2010) Power Distance Index scores are listed for 76 countries; they tend to be higher for East European, Latin, Asian and African countries and lower for Germanic and English-speaking Western countries.

Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty Avoidance is not the same as risk avoidance; it deals with a society's tolerance for ambiguity. It indicates to what extent a culture programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations. Unstructured situations are novel, unknown, surprising, and different from usual. Uncertainty avoiding cultures try to minimize the possibility of such situations by strict behavioral codes, laws and rules, disapproval of deviant opinions, and a belief in absolute Truth; 'there can only be one Truth and we have it'.

Table 2
Ten Differences Between Weak- and Strong- Uncertainty Avoidance Societies

Weak Uncertainty Avoidance	Strong Uncertainty Avoidance
The uncertainty inherent in life is accepted and each day is taken as it comes	The uncertainty inherent in life is felt as a continuous threat that must be fought
Ease, lower stress, self-control, low anxiety	Higher stress, emotionality, anxiety, neuroticism
Higher scores on subjective health and well-being	Lower scores on subjective health and well-being
Tolerance of deviant persons and ideas: what is different is curious	Intolerance of deviant persons and ideas: what is different is dangerous
Comfortable with ambiguity and chaos	Need for clarity and structure
Teachers may say 'I don't know'	Teachers supposed to have all the answers
Changing jobs no problem	Staying in jobs even if disliked
Dislike of rules - written or unwritten	Emotional need for rules – even if not obeyed
In politics, citizens feel and are seen as competent towards authorities	In politics, citizens feel and are seen as incompetent towards authorities
In religion, philosophy and science: relativism and empiricism	In religion, philosophy and science: belief in ultimate truths and grand theories

Research has shown that people in uncertainty avoiding countries are also more emotional, and motivated by inner nervous energy. The opposite type, uncertainty accepting cultures, are more tolerant of opinions different from what they are used to; they try to have fewer rules, and on the philosophical and religious level they are empiricist, relativist and allow different currents to flow side by side. People within these cultures are more phlegmatic and contemplative, and not expected by their environment to express emotions. Table 2 lists a selection of differences between societies that validation research showed to be associated with the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension.

In Hofstede et al. (2010) Uncertainty Avoidance Index scores are listed for 76 countries; they tend to be higher in East and Central European countries, in Latin countries, in Japan and in German speaking countries, lower in English speaking, Nordic and Chinese culture countries.

Individualism

Individualism on the one side versus its opposite, **Collectivism**, as a societal, not an individual characteristic, is the degree to which people in a society are integrated into groups. On the individualist side we find cultures in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family. On the collectivist side we find cultures in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, often extended families (with uncles, aunts and grandparents) that continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty, and oppose other in-groups. Again, the issue addressed by this dimension is an extremely fundamental one, regarding all societies in the world. Table 3 lists a selection of differences between societies that validation research showed to be associated with this dimension.

Table 3
Ten Differences Between Collectivist and Individualist Societies

Individualism	Collectivism
Everyone is supposed to take care of him- or herself and his or her immediate family only	People are born into extended families or clans which protect them in exchange for loyalty
"I" – consciousness	"We" –consciousness
Right of privacy	Stress on belonging
Speaking one's mind is healthy	Harmony should always be maintained
Others classified as individuals	Others classified as in-group or out-group
Personal opinion expected: one person one vote	Opinions and votes predetermined by in-group
Transgression of norms leads to guilt feelings	Transgression of norms leads to shame feelings
Languages in which the word "I" is indispensable	Languages in which the word "I" is avoided
Purpose of education is learning how to learn	Purpose of education is learning how to do
Task prevails over relationship	Relationship prevails over task

In Hofstede et al. (2010) Individualism Index scores are listed for 76 countries; Individualism tends to prevail in developed and Western countries, while collectivism prevails in less developed and Eastern countries; Japan takes a middle position on this dimension.

