Studying Cultural Differences

At the start a new candidate for paradigm may have few supporters, and on occasions the supporters' motives may be suspect. Nevertheless, if they are competent, they will improve it, explore its possibilities, and show what it would be like to belong to the community guided by it. And if that goes on, if the paradigm is one destined to win its fight, the number and strength of the persuasive arguments in its favor will increase. More scientists will then be converted, and the exploration of the new paradigm will go on. Gradually the number of experiments, instruments, articles, and books based upon the paradigm will multiply. Still more men, convinced of the new view's fruitfulness, will adopt the new mode of practicing normal science, until at last a few elderly holdouts remain. And even they, we cannot say, are wrong.

—Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*

Thomas Kuhn (1922–96) was an American philosopher and historian of science. The citation here is from his well-known book in which he describes, with examples from various sciences, how scientific innovation is brought about. In a given period certain assumptions

called *paradigms* dominate a scientific field and constrain the thinking of the scientists in that field. Kuhn called the work done within these paradigms *normal science*. Every now and then, normal science runs into limits: it is unable to explain new facts or unable to meet new challenges. Then, a paradigm change is initiated. As gradually more and more people move to the new paradigm, this then becomes a new type of normal science.

In this chapter we will describe the research process on which this book was based. It is based on a paradigm introduced by Geert in the 1980 edition of his book *Culture's Consequences*, the *dimensions* approach, which since has acquired normal science status.

Measuring Values

As values, more than practices, are the stable element in culture, comparative research on culture starts from the measurement of values. Inferring values from people's actions only is cumbersome and ambiguous. Various paper-and-pencil questionnaires have been developed that ask for people's preferences among alternatives. The answers should not be taken too literally: in reality people will not always act as they have scored on the questionnaire. Still, questionnaires provide useful information, because they show differences in answers between groups or categories of respondents. For example, suppose a question asks for one's preference for time off from work versus more pay. An individual employee who states that he or she prefers time off may in fact opt for the money if presented with the actual choice, but if in group A more people claim to prefer time off than in group B, this does indicate a cultural difference between these groups in the relative value of free time versus money.

In interpreting people's statements about their values, it is important to distinguish between the *desirable* and the *desired*: how people think the world ought to be versus what people want for themselves. Questions about the desirable refer to people in general and are worded in terms of right/wrong, should/should not, agree/disagree, important/unimportant, or something similar. In the abstract, everybody is in favor of virtue and opposed to sin, and answers about the desirable express people's views about what represents virtue and what corresponds to sin. The desired, on the contrary, is worded in terms of "you" or "me" and what we want for ourselves, including our less virtuous desires. The desirable bears only a

faint resemblance to actual behavior, but even statements about the desired, although closer to actual behavior, do not necessarily correspond to the way people really behave when they have to choose.

The desirable differs from the desired in the nature of the *norms* involved. Norms are standards for behavior that exist within a group or category of people.[1] In the case of the desirable, the norm is absolute, pertaining to what is ethically right. In the case of the desired, the norm is statistical: it indicates the choices made by the majority. The desirable relates more to ideology, the desired to practical matters.

Interpretations of value studies that neglect the difference between the desirable and the desired may lead to paradoxical results. A case in which the two produced diametrically opposed answers was found in the IBM studies, to be described later on in this chapter. Employees in different countries were asked for their agreement or disagreement with the statement "Employees in industry should participate more in the decisions made by management." This is a statement about the desirable. In another question people were asked whether they personally preferred a manager who "usually consults with subordinates before reaching a decision." This is a statement about the desired. A comparison of the answers to these two questions revealed that in countries in which the consulting manager was less popular, people agreed more with the general statement that employees should participate in decisions, and vice versa; the ideology was the mirror image of the day-to-day relationship with the boss.[2]

Dimensions of National Cultures

In the first half of the twentieth century, social anthropology developed the conviction that all societies, modern or traditional, face the same basic problems; only the answers differ. American anthropologists, in particular Ruth Benedict (1887–1948) and Margaret Mead (1901–78), played an important role in popularizing this message for a wide audience.

The logical next step was that social scientists attempted to identify *what* problems were common to all societies, through conceptual reasoning and reflection on field experiences as well as through statistical studies. In 1954 two Americans, the sociologist Alex Inkeles and the psychologist Daniel Levinson, published a broad survey of the English-language literature on national culture. They suggested that the following issues qualify as common basic problems worldwide, with consequences for the function-

ing of societies, of groups within those societies, and of individuals within those groups:

- Relation to authority
- Conception of self—in particular:
    - The relationship between individual and society
    - The individual's concept of masculinity and femininity
- Ways of dealing with conflicts, including the control of aggression and the expression of feelings[3]

Twenty years later Geert was given the opportunity to study a large body of survey data about the values of people in more than fifty countries around the world. These people worked in the local subsidiaries of one large multinational corporation: International Business Machines (IBM). At first it may seem surprising that employees of a multinational corporation—a very special kind of people—could serve for identifying differences in *national* value systems. However, from one country to another they represented almost perfectly matched samples: they were similar in all respects except nationality, which made the effect of nationality differences in their answers stand out unusually clearly.

