

# **Cross-Cultural Studies**

**Terence Jackson, Middlesex University**

Pre-refereed version

Full citation: Jackson, T. (2011) Cross-cultural Studies, in Adrian Wilkinson and Michael Barry (eds), *Handbook of Comparative Employment Relation*, Edward Elgar. Chapter 5, pp. 98-126

The area of cross-cultural management and organization studies has been dominated by Hofstede's (1980a) seminal work on cultural values dimensions. Despite much recent criticism, and perhaps because of it, he remains the most cited author in this area. It is difficult to start any account in this field without reference to his work, and this is certainly the starting point here. This chapter first looks at the main contributions of the work of Hofstede, and others working parallel with him or subsequent to his main body of work. This includes looking at the merits of studies including the World Values Survey, Trompenaars (1993) and its subsequent reinterpretation by Peter Smith (Smith, Trompenaars and Dugan, 1996) and the more recent work of the GLOBE study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, 2004). Yet, how useful are these and what are their shortcomings?

This chapter then goes on to argue that although contributing greatly to the development of a sub-discipline, Cross-cultural Management, the 'paradigm' that Hofstede (2007) claims to have created has straight-jacketed this field. Yet this is no new paradigm that he has created, it is merely that of the positivism that social scientists have critiqued over the years, and still appears to persist particularly in the field of cross-cultural psychology. The other influence that it appears to have had is in accepting, and then propagating, an artificial distinction

between a 'cultural' approach and an 'institutional' approach. This is also discussed in this chapter.

The approach of comparing 'cultures' on a limited number of 'values' is fraught with dangers. Mainly, it neglects the dynamics not only of interpersonal and inter-organizational interaction, but also it ignores the important geopolitical power dynamics of globalization. This chapter goes on to argue that an approach that focuses on cultural 'interfaces' is more likely to lead to greater understanding of the cross-cultural dynamics and issues that affect employment relations. This does not just include working at an international level. Most countries are becoming more and more multicultural, with multicultural workforces. Issues such as cultural identity are becoming more complex, yet more important to understand. It is hoped that this chapter will provide a contribution to that understanding.

## **The Cultural Values Approach**

One of the most important contributions of Hofstede (1980a) and the cultural values approach to comparing nations is in providing a critique of the universal nature of management knowledge, policies and practices. Hofstede (1980b) in particular questions whether American management practices, such as participative management, are appropriate in countries that have cultural values that are quite distinct from that of the Anglo-American cultures. This will be returned to later.

Hofstede (1980a) work, as noted above, has been extensively cited, and cross-cultural comparisons of management and employment relations frequently refer to this work. We might ascribe the success of his concepts to their ease of understanding. His theory is very easy to teach, and this simplicity also points to one of its many weaknesses. In this first part of this chapter, the positivist paradigm within which the cultural values approach is seated is momentarily accepted. This is in order to paint a more comprehensive picture of this approach, and to extend it past a limited appreciation of the rather blunt tools of Hofstede.

Among extensive cross-national studies that focus on cultural values, it is possible to distinguish between those that relate to wider societal values (Inglehart, Basanez and Moreno, 1998; Schwartz, 1999) and those that relate more directly to organizations and management (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars, 1993; Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars, 1996; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, 2004). Although the former have been used to discuss issues in people management and organization (particularly Schwartz: see for example Gatley, Lessem and Altman, 1996), they may represent values at different levels: namely macro and meso/micro. For example, Jackson (2002a) pointed out that Schwartz's (1994) data on the former West and East Germanys indicate similarities of values, suggesting that the prevailing cultural values of the two Germanys were more similar and pervasive during the Iron Curtain years than is suggested by data from studies of organizational employees and managers (such as Trompenaars, 1993). There may therefore be differences (as in the case with the former two Germanys) between values in the wider communities and those in corporations. This may also be the case in former colonial countries where work organizations may not reflect the wider values of the societies within which they exist (Jackson, 2004). Yet, there are also connections between organizational values and societal values.

The worth of studies that explore wider societal values is that they provide an indication of fit with organizational values. Understanding the values of the wider (macro) society within which organizations evolve or are imposed is important. Firstly Western countries such as Britain, France, USA, do business abroad with a set of cultural values that often are not manifest or explicit and are assumed to be universal. As we saw above, this is often one of the major quests of cross-cultural studies, to question whether management practices used in the home country are appropriate in other countries. It is important to understand the values from which management systems, or sets of policies and implicit rules used in organizations, are derived, and how they influence the way organizations are managed in other countries.

## ***World Values Survey: A View From Outside the Corporation***

Of national comparative studies of societal values, that of Ronald Inglehart and colleagues is the most extensive, and unlike other studies, takes a longitudinal perspective. The WVS has its origin in a set of surveys conducted in ten Western European countries, and now known as the European Values Surveys. The WVS, growing out of the European studies, was initiated in 1981 'to study the values and attitudes of mass publics across nations of different economic, educational, and cultural backgrounds'. Four waves of the study have been conducted: 1981-1982, 1990-1991, 1995-1997, and 1999-2001. The most recent of these covers over 60 countries. In general terms, the Survey 'explores the hypothesis that mass belief systems are changing in ways that have important economic, political, and social consequences' (ICPSR, 2005). They are based on random, stratified samples of adults in the general population. Each study contains data from interviews conducted with between 300 and 4000 respondents per nation. The areas covered include: the importance of work, family, friends, leisure time, politics and religion; attitudes towards government and religion including the frequency of participating in group activity in governmental and religious organizations; perceptions of economic, ethnic, religious and political groups and feeling of trust and closeness with these groups; assessment of relative importance of major problems facing the world and willingness to participate in solutions; assessment of self in terms of happiness and class identity.

Inglehart's (1997) main theory is that the shift of societies generally towards modernization and materialist values, emphasising economic and physical security, is giving way to postmodern/postmaterialist values. Core elements in the modernization trend include industrialization, increased urbanization, growing occupational specialization and higher levels of formal education. A corollary of this would normally be higher levels of mass political participation for example. Modernization might also be associated with 'cultural' changes like values conducive to economic accumulation. Postmodernization, he believes, is gradually replacing these outlooks or world views associated with modernization that have

existed since the industrial revolution. Essentially he sees modernization as emphasizing economic efficiency, bureaucratic authority and scientific rationality; and, the move towards Postmodernization as moving towards ‘a more human society with more room for individual autonomy, diversity and self expression’ (p. 12).

He appears to view modernization and Postmodernization as stages in human or societal evolution with Postmodernization representing ‘a later stage of development’ (p. 8). One could take a cynical view of this: less industrialized societies are gradually catching up with industrialized societies and moving towards modernization; yet industrialized societies are now moving to Postmodernization, so less industrialized societies have even further to go in following the path of the more advanced countries. The move also towards greater ‘individual autonomy’ appears to reflect a movement towards more individuality and away from collectivism and communalism (see discussion below around Hofstede’s 1980 concepts).