Masculinity – Femininity

Masculinity versus its opposite, **Femininity**, again as a societal, not as an individual characteristic, refers to the distribution of values between the genders which is another fundamental issue for any society, to which a range of solutions can be found. The IBM studies revealed that (a) women's values differ less among societies than men's values; (b) men's values from one country to another contain a dimension from very assertive and competitive and maximally different from women's values on the one side, to modest and caring and similar to women's values on the other. The assertive pole has been called 'masculine' and the modest, caring pole 'feminine'. The women in feminine countries have the same modest, caring values as the men; in the masculine countries they are somewhat assertive and competitive, but not as much as the men, so that these countries show a gap between men's values and women's values. In masculine cultures there is often a taboo around this dimension (Hofstede et al., 1998).

Table 4
Ten Differences Between Feminine and Masculine Societies

Femininity	Masculinity
Minimum emotional and social role differentiation between the genders	Maximum emotional and social role differentiation between the genders
Men and women should be modest and caring	Men should be and women may be assertive and ambitious
Balance between family and work	Work prevails over family
Sympathy for the weak	Admiration for the strong
Both fathers and mothers deal with facts and feelings	Fathers deal with facts, mothers with feelings
Both boys and girls may cry but neither should fight	Girls cry, boys don't; boys should fight back, girls shouldn't fight
Mothers decide on number of children	Fathers decide on family size
Many women in elected political positions	Few women in elected political positions
Religion focuses on fellow human beings	Religion focuses on God or gods
Matter-of-fact attitudes about sexuality; sex is a way of relating	Moralistic attitudes about sexuality; sex is a way of performing

Taboos are based on deeply rooted values; this taboo shows that the Masculinity/Femininity dimension in some societies touches basic and often unconscious values, too painful to be explicitly discussed. In fact the taboo validates the importance of the dimension. Table 4 lists a selection of differences between societies that validation research showed to be associated with this dimension.

In Hofstede et al. (2010) Masculinity versus Femininity Index scores are presented for 76 countries; Masculinity is high in Japan, in German speaking countries, and in some Latin countries like Italy and Mexico; it is moderately high in English speaking Western countries; it is low in Nordic countries and in the Netherlands and moderately low in some Latin and Asian countries like France, Spain, Portugal, Chile, Korea and Thailand.

Long-Term vs. Short-Term Orientation

This dimension was first identified in a survey among students in 23 countries around the world, using a questionnaire designed by Chinese scholars (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987). As all countries with a history of Confucianism scored near one pole which could be associated with hard work, the study's first author Michael Harris Bond labeled the dimension *Confucian Work Dynamism*. The dimension turned out to be strongly correlated with recent economic growth. As none of the four IBM dimensions was linked to economic growth, I obtained Bond's permission to add his dimension as a fifth to my four (Hofstede & Bond, 1988). Because it had been identified in a study comparing students from 23 countries, most of whom had never heard of Confucius, I re-named it Long-Term versus Short-Term Orientation; the long-term pole corresponds to Bond's Confucian Work Dynamism. Values found at this pole were perseverance, thrift, ordering relationships by status, and having a sense of shame; values at the opposite, short term pole were reciprocating social obligations, respect for tradition, protecting one's 'face', and personal steadiness and stability. The positively rated values of this dimension were already present in the teachings of Confucius from around 500 BC. There was much more in Confucius' teachings so Long-Term Orientation is not Confucianism *per se*, but it is still present in countries with a Confucian heritage. In my book for a student readership *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Hofstede, 1991) the fifth dimension was first integrated into my model. It was more extensively analyzed in the second edition of *Culture's Consequences* (Hofstede, 2001) and in the new edition of *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, for which my eldest son Gert Jan Hofstede joined me as a co-author (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

My initial cross-cultural data collected around 1970 by the IBM corporation among its employees in more than 50 countries worldwide represented probably the largest matched-sample cross-national database available anywhere at that time. Bond's Chinese Value Survey showed the power of adding results from other surveys; unfortunately, it covered only 23 countries, and attempts to extend it to other populations were small-scale and hardly reliable.

In the past quarter century the volume of available cross-cultural data on self-scored values and related issues has increased enormously. If I had to start my research now, I

would select the best elements from all these new databases. My prime choice would be the *World Values Survey*. In the early 1980s departments of Divinity at six European Universities, concerned with a loss of Christian faith, jointly surveyed the values of their countries' populations through public opinion survey methods. In the following years their *European Values Survey* expanded and changed focus: in the hands of U.S. sociologist Ronald Inglehart it grew into a periodic World Values Survey (WVS). Subsequent data collection rounds took place with 10-year intervals; as this is written, a fourth round is in process. The survey now covers more than 100 countries worldwide with a questionnaire including more than 360 forced-choice items. Areas covered are ecology, economy, education, emotions, family, gender and sexuality, government and politics, health, happiness, leisure and friends, morality, religion, society and nation, and work. The entire WVS data bank, including previous rounds and down to individual respondent scores, is freely accessible on the Web (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). So far it has remained under-used; potential users tend to drown in its huge volume of information.

Michael Minkov, a Bulgarian linguist and sociologist whom I had met on the e-mail at the turn of the millennium, took up the challenge of exploring the riches of the WVS. In 2007 he published a book with a Bulgarian publisher, in which he described three new cross-national value dimensions extracted from recent WVS data, which he labeled Exclusionism versus Universalism, Indulgence versus Restraint and Monumentalism versus Flexumility (the latter a combination of flexibility and humility). Exclusionism versus Universalism was strongly correlated with Collectivism/Individualism and could be considered an elaboration of aspects of it. The other two dimensions were new, although Monumentalism versus Flexumility was moderately but significantly correlated with Short Term/Long Term Orientation.

Minkov's findings initially inspired the issuing of a new, 2008 version of the Values Survey Module, a set of questions available to researchers who wish to replicate my research into national culture differences. Earlier versions were issued in 1982 (VSM82) and 1994 (VSM94). Next to the established five Hofstede dimensions, the VSM08 included on an experimental basis Minkov's dimensions Indulgence versus Restraint and Monumentalism versus Flexumility (which I re-baptized Self-Effacement). The Values Survey Module (VSM) can be downloaded from www.geerthofstede.nl. Aspiring users should carefully study the accompanying Manual before they decide to collect their own data. In most cases, the use of available results of already existing quality research is to be preferred above amateur replications.

The next step in our cooperation with Minkov was that Gert Jan Hofstede and I invited him to become a co-author for the third edition of *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Hofstede et al., 2010). Minkov's Exclusionism versus Universalism was integrated into the Individualism/Collectivism chapter. By combining elements from his Monumentalism versus Flexumility dimension with additional WVS items, Minkov succeeded in converting into a new version of Long- versus Short-Term Orientation, now available for 93 countries and regions. Indulgence versus Restraint became an entirely new dimension that will be described below.

Table 5 lists a selection of differences between societies that validation research showed to be associated with the old and new version of the Long- versus Short-Term Orientation dimension. In our 2010 book, dimension scores have been re-calculated including Minkov's analysis of recent World Values Survey data.

Long-term oriented are East Asian countries, followed by Eastern- and Central Europe. A medium term orientation is found in South- and North-European and South Asian countries. Short-term oriented are U.S.A. and Australia, Latin American, African and Muslim countries.

Table 5
Ten Differences Between Short- and Long-Term-Oriented Societies

Short-Term Orientation	Long-Term Orientation
Most important events in life occurred in the past or take place now	Most important events in life will occur in the future
Personal steadiness and stability: a good person is always the same	A good person adapts to the circumstances
There are universal guidelines about what is good and evil	What is good and evil depends upon the circumstances
Traditions are sacrosanct	Traditions are adaptable to changed circumstances
Family life guided by imperatives	Family life guided by shared tasks
Supposed to be proud of one's country	Trying to learn from other countries
Service to others is an important goal	Thrift and perseverance are important goals
Social spending and consumption	Large savings quote, funds available for investment
Students attribute success and failure to luck	Students attribute success to effort and failure to lack of effort
Slow or no economic growth of poor countries	Fast economic growth of countries up till a level of prosperity

Indulgence versus Restraint

The sixth and new dimension, added in our 2010 book, uses Minkov's label Indulgence versus Restraint. It was also based on recent World Values Survey items and is more or less complementary to Long-versus Short-Term Orientation; in fact it is weakly negatively correlated with it. It focuses on aspects not covered by the other five dimensions, but known from literature on "happiness research". Indulgence stands for a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun. Restraint stands for a society that controls gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms. Scores on this dimension are also available for 93

countries and regions. Table 6 lists a selection of differences between societies that validation research showed to be associated with this dimension.