This may be an element that is endemic in what Human (1996) has called ‘maximalist’ studies of cultural values. It is certainly a feature of the critique of Hofstede’s work (e.g. Human, 1996: 21, who states: ‘..the value judgements attached to the various dimensions have also rarely been explored as well as the self-fulfilling nature of the imposition of such classification on people’). Hence to say that one society is higher in ‘individualism’ or ‘power distance’ than another, or lower in ‘femininity’ than another (Hofstede, 1980) may be implying a value judgement (or at least one might be inferred) that one society is better than another. Certainly when linking such cultural dimensions to measures of economic development and prosperity as indeed, for example, Hofstede (1980) and Inglehart (1997) do, there does appear to be an implied value judgement in terms of a correlation between economic and social development and cultural values. The value judgement on Inglehart’s part is more than implied. He contends (as co-author with Baker: Inglehart and Baker, 2001: 16-17) that low-income and high-income societies differ systematically, in a polarization between *traditional* and *secular-rational* on the one hand, and between *survival* and *self-*

*expression* values on the other. These dimensions are used by Inglehart's to map the world in terms of Modernization and Postmodernization.

The first dimension (Inglehart, 1997), *Traditional authority vs. Secular-Rational authority* (later simply called *Traditional vs. Secular-Rational* values: Inglehart and Baker, 2000 and 2001) is based on items that reflect an emphasis on obedience to traditional authority, often religious authority and adherence to family and communal obligations and norm sharing, versus items emphasising a secular worldview where authority is legitimized by rational-legal norms and an emphasis on economic accumulation and individual achievement. Hence items loading positively and representing the *Traditional* pole are: God is very important in respondent's life; it is more important for a child to learn obedience and religious faith than independence and determination; abortion is never justified; respondent has a strong sense of national pride; respondent favours more respect for authority. *Secular-rational* emphasizes the opposite values: that is, provides negative scores on the above items. Inglehart and Baker (2000) also produce a list of a further 24 items that correlate (between .89 and .41) with this values dimension. These are mainly concerning the importance of religion, respect for parents and family including the dominance of the husband's role, importance of work, and loyalty to country; with a positive correlation representing *traditional* values.

The second dimension (Inglehart, 1997) *Survival values vs. Well-being values* (later termed *Survival vs. Self-Expression* values: Inglehart and Baker, 2000 and 2001) reflects, according to Inglehart, Basanez and Moreno (1998: 14-15), 'the fact that in post-industrial society, historically unprecedented levels of wealth and the emergence of the welfare state have given rise to a shift from scarcity norms, emphasising hard work and self-denial, to postmodern values emphasising the quality of life, emancipation of women and sexual minorities and relatively postmaterialist priorities such as emphasis on self-expression'. Items loading on the factor *Survival* are: respondent gives priority to economic and physical security over self-expression and quality-of-life; respondent describes self as not very happy; respondent has not signed nor would not signed a petition; homosexuality is never justifiable; you have to be

very careful about trusting people. *Self-Expression* emphasizes the opposite values: that is, provide negative scores on the above items. Inglehart and Baker (2000) also produce a list of a further 31 items that correlate (between .86 and .42) with this values dimension. These emphasize the different role of men and women, dissatisfaction with own situation, rejection of people who are different including foreigners, favouring of technology, lack of emphasis on preserving the environment, emphasis of material wellbeing and hard work, with a positive correlation representing *Survival* values.

Countries classified under 'Protestant European' (e.g. Scandinavian countries, two Germanys, Netherlands and Switzerland) score high on both the *Secular-Rational* (modernists) and *Self-Expression* (postmodernist) dimensions. They also represent countries with the highest GNP per capita (Inglehart and Baker, 2000). At the opposite extreme and representing countries with the lowest GNP per capita (Inglehart and Baker, 2001), those whose scores represent *Traditional* (pre-modern/pre-industrialized) and *Survival* (pre-postmodern) are the countries clustered in an 'Africa' group (South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana) and 'South Asia' group (Pakistan, Bangladesh, Philippines, Turkey and India).

Bordering the *Self-Expression* end of the *Survival/Self-Expression* dimension, but still representing *Traditional* values on the *Traditional/Secular-Rational* dimension, are countries clustered in a 'Latin America' group (Peru, Venezuela, Columbia, Brazil; and bordering on the *Secular-Rational* Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay). An 'Ex-Communist/Baltic' group (Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Czech) is clustered high on the *Secular-Rational* end of the *Traditional/Secular-Rational* dimension and at the *Survival* end of the *Survival/Self-Expression* dimension.

Bordering this group, towards the *Self-Expression* side of the dimension is a 'Confucian' group (China, S Korea, Taiwan and Japan), and towards the middle of the *Traditional/Secular-Rational* dimension, but still at the *Survival* side of the *Survival/Self-Expression* dimension an 'Orthodox' group (Russia, Ukraine, Bulgaria, and others).

An 'English Speaking' cluster (USA, Britain, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand Canada) is grouped in the middle of the *traditional/secular-rational* dimension, and high on *Self-Expression*. In the middle of both dimensions is a 'Catholic Europe' cluster that includes Belgium, France, Italy, Spain and Austria towards the *Self-Expression* side of the *Survival/Self-Expression* dimension, and overlapping with the 'Orthodox' group towards *Survival* is Slovenia, Croatia, Slovakia, Hungary.

Inglehart and Baker (2001) point out that America, contrary to what some modernist commentators suppose, is not the archetypal modern/postmodern or Secular-Rational and Self-Expression society that serves as the model for all other societies. In fact on Inglehart's (1997) cultural map of the World it is a 'deviant case'. Although high on *Self-Expression*, it is also high on *Traditional* values with high levels of religiosity and national pride comparable to 'developing' countries.

Inglehart and Baker (2000) also look at the movement of nations on these dimensions from the original survey to the most recent survey. The trajectory generally confirms their hypothesis that countries are moving towards *Secular-Rational* and *Self-Expression*. Yet countries such as Russia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia appear to be moving in the opposite direction. They assert that as a result of the collapse of the economic, social and political systems of the Soviet Union, there is an increasing emphasis on survival values, and even on traditional values. The former trend is certainly confirmed in the management literature where former Soviet countries show a bigger emphasis on what Jackson (2002b) calls *Instrumental* values where there is a perceived need for a quick move towards Western prosperity by the wholesale and uncritical importing of Western management approaches to human resource management for example.

China shows a big shift towards more traditional values between 1990 and 1995 that is not really explained by Inglehart and Baker (2000). Also not explained is the shift of South

Africa, Turkey, and Brazil towards more traditional values. This could in part reflect a search for traditional approaches, and melding these with Western approaches reflected in the management literature (Jackson, 2002a, 2004). It is also interesting to note that between 1981 and 1998 Britain moved more towards secular-rational and more towards survival. Perhaps this was a reflection of the Thatcher years.

### ***Schwartz's Value Dimensions: A View from the Custodians of Culture***

Shalom Schwartz's (1999) argues that there are three basic issues that confront all societies. The first issue is the relation between the individual and the group; the second is the way it is possible to guarantee responsible behaviour to maintain the social fabric; the third is the relationship between humankind and the natural and social world within which they exist.

The way the first issue is addressed, he reminds us, is reflected in the large body of literature on individual-collectivism. Much of this literature is contained within management and organizational studies. Schwartz (1999) also explains that this concept is reflected in a wider literature and described as individualism-communalism, independence-interdependence, autonomy-relatedness and separateness-interdependence (see Schwartz, 1999, for a bibliography). He suggests that inherent within this issue are two themes: the extent to which the individual's or the group's interests should take precedence; and, the extent to which persons are autonomous versus their embeddedness in their group. He believes that the latter is more fundamental, as the extent to which a person is embedded in their group determines the extent to which conflicts of interests are unlikely to be experienced. One pole of this dimension reflects cultural values that see a person as being embedded in the collectivity, finding meaning in life mainly through social relationships and identifying with the group through participation in a shared way of life. This set of values is encompassed in Schwartz's empirically derived value type *Conservatism*, or 'a cultural emphasis on maintenance of the status quo, propriety, and restraint of actions or inclinations that might disrupt the solidary

group or the traditional order (social order, respect for tradition, family security, wisdom).’ (Schwartz, 1999: 27). The other pole reflects individual autonomy.