Indulgence tends to prevail in South and North America, in Western Europe and in parts of Sub-Sahara Africa. Restraint prevails in Eastern Europe, in Asia and in the Muslim world. Mediterranean Europe takes a middle position on this dimension.

Table 6
Ten Differences between Indulgent and Restrained Societies

Indulgence	Restrained
Higher percentage of people declaring themselves very happy	Fewer very happy people
A perception of personal life control	A perception of helplessness: what happens to me is not my own doing
Freedom of speech seen as important	Freedom of speech is not a primary concern
Higher importance of leisure	Lower importance of leisure
More likely to remember positive emotions	Less likely to remember positive emotions
In countries with educated populations, higher birthrates	In countries with educated populations, lower birthrates
More people actively involved in sports	Fewer people actively involved in sports
In countries with enough food, higher percentages of obese people	In countries with enough food, fewer obese people
In wealthy countries, lenient sexual norms	In wealthy countries, stricter sexual norms
Maintaining order in the nation is not given a high priority	Higher number of police officers per 100,000 population

Other Applications of the Dimensional Paradigm

When *Culture's Consequences* appeared in 1980, it represented a new paradigm in social science research: analyzing survey-based values data at the national level and quantifying differences between national cultures by positions on these dimensions. Like other new paradigms, it initially met with rejection, criticism and ridicule next to enthusiasm (Kuhn, 1970). By the 1990s the paradigm had been taken over by many others, and discussions shifted to the content and number of dimensions. The paradigm inspired a number of other studies into dimensions of national cultures.

Many projects further explored the dimension of individualism versus collectivism (e.g. Kim et al., 1994; Hofstede, 2001, ch. 5; Triandis, 1995). From all the Hofstede dimensions, this one met with the most positive reactions among psychologists, especially in the U.S.A. which happened to be the highest scoring country on it. Individualism/Collectivism scores were strongly correlated with national wealth which led some people to the conclusion that promoting individualism in other cultures would

contribute to their economic development. In fact, data show that the causality is most probably reversed: wealth tends to lead to individualism (Hofstede, 2001, p. 253). The individualism in U.S. culture also led people to studying it at the *individual* level (comparing one person to another), not at the level of societies. In this case it is no longer a dimension of culture but an aspect of personality. Also there is no more reason why individualism and collectivism need to be opposite; they should rather be considered separate features of personality. An extensive review of studies of individualism *at the individual level* was published by Oyserman, Coon and Kemmelmeier (2002). Comparing these studies across societies they found a different ranking of countries from the Hofstede studies; but Schimmack, Oishi and Diener (2005) proved this was due to a methodological error: Oyserman et al. (2002) forgot to control for acquiescence (response set), and the acquiescence in their data was significantly negatively correlated with the object of their study which made their results random.

The cultural focus on the Individualism versus Collectivism dimension led Triandis (1995) to splitting it into horizontal and vertical individualism. This split overlooks the fact that the Hofstede dimension of large versus small Power Distance already covered the horizontal/vertical aspect quite satisfactorily. From my point of view the horizontal/ vertical distinction for Ind/Col as a dimension of culture is redundant. It may be useful at the individual level, but this is for others to decide.

Like individualism and collectivism, the terms masculinity and femininity have also been used for describing values at the individual level. Earlier studies by U.S. psychologist Sandra Bem (1974) showed already that in this case masculinity and femininity should again rather be treated as separate aspects than as opposite poles.

An important alternative application of the dimensional paradigm was developed by the Israeli psychologist Shalom Schwartz. Borrowing mainly from the work of U.S. psychologist Milton Rokeach (1972, 1973) who studied values of U.S. individuals, Schwartz composed a list of 56 values. Through a network of colleagues he collected scores from samples of elementary school teachers and of college students in over 50 countries. (Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Respondents scored the importance of each value "as a guiding principle in my life". Schwartz at first assumed the same dimensions would apply to individuals and to countries, but his data showed he needed different classifications at different levels. At the country level he distinguished seven dimensions: Conservatism (later rebaptized "Embeddedness"), Hierarchy, Mastery, Affective autonomy, Intellectual autonomy, Egalitarianism and Harmony. Country scores for teachers published by Schwartz in 1994 were significantly correlated with the IBM scores for Individualism, Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede, 2001, p. 265).

Another large scale application was the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) project, conceived by US management scholar Robert J. House in 1991. At first House focused on leadership, but soon the study branched out into other aspects of national and organizational cultures. In the period 1994-1997 some 170 voluntary collaborators collected data from about 17,000 managers in nearly 1,000 local (non-multinational) organizations belonging to one of three industries: food processing, financial services, and telecommunication services, in some 60 societies

throughout the world. In the preface to the book describing the project (House et al., 2004), House writes "We have a very adequate dataset to replicate Hofstede's (1980) landmark study and extend that study to test hypotheses relevant to relationships among societal-level variables, organizational practices, and leader attributes and behavior".

For conceptual reasons GLOBE expanded the five Hofstede dimensions to nine. They maintained the labels Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance (but not necessarily their meaning). They split Collectivism into Institutional Collectivism and In-Group Collectivism, and Masculinity-Femininity into Assertiveness and Gender Egalitarianism. Long Term Orientation became Future Orientation. They added two more dimensions: Humane Orientation and Performance Orientation. The nine dimensions were covered by 78 survey questions, half of them asking respondents to describe their culture ('as is') and the other half to judge it ('should be'). GLOBE thus produced $9 \times 2 = 18$ culture scores for each country: nine dimensions 'as is' and nine dimensions 'should be'.

In an evaluation of the GLOBE project (Hofstede, 2006), I re-factor analyzed the country scores on GLOBE's 18 dimensions. Five meta-factors emerged, of which the strongest, grouping seven of the 18 measures, was highly significantly correlated with GNP per capita and next with the Hofstede Power Distance dimension. Three more meta-factors were significantly correlated with respectively the Hofstede Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism and Long Term Orientation dimensions. The GLOBE questionnaire contained very few items covering Masculinity in the Hofstede sense, but whatever there was belonged to the fifth meta-factor. The results show that in spite of a very different approach, the massive body of GLOBE data still reflected the structure of the original Hofstede model. The GLOBE research has provoked an extensive debate in the literature, but I have seen few applications relevant for practical use by cross-cultural practitioners (Hofstede, 2010). Minkov and Blagoev (2011) have tried to validate each of GLOBE's 18 dimensions by testing their nomological networks (correlation patterns with variables from other sources). The largest number of GLOBE's mutually correlated dimensions can be considered useful as facets of Hofstede's Individualism/Collectivism; some have enriched insights into Hofstede's Power Distance dimension, and GLOBE's Assertiveness "should be" provides some new elements. GLOBE's Humane Orientation and Performance Orientation, both "as is" and "should be" cannot be meaningfully validated at all.

An author sometimes cited as having researched dimensions of national culture is the Dutch management consultant Fons Trompenaars (1993). He distinguished seven conceptual dimensions, the first five borrowed from Parsons and Shils (1951) and the last two from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) which he applied to the level of nations (see earlier in this article). Trompenaars collected a database of survey items related to these dimensions, but in the only statistical analysis of his data published so far, applying Multidimensional Scaling to some 9,000 questionnaires, only two interpretable factors emerged, both correlated with Hofstede's Individualism, one of these also with Power Distance (Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996; Smith, Trompenaars, & Dugan, 1995). The only country scores that could be based on Trompenaars' data refer to these two flavors of individualism (Smith, Peterson, & Schwartz, 2002). Trompenaars' claim to seven dimensions therefore lacks empirical support.

The World Values Survey has been described above. Although the search for dimensions was not a primary purpose of this study, WVS director Ronald Inglehart in an overall statistical analysis found two key country-level factors which he called: 'Well-being versus survival' and 'Secular-rational versus traditional authority' (Inglehart, 1997, pp. 81-98). Well-being versus survival correlated with a combination of Individualism and Masculinity; Secular-rational versus traditional authority negatively with Power Distance.

Michael Minkov issued an extended and updated version of his 2007 book in a new volume *Cultural Differences in a Globalizing World* (Minkov, 2011). For the dimensions Exclusionism versus Universalism and Monumentalism versus Flexumility, country scores have been re-calculated from partly different sources, for 86 countries for exclusionism and for 43 countries for monumentalism. Indulgence versus Restraint has been reversed and renamed Industry versus Indulgence; scores for 43 countries have been based on a slightly different choice of WVS items. The old and new versions of these three dimensions are still strongly correlated, in the case of Indulgence obviously negatively.