He distinguishes between two types of autonomy. These are *Intellectual Autonomy*: ‘A cultural emphasis on the desirability of individuals independently pursuing their ideas and intellectual directions (curiosity, broadmindedness, creativity)’; and *Affective Autonomy*: ‘A cultural emphasis on the desirability of individuals independently pursuing affectively positive experiences (pleasure, exciting life, varied life)’.

The second issue seeks to address the way it is possible to guarantee responsible behaviour to maintain the social fabric, and gives rise to two polar resolutions. From Schwartz’s (1999: 27) empirical work, one resolution involves using power differences, and the other involves voluntary responses to promoting the welfare of others. He terms the first *Hierarchy*: ‘A cultural emphasis on the legitimacy of an unequal distribution of power, roles and resources (social power, authority, humility, wealth)’. The second Schwartz (1999:28) terms *Egalitarianism*: ‘A cultural emphasis on transcendence of selfish interests in favour of voluntary commitment to promoting the welfare of others (equality, social justice, freedom, responsibility, honesty)’.

The third issue that addresses the relationship between humankind and the natural and social world is resolved again through two possible responses. The first seeks to master, change and exploit the outside world out of personal or group interests; the second seeks to fit into the natural world and to accept it as it is. From his empirical study Schwartz (1999: 28) defines these two value types as *Mastery*: ‘A cultural emphasis on getting ahead through active self-assertion (ambition, success, daring, competence); and *Harmony*: ‘A cultural emphasis on fitting harmoniously into the environment (unity with nature, protecting the environment, world of beauty).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Single values in brackets that relate to each pole of each value dimension are examples from his values questionnaire that Schwartz (1999) provides in the original.

So, for each of the three issues, there is a bipolar dimension that represents alternative resolutions of the issue that can be found in different cultural groups: 1. relation of individual and group (Conservatism versus Autonomy); 2. preservation of the social fabric (Hierarchy versus Egalitarianism); and, 3. relation to nature (Mastery versus Harmony).

Schwartz's (1994) samples are from teachers and students. He argues that the former are good representatives of the cultures as they are custodians of cultures and it is they who pass this on to the next generation. The samples of university students generally corroborate results from school teachers. They reflect societal values (rather than those in corporate settings) because of the populations from which Schwartz took his samples.

There also appears to be some overlap with Inglehart and colleagues' theory concerning modernization/postmodernization trends and associated societal values, suggested in Table 1. Hence, we could postulate that *Conservatism* and *Hierarchy* may prevail in Inglehart's 'traditional' cultures (reflecting 'developing' countries) as well as in 'secular-rational'/'survival' cultures (such as in rapidly industrialized or 'emerging' countries, e.g. Eastern European countries); *Autonomy* in 'secular-rational'/'self-expressive' cultures (such as Western European and Anglo-Saxon countries); *Egalitarianism* in 'secular-rational'/'self-expression' cultures; *Mastery* in 'secular-rational'/'survival' cultures (such as the Eastern European and rapidly industrialized countries); and, *Harmony* in both 'traditional' and 'self-expression' cultures (Table 1).

\*\*\*\*\*

Table 1 about here

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***Smith's Reinterpretation of Trompenaars' Work: A View from Within the Corporation***

The work of Fons Trompenaars (1993) has severe limitations in methodology and academic rigour. Yet it has been used extensively, particularly in connection with cross-cultural management development activities. Here the reanalysis of Trompenaars' extensive database led by Peter Smith (Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars, 1996) is discussed, as its concepts are partly related to those of Schwartz and, as we see below, to those of Hofstede.

Trompenaars' (1993) work was conceptually built on Parsons and Shils (1951) and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) formulations of cultural differences, and other dimensions drawn from Rotter (1966) and Hall (1959). These are: regard for rules or relations (universalism-particularism), individualism-collectivism, neutral-affective expression of emotions, low and high context societies (specific-diffuse) and the way status is accorded (achievement-ascription). Trompenaars (1993) also considers attitudes to time (synchronic-sequential) and relation to nature (external-internal locus of control). His results are presented in terms of the percentage of positive (or negative) responses to each of several questions for each of some fifty different nationalities. His information was gathered through administering a questionnaire to attendees of management seminars in the various countries surveyed (Trompenaars, 1993).

Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars (1996) then undertook a rigorous statistical reanalysis of Trompenaars extensive international database. This provides two major value dimensions through multidimensional scaling, which are now discussed. It is still useful to refer back to Trompenaars' original 'dimensions' to describe these larger value dimensions that in part correlate with Schwartz's dimensions, and those of Hofstede. Smith et al (1996) dimensions are as follows.

- **Conservatism:** comprises items that represent ascribed status, particularist/paternalistic employers and formalized hierarchies, and represents an external locus of control. It correlates with Hofstede's Collectivism and Power Distance (see below) and falls just short of a significant correlation with Schwartz's Conservatism.
- **Egalitarian commitment:** comprises achieved status, universalistic and non-paternalistic values, as well as functional hierarchy and internal locus of control. It correlates with Hofstede's individualism and low Power Distance. It also correlates with Schwartz's Egalitarianism.
- **Utilitarian Involvement:** comprises aspects of individualism that emphasise individual credit and responsibility. It correlates with Hofstede's individualism and low power distance.
- **Loyal Involvement:** comprises aspects of collectivism that stress loyalty and obligation to the group, as well as corporate loyalty and obligation. It correlates with Hofstede's collectivism and high power distance.

**Conservations-Egalitarian Commitment.** Of Trompenaars' (1993) dimensions referred to above universalism-particularism, achievement-ascription and locus of control are the most relevant to our present discussion. In some cultures people see rules and regulations as applying universally to everyone, regardless of who they are. In cultures which are more particularist, people see relationships as more important than applying rules the same for everyone. There is an inclination to apply the rules according to friendship and kinship relations. This has implications for recruitment and promotion policies in organizations in some Asian countries which may be at variance to practices in countries such as the United States and Britain where this might be termed 'nepotism'. However, there are differences in European countries. Greece, Spain and France are seen as more particularist, and Sweden, former West Germany and Britain as more Universalist.

Also within the Conservatism-Egalitarian Commitment construct is Trompenaars' concept of achievement-ascription. Status is accorded to people on the basis of what they achieve in their

jobs and their lives (achievement) or who they are and where they come from such as family background, their school or some other prior factor (ascription). Quite often more traditional societies attribute status according to the latter precept. Again, this may influence recruitment and promotion policies which may be at variance to practices in some (but not all) western cultures, and again may raise ethical issues. On some measures Austria, Belgium, Spain and Italy are more ascription oriented, and Denmark, Britain and Sweden more achievement oriented.

Locus of Control is another concept that is subsumed within the Conservatism-Egalitarian Commitment construct. People tend to believe that what happens to them in life is their own doing (internal locus of control), or they have no or little control over what happens to them (external locus of control), the causes of which are external to them. Although a connection has not been made directly to Schwartz (1994) Harmony-Mastery construct (Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars, 1996), locus of control does raise issues about how people relate to their environment, and the level of control they believe they have over the natural world. This may have implications for the nature of interaction with the natural and social world, and raise about power (in the social sphere) and environment controls (in the natural sphere). It also may have implications regarding the nature of management control in organizations. For example, setting targets may be inappropriate as a form of management control in a society that culturally has an external locus of control.

Paternalism is also an important concept in cross-cultural management research and is captured in part by Trompenaars' concept of specific-diffuse which contains questionnaire items such as 'should the company provide housing' and involves the extent to which relationships at work, particularly with the boss, are carried through to other aspects of one's life. It is subsumed within the construct of Conservatism, and may have ethical implications for the regard for interference/protection in one's life by the corporation. Paternalism is however more thoroughly investigated elsewhere (see Aycan, 2006, who defines it as 'people

in authority assuming the role of parent and considering it an obligation to provide support and protection to others under their care’).

### **Utilitarian Involvement-Loyal Involvement.**

This dimension is most allied to Hofstede’s individual-collectivism and Power Distance (see below), but reflects the nature of loyalty of the individual to the group and corporation. While individuals may have a contractual relationship with the organization within the Utilitarian Involvement construct, members of a group or corporation have relations with the wider collective that involve obligation and reciprocity.

### ***Hofstede’s Cultural Values: A View From Within One Corporation***

Geert Hofstede (1980) was one of the first to attempt to develop a universal framework for understanding cultural differences in managers’ and employees’ values based on a world-wide survey within the company that employed him at the time: IBM. Hofstede’s work focuses on ‘value systems’ of national cultures which are represented by four dimensions:

- *Power Distance.* This is the extent to which inequalities among people are seen as normal. This dimension stretches from equal relations being seen as normal to wide inequalities being viewed as normal. For example, the former West Germany scored (scores are nominally between 100 and 0) a relatively low 35, USA a relatively low to medium 40, Britain 35 and France a relatively high 68. Brazil scored 69 and Mexico 81. China was not included in the study. Hong Kong scored 68 and Taiwan 58. Eastern European countries were also not included in the study. An all white South African sample scored 49. Schwartz’s (1994) concept of Hierarchy equates with Power Distance.
- *Uncertainty Avoidance.* This refers to a preference for structured situations versus unstructured situations. This dimension runs from being comfortable with flexibility and ambiguity to a need for extreme rigidity and situations with a high degree of certainty. For example, the former West Germany scored a medium 65, France a high 86 on a level with

Spain. US scored a relatively low 46, with Britain at 35. Brazil scored 76 and Mexico 82. Hong Kong scored 29 and Taiwan 69. The all white South African sample scored 49.

- *Individualism-Collectivism*. This looks at whether individuals are used to acting as individuals or as part of cohesive groups, which may be based on the family (which is more the case with Chinese societies or the corporation (as may be the case in Japan). This dimension ranges from collectivism (0) to individualism (100). USA is the highest (91). France scores 71 and Britain 89. The former West Germany scored 67. Brazil scored 38 and Mexico 30 (Guatemala was the most collectivist at 6). Hong Kong scored 25, and Taiwan 17. The all white South African sample scored 65. Schwartz's (1994) concept of Conservatism-Autonomy has similarities with this dimension.
- *Masculinity-Femininity*. Hofstede distinguishes 'hard values' such as assertiveness and competition, and the 'soft' or 'feminine' values of personal relations, quality of life and caring about others, where in a masculine society gender role differentiation is emphasized. The US scored a medium to high (masculinity) 62, with the former west Germany at 66. Britain scored 66 and France 43. Brazil scored 49 and Mexico 69. Taiwan scored 45 and Hong Kong 56. The all white South African sample scored 63. Aspects of Schwartz's (1994) concept of Mastery-Harmony have similarities to this dimension.

Hofstede (1980; 1991; 2003) conceptually extrapolates from these dimensions derived from factor analysis of items on his questionnaire, to infer wider descriptions of the nature and implications of cultural values both within and outside the corporate setting, as follow.

*Power distance* is polarized into small and large power distance and comprises attitudes which people within the culture have about the acceptable inequalities between people in the society or organization. In small power distance cultures there is a belief that inequalities among people should be minimized, that parents should treat children as equals and that teachers expect student initiative in the classroom. Hierarchies in work organizations are established as a convenience only to manage inequality of roles. Decentralization is popular,

subordinates expect to be consulted, and privileges are frowned upon in a small power distance society. Conversely, in a large power distance culture, inequalities are expected and desired, parents teach children obedience and teachers are expected to take the initiative in the classroom. Hierarchies in organizations reflect the natural order of inequalities between the higher-ups and the lower-downs, centralization is popular and subordinates expect that they are told what to do. Privilege and status symbols are expected.

Weak *Uncertainty Avoidance* cultures accept uncertainty as a feature of everyday life, there is generally low stress and people feel comfortable in ambiguous situations. People are curious with what is different. Students are happy with open-ended learning situations, and teachers can say 'I don't know'. Rules should only be for what is necessary. People may be lazy, and work hard only when needed. Punctuality has to be learned, and people are motivated by achievement and esteem or belonging to a group.

Strong *Uncertainty Avoidance* is characterized by the threat of uncertainty which is always present but must be fought. It is characterized by high stress and a fear of ambiguous situations and unfamiliar risk. There is a feeling that what is different must be dangerous. Students are more comfortable in a structured learning situation and like to be told the right answer: teachers are supposed to know the answers. There is an emotional need for rules, even when these may not work. There is a need to be busy, and a feeling that time is money: an inner urge to hard work. Punctuality is natural, and people are motivated by security, esteem or belongingness.

In societies where *individualism* describes cultural values people look after themselves and the immediate nuclear family. A person's identity is based on him or her as an individual. Speaking one's mind is respected. Education is aimed at learning to learn, and academic and professional diplomas increase self respect and potential economic worth. The employer-employee contract is assumed to be based on mutual advantage, and hiring decisions are

supposed to be based on individual competence. Managers manage individuals, and tasks are more important than relationships.

In *Collectivistic* societies people are born into and protected by extended families, to which they exchange loyalty. One's identity is based in the belongingness to a social group or network. Children are taught to think of 'we' not 'I'. Rather than speaking one's mind, harmony should be maintained and direct confrontation avoided. The purpose of education is to learn how to do, and diplomas provide an entry into higher status groups. Rather than purely a contract, the employer-employee relationship is seen as a moral one such as a family relationship, and when hiring or firing the employee's in-group is considered. Managers manage groups, and relationships are more important than tasks.

In a *Masculine* society values are based on material success, money and possessions. Men are expected to be assertive and ambitious, and women tender and concerned with relationships. The father deals with facts and the mother with feelings. There is sympathy for the strong and the best student is the norm: failing in school is seen as a disaster. People live in order to work. Managers are expected to be decisive and assertive, and there is a stress on competition, performance and resolution of conflict by fighting them out.

In contrast, the *Feminine* society has values of caring for others and preservation rather than progress. People and good relationships are more important than money and things, and people are expected to be modest. Both men and women are expected to be concerned with relationships, and both mother and father should deal with feelings and facts. There is sympathy for the weak, and the average student is the norm. Failing in school is a minor accident. People work in order to live. Managers use intuition and try to gain consensus. There is a stress on equality, solidarity and quality of work life. Conflicts are resolved by compromise and negotiation.