A unique feature of the new book is the addition of a dimension not based on survey questions but on a statistically strong cluster of national statistics: murder rates, HIV (AIDS) rates, adolescent fertility rates and low average IQ (Intelligence Quotient, explainable from low education levels). This can be used for validation of dimensions based on survey items. Minkov called it Hypometropia versus Prudence; hypometropia is a medical term for short-sightedness, which he borrowed to avoid an *a priori* depreciating term. He calculated hypometropia scores for 80 countries. It correlates significantly with Minkov's Exclusionism and Monumentalism. From the six dimensions in Hofstede et al. (2010) only Individualism correlates significantly negatively with hypometropia, across 55 overlapping countries.

Dimensions of Organizational Cultures

The dimensional paradigm can be applied at other than the national level as well, in particular at the organizational and occupational levels (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998). A research project similar to the IBM studies but focusing on organization rather than national differences was carried out by this author and a team of collaborators in the 1980s (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohavy, & Sanders, 1990). Qualitative and quantitative data were collected in twenty work organizations or parts of organizations in the Netherlands and Denmark. The units studied varied from a toy manufacturing company to two municipal police corps. The study consisted of three phases: open-ended interviews with a selection of informants, forced-choice questionnaires with all, or random samples of, employees, and collecting measurable characteristics at the organization level. The questionnaires included the items used for calculating national culture dimensions in the IBM cross-national survey, but added a large number of questions collected by the 18 interviewers in the interview phase. This study found large differences among units in perceptions of daily practices but only modest differences in values, beyond those due to such basic facts as nationality, education, gender and age group.

Six independent dimensions, resembling distinctions known from organization sociology, were identified that describe the larger part of the variety in organization practices. These six dimensions can be used as a framework to describe organization cultures, but their research base in twenty units from two countries is too narrow to consider them as universally valid and sufficient. For describing organization cultures in other countries and/or in other types of organizations, additional dimensions may be necessary or some of the six may be less useful. The six dimensions found in our research were:

1. *Process-oriented versus results-oriented*

Process-oriented cultures are dominated by technical and bureaucratic routines, results-oriented by a common concern for outcomes. This dimension was associated with the culture's degree of homogeneity: in results-oriented units, everybody perceived their practices in about the same way; in process-oriented units, there were vast differences in perception among different levels and parts of the unit. The degree of homogeneity of a culture is a measure of its 'strength': the study confirmed that strong cultures are more results-oriented than weak ones, and vice versa (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

2. *Job-oriented versus employee-oriented*

The former assume responsibility for the employees' job performance only, and nothing more; employee-oriented cultures assume a broad responsibility for their members' well-being. At the level of individual managers, the distinction between job orientation and employee orientation has been popularized by Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid (1964). The Hofstede et al. study (1990) shows that job versus employee orientation is part of a culture and not (only) a choice for an individual manager. A unit's position on this dimension seems to be largely the result of historical factors, like the philosophy of its founder(s) and the presence or absence in its recent history of economic crises with collective layoffs.

3. *Professional versus parochial*

In the former, the (usually highly educated) members identify primarily with their profession; in the latter, the members derive their identity from the organization for which they work. Sociology has long known this dimension as 'local' versus 'cosmopolitan', the contrast between an internal and an external frame of reference (Merton, 1949).

4. *Open systems versus closed systems*

This dimension refers to the common style of internal and external communication, and to the ease with which outsiders and newcomers are admitted. This is the only one of the six dimensions for which a systematic difference was found between Danish and Dutch units. It seems that organizational openness is a societal characteristic of Denmark more than of the Netherlands. This shows that organization cultures also contain elements from national culture differences.

5. *Tight versus loose control*

This dimension deals with the degree of formality and punctuality within the organization; it is partly a function of the unit's technology: banks and pharmaceutical companies can be expected to show tight control, research laboratories and advertising agencies loose control; but even with the same technology some units may still be tighter or looser than others.

6. *Pragmatic versus normative*

The last dimension describes the prevailing way (flexible or rigid) of dealing with the environment, in particular with customers. Units selling services are likely to be found towards the pragmatic (flexible) side, units involved in the application of laws and rules towards the normative (rigid) side. This dimension measures the degree of 'customer orientation', which is a highly popular topic in the marketing literature.

The research grounding of these dimensions is documented extensively in Hofstede et al. (1990). Applications and implications can be found in Hofstede et al. (2010, ch. 10).

Dimensionality of Cultures in the Future

The fact that the world around us is changing does not need to affect the usefulness of the dimensional paradigm; on the contrary, the paradigm can help us understand the internal logic and the implications of the changes.

Some critics suggest that the number of dimensions should be extended. Triandis (2004) has defended this position, and the GLOBE project actually tried to extend the five Hofstede dimensions to 18. But additional dimensions are only meaningful if they are both conceptually and statistically independent from those already available, and they should also be validated by significant correlations with conceptually related external measures. There is an epistemological reason why the number of meaningful dimensions will always be small. Dimensions should not be reified. They do not 'exist' in a tangible sense. They are constructs: if they exist, it is in our minds (Levitin, 1973). They should help us in understanding and handling the complex reality of our social world. But human minds have a limited capacity for processing information, and therefore dimensional models that are too complex will not be experienced as useful. In a famous short article, Miller (1956) argued that useful classifications should not have more than seven categories, plus or minus two. I would go for the minus rather than the plus.

Within the dimensional model cultures can of course change their position on a dimension. Critics argue that Hofstede country scores based on IBM subsidiaries around 1970 are obsolete. But studies correlating the old country scores with related variables available on a year-by-year basis in many cases find no weakening of the correlations. A good reason for this is that the country scores on the dimensions do not provide *absolute* country positions, but only their positions *relative to the other countries* in the set. The relationship of the dimensions to basic problems of societies and the historical evidence of the continuity of national solutions to such problems suggest that even over much longer

periods the measures obtained will retain their validity. Influences like those of new technologies tend to affect all countries without necessarily changing their relative position or ranking; if their cultures change, they change together. Only if on a dimension one country leapfrogs over others will the validity of the original scores be reduced. This is a relatively rare occurrence. China might be one of those rare cases, where after a period of relative isolation, decades of unparalleled double-digit economic development concurrent with rapid global exposure and integration may be bringing about shifts, especially in the younger generation. But this remains to be demonstrated in carefully designed research.

Some authors predict that new technologies will make societies more and more similar. Technological modernization is an important force toward culture change and it leads to partly similar developments in different societies, but there is not the slightest proof that it wipes out variety on other dimensions. It may even increase differences, as on the basis of pre-existing value systems societies cope with technological modernization in different ways.

Culture change basic enough to invalidate the country dimension index rankings, or even the relevance of the dimensional model, will need either a much longer period – say, 50 to 100 years – or extremely dramatic outside events. Many differences between national cultures at the end of the 20th century were already recognizable in the years 1900, 1800 and 1700 if not earlier. There is no reason why they should not play a role until 2100 or beyond.

References

- Adelman, I & Morris, C. T. (1967). *Society, politics and economic development: A quantitative approach*. Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-62.
- Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston TX: Gulf.
- Cattell, R. B. (1949). The dimensions of culture patterns by factorization of national characters. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44*, 443-69.
- Chinese Culture Connection (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 143-64.
- Costa, P. T., Jr. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Douglas, M. (1973). *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Gregg, P. M. & Banks, A. S. (1965). Dimensions of political systems: Factor analysis of a cross-polity survey. *American Political Science Review, 59*, 602-14.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Helmreich, R. L., & Merritt, A. C. (1998). *Culture at work in aviation and medicine: National, organizational and professional influences*. Aldershot, Hants, UK: Ashgate.

- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (co-published in the PRC as Vol. 10 in the Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press *SFLEP Intercultural Communication Reference Series*, 2008)
- Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 882-96.
- Hofstede, G. (2010). The GLOBE debate: Back to relevance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 1339-46.
- Hofstede, G. & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: from cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16, 4-21.
- Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Rev. 2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. For translations see www.geerthofstede.nl and "our books".
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Rev. 3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. For translations see www.geerthofstede.nl and "our books".
- Hofstede, G. & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Culture and personality revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 38, 52-88.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D. & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316.
- Hofstede, G. with Arrindell, W. A., Best, D. L., de Mooij, M. Hoppe, M. H., van de Vliert, E., van Rossum, J. H. A., Verweij, J., Vunderink, M. & Williams, J. E. (1998). *Masculinity and Femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inkeles, A. & Levinson, D. J. (1969). National character: The study of modal personality and sociocultural systems. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology IV* (pp. 418-506). New York: McGraw-Hill (first published 1954).
- Kim, U, Triandis, H. C., Kagitçibasi, C., Choi, S. C., & Yoon, G. (Eds.). (1994), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., & Gibson, C. B. (2006). A quarter century of Culture's Consequences: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 285-320.