A fifth dimension was added by Hofstede to the original four. This was developed through the Chinese Cultural Connection study (CCC, 1987) and in part justified by Hofstede's warning of the dangers of developing constructs from a Western point of view. The Chinese Cultural Connection was an attempt to counter this by introducing an Eastern perspective and values. The study reinforced three out of the four dimensions in Hofstede's original study: the Chinese dimension of 'human-heartedness', which incorporates values such as kindness, courtesy and social consciousness, correlates negatively with masculinity; 'integration' which encompasses the cultivation of trust, tolerance and friendship correlates negatively with power distance; 'moral discipline' including values of group responsiveness, moderation, adaptability and prudent behaviour correlates negatively with individualism.

None of the new dimensions correlated with uncertainty avoidance, but a new dimension termed Confucian Dynamism and then Long Term Orientation, with values of persistence and perseverance, ordering relationships by status and observing order, thrift and having a sense of shame. Uncertainty avoidance is concerned with absolute Truth which may not be a relevant value in Chinese society and other Eastern cultures which are more concerned with Virtue. Of particular relevance is the virtue of working hard and acquiring skills, thrift, being patient and persevering: these are all values connected with this fifth dimension that may replace uncertainty avoidance as a relevant Eastern concept. On a scale from a minimum score of 0 to a maximum 118, Pakistan scores 0 and China 118. The Chinese societies of Hong Kong (96) and Taiwan (87) are towards the top of the scale with Japan (80) and South Korea (75) next. Brazil scores 65, Singapore 48 and Netherlands 44. Sweden (33), Poland (32) and the former West Germany (31) follow. USA scores a relatively low 29, with Britain at 25. Of African countries, Zimbabwe (25) scores the same as Britain, and Nigeria is second from bottom with 16. This seems to bear out an assumption that the Eastern 'tiger' countries which have done well economically are high on this dimension, with the Anglo-Saxon countries relatively low, and African countries with a short term economic perspective scoring very low.

## ***GLOBE Culture Constructs: Trying to Improve on Hofstede?***

The GLOBE project (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program) is a more recent cross-national study undertaken by Robert House and a team of 170 researchers across 62 societies (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, 2004). Its main focus is the relationship between culture and leadership characteristics. In some ways the study is disappointing because it did little to break out of the conceptual framework of cultural dimensions set by Hofstede in the early 1980s, and it mirrors many of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Yet this, for our current purpose is useful as it provides a more up to date view of these cultural dimensions, and like the other studies examined above, provides a basis for considering the appropriateness of transferring management theory and practice. It also purports to investigate both 'values' (e.g. 'Followers **should be** expected to obey their leaders without question') and 'practices' (e.g. 'Followers **are** expected to obey their leaders without question'). The cultural value dimensions proffered by the GLOBE project are as follows (Javidan, House and Dorfman, 2004: 30).

- Power Distance: 'The degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally'. This ('practices' only, not 'values') correlates positively with Hofstede's Power Distance and Schwartz's Hierarchy.
- Uncertainty Avoidance: 'The extent to which a society, organization or group relies on social norms, rules, and procedures to alleviate unpredictability of future events'. Curiously 'values' correlates positively and 'practices' negatively with Hofstede's Uncertainty Avoidance. It correlates positively with Schwartz's 'Embeddedness' (this is Schwartz's (1994) dimension at the individual level, and equates with Conservatism at the group level).
- Humane Orientation: 'The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring and kind to others'. This does not appear to correlate with Hofstede's or Schwartz's dimensions.
- Collectivism I (Institutional Collectivism): 'The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and

collective action'. 'Values' correlates negatively with Hofstede's Individualism, but not with any of Schwartz's dimensions.

- Collectivism II (In-Group Collectivism): 'The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families'. 'Practices' correlates negatively with Hofstede's Individualism, but not with any of Schwartz's dimensions.
- Assertiveness: 'The degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in their relationships with others'. 'Practices' correlates positively with Hofstede's Masculinity and negatively with Schwartz's Egalitarianism.
- Gender Egalitarianism: 'The degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequalities'. This does not correlate with any of Hofstede's dimensions, but correlates positively with Schwartz's Egalitarianism.
- Future Orientation: 'The extent to which individuals engage in future-oriented behaviours such as delaying gratification, planning, and investing in the future'. This does not appear to correlate with any of Hofstede's or Schwartz's dimensions.
- Performance Orientation: 'The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellent'. Again this appears not to correlate with Hofstede's or Schwartz's dimensions.

The GLOBE project findings reflect many of the cultural dimensions proffered in earlier studies, and as such do not add conceptually to our descriptive understanding of values across cultures. They do, however, provide current information that is perhaps more rigorously validated, and covers more countries than previous studies. For example it covers some six African countries and six post-communist countries. Yet despite these more comprehensive studies such as WVS and GLOBE, Hofstede's theory, maybe in its apparent simplicity, remains in the forefront (perhaps rekindled by his updating of his work in 2003) of the comparative cultural values studies in the positivist paradigm.

## **Transferability and Appropriateness: Cross-cultural Studies as Critique**

One of Hofstede's (1980b) main contributions to management scholarship has been to introduce a cross-cultural critique of the transferability of Western (American) management principles to non-Western (non-American) countries. From this, not only should we ask if management is effective, but also we should be asking if it is appropriate within a particular cultural context? Yet for whom it should be appropriate implies relationships of power. This is a question Hofstede (1980b) did not take up. For examples, what is appropriate for foreign shareholders of a multinational corporation operating in an African country, might not be appropriate for local employees or the local community within which the subsidiary is located ('effectiveness' for a Western firm operating in Africa implies that it is operating appropriately for its shareholders in making profits). Not only should power relations within international organizations be considered however, but geopolitical issues also. This was not really taken up in the management literature until over ten years later in another landmark publication.

## **The Parochial Dinosaur – a Hint at Power Dynamics**

This landmark article, Boyacigiller and Adler (1991), outlines the ascendancy of American management thought, principles and practices around the world due to the economic dominance of the United States after World War II. In the end these two authors ascribe this to parochialism on the part of American managers, rather than anything more sinister. They hint at power relations, yet this is not developed, and has not been taken up generally in the ensuing cross-cultural literature. Concepts of leadership and participatory management, for which Hofstede (1980b) provided the basis for a critique of transferability, have been propagated through MBA programmes and management textbook throughout the world. This has only attracted any degree of derision among scholars working in developing country contexts. For example, a leading book on management in Africa of the 1990s states:

Current theories of leadership....in the West place high value...on teamwork, empowerment ..... The problem is that the amount of hype surrounding such putative

features implies it is a hard sell, even in its place of origin.... Transformational leadership in the West... is more a construct of the rhetoric of management consultants than it is the reality of management practice. It seems likely that – as with Coca-Cola – the less the worth of the product to the consumer the more one needs to envelop it in a promotional mystique... and this helps to disguise its discordance with most of the cultures in which its tenets are applied’ (Blunt and Jones, 1997: 11).

More recent international events have brought the same type of geopolitical forces in operation here into even sharper relief, where Western concepts of ‘democracy’ have been enforced through military intervention (for example Chomsky’s, 2003, critique is illuminating on this subject). Normally within the confines of academia, international power relations are carried out in a far more subtle way, yet reflecting what many commentators have regarded as neo-colonialism in the practices of multinational corporations including those in the not-for-profit sector. For example, Cooke and Kothari’s (2002) provide a useful critique of the imposition of participatory management mainly in the NGO sector. Within the same edited volume, the following harsh critique is delivered:

‘...participatory discourse and practices are part of a wider attempt to obscure the relations of power and influence between elite interests and less powerful groups... (p.122). ....I would argue, however, that participatory discourses are utilized in both the development and managerial contexts because they serve essentially the same purpose of giving the “sense” and warm emotional pull of participation without its substance, and are thus an attempt to placate those without power and obscure the real levers of power inherent in the social relations of global capitalism (p.125).’ (Taylor, 2002)

Postcolonial Theory has provided an elaboration and critique of these more subtle power dynamics within literary studies (Said’s, 1978, *Orientalism* is the landmark study), in development studies (e.g. Mohan, 2002, provides an outline) and more recently in organization studies (Prasad, 2003). Mohan (2002: 157) for example, puts it rather sharply

when saying ‘Postcolonial studies alerts us to the epistemic violence of Eurocentric discourses of the non-West and the possibilities of recovering the voices of the marginalized’. Yet he warns that ‘much of this abstracts cultural processes away from material conditions and is unable to stand outside (or suggest alternatives to) the dominant epistemological frameworks against which they argue.’

It seems that this debate has largely passed by the field of cross-cultural management. Since initiating a critique of Western management hegemony in 1991, Boyacigiller and Adler’s articles has been much quoted, but little has been done to expand on this and to take it on board. International world events, in contributing to cross-cultural dynamics and contextualizing the study of cross-cultural management, seem also to pass us by.

Before moving on to how cross-cultural theory may be developed, there are three other important aspects in considering the limitations of Hofstede’s theory, and where we go from here: crossvergence and cultural interfaces, and cultural identities.

## **Crossvergence and Cultural Interfaces**

Hofstede’s theory appears to remain firmly within the ‘divergence’ camp. That is, there is an assumption that country cultures remain distinct from each other. Hence, there are fundamental differences assumed between French and Italian managers, or American and Japanese managers. However, the difficulties in identifying the ‘culture’ of a location such as Hong Kong, at a confluence of Western and Chinese influence, suggest that things might be more complicated than supposed.

Hong Kong represents a complex interface of Western and Chinese culture, business practices and management processes. It is perhaps no accident that theories of cultural *crossvergence* have been developed by management academics focusing on Hong Kong (Ralston et al, 1994;

Priem et al, 2000). This concept brings together opposing views of globalization, namely convergence and divergence theories.

*Convergence* is based on an assumption that all societies are following the same trajectory. As societies industrialize they embrace capitalism and technology and evolve towards the (Western) industrialized societies (from Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison and Myers, 1960). Contained within this must also be noted the influence of television, Hollywood, the global reach of multinational companies, global brands such as Coca Cola and McDonald's, conditional financial aid, structural adjustment programmes, American/Western management education programmes, migration, cosmopolitanization, and so on. These all influence a tendency towards cultural convergence.

*Divergence* argues that national cultures continue to be a primary influence on values, beliefs and attitudes despite globalizing forces and industrialization, and that culture is a long-lived rather than a transient phenomenon. Successive studies that focus on comparing national cultures have sought to demonstrate this as we have seen.

Yet both concepts, of convergence or divergence, do not appear to consider the process of what goes on during cross-cultural interactions. Rather than trying to identify the nature of a cultural entity, such as a country, it would seem more legitimate to discover the nature of intercultural interactions at different levels of analysis, and (to borrow from a phrase from Hofstede, 1980/2003) their consequences.

A third perspective (Beals, 1953; Ralston et al 1994; Priem et al, 2000), that of cultural *crossvergence*, suggests that culture and industrialization will interact to produce a new value system, such as in the case of Hong Kong. It is possible to go further than this in asserting, for example in relation to the way people are managed in organizations, that although there may be hegemonic influences from stronger and more successful economies such as the United States that propel transitional and emerging countries to adopt inappropriate solutions,

crossvergence or the interaction of different cultural influences in cultures such as South Korea and Hong Kong have given rise to successful hybrid management systems. (Jackson, 2002a).

Crossvergence theory, when stressing the importance of interaction at different levels, may well be the key to understanding not culture as a product or characteristic of a discrete cultural entity such as a nation, but as an *interface* between or interfaces among different cultural influences; between attitudes, beliefs and values, (and institutions as cultural manifestations as argued below) and within relationships containing power dynamics.

‘Interaction’ as a term is normally applied at the social psychological level of interpersonal relations (Adler and Graham, 1989; Fink, Neyer & Kolling, 2006). Hence the term ‘interfaces’ implies a broader conceptual framework whereby geopolitical dynamics at the macro level are considered, through to the meso levels of inter-organizational interactions, and micro level of interpersonal interactions; and, whereby these different levels further interact to produce diverse hybrid social forms of organization, and multiple forms of individual cultural identity. Before considering this in more detail, it is necessary to discuss the relationship (in international management and organization studies) between what is considered ‘cultural’ and what is considered ‘institutional’. This is a particularly important issue when it comes to looking at cultural interfaces within regions of the world (at least 80 per cent of the globe) that have a postcolonial legacy.

### ***Interfaces and the Cultural-Institutional Debate***

Within a continuing debate between ‘culturists’ and ‘institutionalists’, differences across nations are either attributed to institutional arrangements, which are seen as fundamental (e.g. Hickson and McMillan, 1981); or, differences are attributed to cultural factors or, in Hofstedian parlance, to differences in the ‘software of the mind’ (Hofstede, 1991). Sorge (2004) believes that the two approaches should be complementary. He cites Giddens (1986) in saying that individual behaviour and social structure are reciprocally constituted, that is normative customs that are instituted to be binding are kept in place by acting individuals. Yet

on the other hand, individuals do not make behavioural choices without regard to such norms. Sorge (2004) believes that such an integrative approach will consider both the construction of actors, that is people with values, preferences and knowledge, and the construction of social and societal systems as reciprocally related to an extent that they cannot be separated from each other.

From this point of view the concept of culture should take in ‘that complex whole which involves knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society’ (Tylor, 1871), or indeed the ‘human-made part of the environment’ (Herskovits, 1948). In other words, institutions as part of ‘culture’ are created by sentient human beings in interaction interpersonally, inter-organizationally, and inter-nationally. Their rules reflect societal values, and the societal values reflect institutional rules.

Jack Goody (1994), a prominent British social anthropologist, points to the dichotomy in the American tradition of *cultural* anthropology between ‘cultural studies’ concerned with symbols and meaning, and the social (social structures, organizations etc). He maintains that in the European tradition of *social* anthropology this dichotomy is not readily accepted, and has tended to treat these two categories as virtually synonymous. Certainly this is reflected in Tylor’s classic definition (above), and for example Firth’s (1951) view where culture is seen as the content of social relations, not as some distinct entity. Hence the institutional context both shapes meaning, and is shaped by it. Both are what can be described as culture. Institutions are cultural constructs with rules that are applied in society, and they also shape and are shaped by values, which are part of the meaning systems of society. This is different, for example, from the conceptualization of the American cultural anthropologist Geertz (1973:89) who sees culture as ‘an historically transmitted pattern of meaning embodied in symbols of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means which men communicate’, and distinguishes between cultural symbols as ‘vehicles of thought’ and social structure as ‘forms of human association’ with a ‘reciprocal interplay’ occurring between them.