- Kluckhohn, C. (1962). Universal categories of culture. In S. Tax (Ed.), *Anthropology today: Selections* (pp. 304-20). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (first published 1952).
- Kluckhohn, F. R. & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Levitin, T. (1973). Values. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of social psychological attitudes* (pp. 489-502). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center.
- Lynn, R. (1971). *Personality and National Character*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Lynn, R. & Hampson, S. L. (1975). National differences in extraversion and neuroticism. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14, 223-240.
- Merton, R. K. (1968[1949]). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-97.
- Minkov, M. (2007). *What makes us different and similar: A new interpretation of the World Values Survey and other cross-cultural data*. Sofia, Bulgaria: Klasika i Stil.
- Minkov, M. (2011). *Cultural differences in a globalizing world*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Minkov, M. & Blagoev, V. (2011). What do Project GLOBE's cultural dimensions reflect? An empirical perspective. *Asia Pacific Business Review* online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2010.496292> .
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M. & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 3-72.
- Parsons, T. & Shils, E. A. (1951). *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rokeach, M. (1972). *Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Schimmack, U., Oishi, S. & Diener, E. (2005). Individualism: A valid and important dimension of cultural differences between nations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 17-31.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S. C. Choi & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications* (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across culture: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 268-290.

- Smith, P. B., Trompenaars, F. & Dugan, S. (1995). The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries: A test of cultural relativity. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 377-400.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 231-264.
- Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F. & Schwartz, S. H. (2002) Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior: A 47-nation study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 188-208.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Triandis, H. C. (2004). The many dimensions of culture. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, 88-93.
- Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London, UK: Economist Books.
- World Values Survey (ongoing). Online at www.worldvaluessurvey.org .

About the Author

Geert Hofstede (1928) holds an M.Sc. level degree in mechanical engineering and a Ph.D. level degree in social psychology. He had a varied career both in industry and in academia, retiring as a professor of organizational anthropology and international management from the University of Maastricht, the Netherlands, in 1993. Through his book *Culture's Consequences* (1980, new edition 2001) he became a pioneer of comparative intercultural research; his ideas are used worldwide. A student-level book *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (1991, third edition 2010 co-authored with Gert Jan Hofstede and Michael Minkov) has so far appeared in 17 European and 4 Asian languages. Geert Hofstede was listed in the *Wall Street Journal* of May 2008 among the Top 20 most influential business thinkers. He held visiting professorships in Hong Kong, Hawaii, Australia and New Zealand. He received honorary doctorates from ten European universities, and is a Fellow of the Academy of Management and the Academy of International Business in the USA and a Honorary Fellow of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

Discussion Questions

1. In today's newspaper, find an article about an event or situation in which cultural differences between persons born and educated in different countries may have played a role (there are always several). Which *one* of the six Hofstede et al. (2010) dimensions is most useful for understanding what was said and done?¹
2. Think of the last time you personally experienced a culture shock. Culture shock occurs when somebody becomes painfully aware that a person or persons born and educated in another country think(s), feel(s) and/or act(s) differently from what was expected. What happened and which *one* of the six Hofstede et al. (2010) dimensions explains best the reason for the shock?
3. Next time you attend an international meeting, compare the theories and ways of presentation of participants born and educated in different countries. Which *one* of the six Hofstede et al. (2010) dimensions was most useful for understanding the differences in what was said and how?
4. Draw the culture profile of the country in which you grew up on the six Hofstede et al. (2010) dimensions. Then imagine two persons from two different countries and imagine how each of them will describe your culture to a compatriot.

¹ Culture scores of countries can be found in Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010) and on our home website www.geerthofstede.eu under "research and VSM" and "dimension data matrix". Scores are also published on other websites and apps, but the author is not responsible for the information presented there.