Goody (1994: 252) therefore maintains that ‘..attempts to differentiate the cultural from the social, or the symbolic from other forms of human interaction, seem open to question. The terms may serve as general signposts to areas of interest within a wider field of social action..’ In terms of this debate Hofstede seems to be firmly in the American camp, distinguishing ‘the software of the mind’ as meaning/value systems and juxtaposing himself to the institutionalists.

However, just when this debate, at least in the European tradition, appears to be redundant, things start to get complicated in ‘developing’ countries that have a history of colonization. Dia (1996) takes the view that institutions were imposed on African societies during the colonial period. They have largely remained and evolved through the post-colonial period, and mostly are seen as still inappropriate to African societies and their context. Here, rules seem to be at odds with values; institutions appear to be at odds with symbolic culture. The split between (local) culture and ‘global’ or ‘Western’ institutions in Africa and other post-colonial countries can only be explained by geopolitical power relations.

The introduction of colonial institutions into Africa, no doubt, involved a number of elements: firstly the (cultural) background of the colonizing countries; secondly the interaction of colonizers with colonized societies and institutions (for example African institutions such as chiefdoms were integrated into colonial administrations to enlist the help of local chiefs to keep law and order and to collect taxes: Gluckman, 1956/1970); and thirdly the wielding of (economic, military and then ideological) power by the colonizers within the interactions with local communities. There is no doubt also that these institutions have an influence on African communities today, and that they have helped to shape modern and urban African cultures. Through interactions these institutions have also been shaped by African cultural influences which include African institutions (Ayitter, 1991).

The interaction effects among ‘rules’ (institutions), ‘values’ (culture), and ‘control’ (power), may therefore be the way forward in understanding culture as a dynamic, rather than a static entity. In other words, culture is created/recreated at the point of intersection – the interface. Central to this is ‘power’, in Foucault’s (1979: 194) terms, for example: ‘power produces, it

makes reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth'. He contends that power relations do not stand apart from other relations, but power is inherent in all relations and is the effect of divisions, inequalities and imbalances found in these relations, and at the same time are preconditions for these differentiations. Dominance in a power relationship has a legitimizing effect. Yet, for Foucault power also infers the possibility of resistance, and that resistance is always part of a power relationship. Hence values (culture) come into conflict with rules (institutions).

So, in post-colonial societies 'culture' (as a concrete noun) starts to get fuzzy. When a Hofstede (1980), or a Trompenaars (1993), or a Schwartz (1999), or a House (House et al, 2004) comes along with their questionnaire to ask questions about the values of a representative of the 'culture' of (for example) South Africa, they are in trouble. Their individual 'subject' represents not a 'culture', but the confluence of a complex and multi-layered interface that can only be accessed through the agency of individuals' cultural identity, but can only really be understood through an analysis of the cultural interfaces involved.

## **The Way Forward**

The positivist view of social science allows no place for value judgements. Hence the position of Hofstede and those that have developed 'maximalist' (Human, 1996) approaches to comparing nations, would not contemplate the question 'we know that organizations in country X operate in a national culture that is higher in Power Distance than our own, where the boss's word is law, and cannot be questioned: what do we do about it?' However, the answer may be provided in the implicit derogation of high power distance. If a scholar, or manager, came from a country that favoured a lower power distance, it would be natural to look down on countries that favoured high power distance and felt okay about inequalities in the work place. Yet such approaches as Hofstede's express 'a view from nowhere', which Flyvbjerg (2001) reminds us is impossible in the social sciences. For scholars who focus on cross-cultural differences, and an understanding of different cultures, this is somewhat

surprising. All scholarship in the social science takes a ‘view from somewhere’, yet this is inadequately articulated in cross-cultural management studies of this sort.

As Nonaka and Toyama (2007, who also refer to Flyvbjerg) point out, the relativist view that everything is subjective with no universality is of little practical use. Indeed, they site the interactions of different subjectivities within the realm of knowledge creation: ‘What is “truth” depends on who we are (values) and from where we look at it (context). And it is the differences in our values and contexts that create new knowledge’ (Nonaka and Toyama, 2007: 374).

The objective of studying cultural interfaces is not merely to learn about the influences (antecedents) of hybrid cultural forms. It is also about studying what knowledge is created from this and how; and, what use is this, and to whom (the appropriateness of the knowledge created to the context in which it is applied: e.g. people management principles and practices that are created through interaction between powerful Western organizations and weak African/Eastern European/Latin American, etc, organizations or individual managers, and their appropriateness to local staffs).

Bound up with this is the analysis of power within each interface: who/what wields power in what form and how? What are the results of power in this relationship? In an abstract way each of these ‘world views’ within any point of analysis (interfaced) may be equal in value to any other. But as Foucault (1979) suggests, power legitimizes. This legitimization takes two forms: the legitimization of the view of the most powerful in the relationship; and, the legitimization of the scholar (not forgetting that in most cases this will be undertaken from a Western perspective, with indigenous interpretations/explanations struggling for legitimization) with the relationship between researcher and researched constituting another interface, and the relationship between foreign manager and local staff another.

An important issue in cross-cultural management research is not so much that nations or cultural groups are different, and have different world views, but what do we do with this information when looking at the consequences in the interface between two of those ‘entities’? If Hofstede’s theory suggests that it may be inappropriate to transpose participatory management from a low power culture to a high one, what do we do about it?

Clearly, cross-cultural theory, and the way it may inform employment relations, has some way to go beyond mere references to Hofstede, and indeed critiques of Hofstede. In order to explore national comparisons international employment relations should not only take cognizance of some of the more sophisticated, yet more complex value dimension studies, but also consider the conceptual difficulties in separating institutions from culture, and indeed institutional studies from cross-cultural studies. As cultural identity (of individuals and organizations) becomes a more complex issue in a globalized world, theory of cultural crossvergence and the study of cultural interfaces should come to the fore. Yet geopolitical power relations (particularly in a post-colonial world) should take centre stage, particularly in challenging a ‘view from nowhere’ that currently dominates cross-cultural studies.

## References

- Adler, N.J., & Graham, J.L. (1989). Cross-cultural interaction: The international comparison fallacy? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 20(3), 515-537.
- Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: towards conceptual refinement and operationalization, in K.S. Yang, K. K. Hwang and U. Kim (Eds.) *Scientific Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical and Cultural Contributions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206, 445-66
- Ayitter, G. B. N. (1991) *Indigenous African Institutions*, New York: Transnational Publishers.

- Beals, R. (1953), Acculturation, in A. L. Kroeber (ed) (1953) *Anthropology Today*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyacigiller, N. A. and Adler, N. J. (1991) The parochial dinosaur: organizational science in a global context, *Academy of Management Review*, 16(2), 262-90.
- CCC (Chinese Cultural Connection) (1987) Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 143-64.
- Chomsky, N. (2003) *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*, London: Penguin.
- Cooke, B. and Kothari, U (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, London: Zed Books.
- Dia, M. (1996) *Africa's Management in the 1990s and Beyond*, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Fink, G, Neyer, A-K & Kolling, M (2006) Understanding Cross-Cultural Management Interaction: Research into Cultural Standards to Complement Cultural Value Dimensions and Personality Traits, *International Studies of Management. & Organization*, 36(4), 38–60.
- Firth, R (1951) *Elements of Social Organization*, London: Watts.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish*, New York; Vintage Books, p.194.
- Gatley, S., Lessem, R. and Altman, Y. (1996), *Comparative Management: A Transcultural Odyssey*, London: McGraw-Hill
- Geertz, C (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A (1986) *The Constitution of Society*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gluckman, M (1956/1970) *Custom and Conflict in Africa*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goody, J. (1994) Culture and its boundaries: a European perspective, in R. Borofsky (ed) *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*, New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 250-61.
- Hall, E. T. (1959) *The Silent Language*, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Herskovits M J (1948) *Man and His Works: The Science of Cultural Anthropology*, New York: Knopf.

- Hickson, D. J. and McMillan, C.J (1981) (eds) *Organization and Nation: The Aston Programme, IV*, Aldershot: Gower.
- Hofstede, G (1980a/2003) *Cultures Consequences*, 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> Editions, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980b) Motivation, leadership and organization: do American theories apply abroad?, *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer, pp. 42-63.
- Hofstede, G (1991) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede G (2007) Hofstede after Hofstede: what should be done with my dimensions, presentation at IACCM Conference: Crosscultural Life of Social Values, Rotterdam, 18-18 May 2007.
- House, R, Hanges P J Javidan, M and Dorfman, P W, (2004) *Leadership, Culture and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Human, L (1996) *Contemporary Conversations*, Dakar, Senegal: The Goree Institute
- ICPSR (2005) Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, at <http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/ICPSR-STUDY/03975.xml>, accessed 18 December 2005.
- Inglehart, R, Basanez, M and Moreno, A (1998) *Human Values and Beliefs: A Cross-cultural Sourcebook*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press
- Inglehart, R. (1997) *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. and Baker, W. E. (2000), Modernization, cultural change, and persistence of traditional values, *American Sociological Review*, 65, February, 19-51.
- Jackson, T. (2002a) *International HRM: A Cross-cultural Approach*, London: Sage.
- Jackson, T. (2002b) The management of people across cultures: valuing people differently, *Human Resource Management*, 41(4), 455-75.
- Jackson, T. (2004) *Management and Change in Africa: A Cross-cultural Perspective*, London: Routledge.
- Kerr, C., Dunlop, J. T., Harbison, F. H. and Myers, C. A. (1960) *Industrialism and Industrial Man*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kluckholm, F and Strodtbeck, F. (1961) *Variations in Value Orientation*, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Mohan, G (2002) Beyond participation: strategies for deeper empowerment, in B. Cooke and U Kothari, *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, London: Zed Books, 2002: 153-167.
- Nonaka, I and Toyama, R (2007) Strategic management as distributed practical wisdom (phronesis), *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16(3), pp. 371–394
- Parson, T. and Shils, (1951) *Towards a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Prasad, A (ed) (2003) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Reader*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Priem, R. L., Love, L. G. and Shaffer, M. (2000) Industrialization and values evolution: the case of Hong Kong and Guangzhou, China, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 17(3), 473-92.
- Ralston, D. A., Gaicalone, R. A. & Terpstra, R. H. (1994) Ethical perceptions of organizational politics: a comparative evaluation of American and Hong Kong managers, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, pp. 989-99.
- Rothwell, S. (1985) Is Management a Masculine Role? *Management Learning*,. 16: 79 - 98.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966) 'General expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement', *Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 80, No. 1, Whole No. 609, 1-28
- Said, Edward (1978/1995) *Orientalism*, London: Penguin
- Schwartz, S (1994) Beyond individualism/collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values, in U. Kim, Triandis, H. C., Kâğitçibaşı, Ç., Choi, S-C, and Yoon, G. *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Application*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 85-119.
- Schwartz, S H (1999) A theory of cultural values and some implications for work, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 23-47.
- Schwartz, S H (1999) A theory of cultural values and some implications for work, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 23-47.

- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. and Trompenaars, F. (1996) National culture and the values of organizational employees: a dimensional analysis across 43 nations, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27 (2), 231-64.
- Sorge, A (2004) Cross-national differences in human resources and organization, Chapter 5 in A-W Harzing and J Van Ruysseveldt, *International Human Resource Management*, London: Sage, 2004, pp.117-140.
- Trompenaars, F (1993) *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*, London: Nicholas Brealey
- Taylor, H. (2002) Insights into participation from critical management and labour process perspectives, chapter 8 in Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (eds.) (2002) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books, pp. 122-138.
- Tylor, E B (1871) Primitive Culture, cited in C Levi-Strauss (1963) (Trans. Jacobson, C and B G Schoel), *Structural Anthropology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

<i>WVS Trends</i>	<b>Modernization</b>		<b>Postmodernization</b>	
	<i>Traditional</i>	<i>Secular-Rational</i>	<i>Survival</i>	<i>Self-expression</i>
<b><i>Schwartz's Issues/Values</i></b>				
Individual & Group: Conservatism-Autonomy	Conservatism	Conservatism/Autonomy	Conservatism	Autonomy
Social Fabric: Hierarchy-Egalitarianism	Hierarchy	Hierarchy/Egalitarianism	Hierarchy	Egalitarianism
Relation to Natural and Social World: Mastery-Harmony	Harmony	Mastery	Mastery	Harmony
<b><i>Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars' broad values dimensions</i></b>				
Conservatism-Egalitarian Commitment	Conservatism	Egalitarian commitment	Conservatism	
Utilitarian Involvement – Loyal Involvement	Loyal involvement	Utilitarian involvement		Utilitarian involvement
<b><i>Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions</i></b>				
Power Distance	High power distance	Medium to high Power Distance	High power distance	Low to Medium Power Distance
Uncertainty Avoidance	Low to Medium Uncertainty Avoidance	Medium to high Uncertainty Avoidance	High Uncertainty Avoidance	Low Uncertainty Avoidance
Individualism-Collectivism	Collectivism	Individualism	Collectivism	Individualism
Masculinity-Femininity	Femininity	Masculinity	Masculinity	Femininity
<b><i>GLOBE Dimensions</i></b>				
Power Distance	High Power distance	Medium to high Power Distance	High Power Distance	Low to medium Power Distance
Uncertainty Avoidance	?	?	High Power Distance	Low Power Distance
Humane Orientation	?	?	?	?
Institutional Collectivism	High Institutional Collectivism	Low Institutional Collectivism	Medium to high Institutional Collectivism	Low Institutional Collectivism
In-group Collectivism	High In-group Collectivism	Low In-group Collectivism	Medium to high In- group Collectivism	Low In-group Collectivism
Assertiveness	Low Assertiveness	High Assertiveness	High assertiveness	Low Assertiveness
Gender Egalitarianism	High Gender Egalitarianism	Low Gender Egalitarianism	Low Gender Egalitarianism	High Gender Egalitarianism
Future orientation	?	?	?	?
Performance orientation	Possibly low Performance orientation	Possibly high Performance orientation	Possibly high Performance orientation	Possibly low Performance orientation

Table 1. Conceptual Associations of Value Dimensions with Inglehart's Modernization and Postmodernization Trends (from Jackson, 2010)