A statistical analysis[4] of the country averages of the answers to questions about the values of similar IBM employees in different countries revealed common problems, but with solutions differing from country to country, in the following areas:

- Social inequality, including the relationship with authority
- The relationship between the individual and the group
- Concepts of masculinity and femininity: the social and emotional implications of having been born as a boy or a girl
- Ways of dealing with uncertainty and ambiguity, which turned out to be related to the control of aggression and the expression of emotions

These empirical results covered amazingly well the areas predicted by Inkeles and Levinson twenty years before. The discovery of their prediction provided strong support for the theoretical importance of the empirical findings. Problems that are basic to all human societies should be reflected in different studies, regardless of their methods. The Inkeles and Levinson study had strikingly predicted what Geert found twenty years later.

The four basic problem areas defined by Inkeles and Levinson and empirically found in the IBM data represent *dimensions of cultures*. A dimension is an aspect of a culture that can be measured relative to other cultures. The four dimensions found will be described in Chapters 3 through 6. They have been named *power distance* (from small to large), *collectivism versus individualism*, *femininity versus masculinity*, and *uncertainty avoidance* (from weak to strong). Each of these terms existed already in some part of the social sciences, and they seemed to apply reasonably well to the basic problem area each dimension stands for. Together they form a four-dimensional model of differences among national cultures. Each country in the model is characterized by a score on each of the four dimensions.

A dimension groups together a number of phenomena in a society that were empirically found to occur in combination, regardless of whether there seems to be a logical necessity for their going together. The logic of societies is not the same as the logic of individuals looking at them. The grouping of the different aspects of a dimension is always based on statistical relationships—that is, on *trends* for these phenomena to occur in combination, not on iron links. Some aspects in some societies may go against a general trend found across most other societies. Because they are found with the help of statistical methods, dimensions can be detected only on the basis of comparative information from a number of countries—say, at least ten. In the case of the IBM research, Geert was fortunate to obtain comparable data about culturally determined values from (initially) forty countries, which made the dimensions within their differences stand out clearly.

The scores for each country on one dimension can be pictured as points along a line. For two dimensions at a time, they become points in a diagram. For three dimensions, they could, with some imagination, be seen as points in space. For four or more dimensions, they become difficult to imagine. This is a disadvantage of dimensional models. Another way of picturing differences among countries (or other social systems) is through *typologies*. A typology describes a set of ideal types, each of them easy to imagine. A common typology of countries in the second half of the twentieth century was dividing them into a first, second, and third world (a capitalist, communist, and former colonial bloc).

Whereas typologies are easier to grasp than dimensions, they are problematic in empirical research. Real cases seldom fully correspond to one single ideal type. Most cases are hybrids, and arbitrary rules have to

be made for classifying them as belonging to one type or another. With a dimensional model, on the contrary, cases can always be scored unambiguously. On the basis of their dimension scores, cases can *afterward* empirically be sorted into clusters with similar scores. These clusters then form an empirical typology. More than fifty countries in the IBM study could, on the basis of their scores on the four dimensions, be sorted into twelve such clusters.[5]

In practice, typologies and dimensional models are complementary. Dimensional models are preferable for research, and typologies are useful for teaching purposes. This book will use a kind of typology approach for explaining each of the dimensions. For every separate dimension, it describes the two opposite extremes as pure types. Later on, some dimensions are plotted two by two, every plot creating four types. The country scores on the dimensions will show that most real cases are somewhere in between the extremes.

Using Correlations

Dimensions are based on *correlations*. Two measures (called *variables*) are said to be correlated if they vary together. For example, if we were to measure the height and weight of a hundred people randomly picked from the street, we would find the height and weight measures to be correlated: taller people would also usually be heavier, and shorter ones would also tend to be lighter. Because some people are tall and skinny and some are short and fat, the correlation would not be perfect.

The *coefficient of correlation*[6] expresses the strength of the relationship. If the correlation is perfect, so that one measure follows entirely from the other, the coefficient takes the value 1.00. If the correlation is nonexistent—the two measures are completely unrelated—the coefficient is 0.00. The coefficient can become negative if the two measures are each other's opposite—for example, a person's height and the number of times he or she would meet someone who is still taller. The lowest possible value is −1.00; in this case the two measures are again perfectly correlated, only the one is positive when the other is negative, and vice versa. In the example of the height and weight of people, one could expect a coefficient of about 0.80 if the sample included only adults—and even higher if both children and adults were included in the sample, because children are extremely small and light compared with adults.

Extending the IBM Model:
The Chinese Value Survey

In late 1980, just after *Culture's Consequences* had been published, Geert met Michael Harris Bond, from the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Bond and a number of his colleagues from the Asia-Pacific region had just finished a comparison of the values of female and male psychology students from each of ten national or ethnic groups in their region.[11] They had used an adapted version of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), developed by U.S. psychologist Milton Rokeach on the basis of an inventory of values in U.S. society around 1970. When Bond analyzed the RVS data in the same way that Geert had analyzed the IBM data, he also found four meaningful dimensions. Across the six countries that were part of both studies, each RVS dimension was significantly correlated with one of the IBM dimensions.[12]

The discovery of similar dimensions in completely different material represented strong support for the basic nature of what was found. With another questionnaire, using other respondents (students instead of IBM employees), at another point in time (data collected around 1979 instead of 1970) and in a restricted group of countries, four similar dimensions emerged. Both Michael and Geert were not just pleased but also puzzled. The survey results themselves demonstrated that people's ways of thinking are culturally constrained. As the researchers were human, they were also children of their cultures; both the IBM questionnaire and the RVS were products of Western minds. In both cases, respondents in non-Western countries had answered Western questions. To what extent had this circumstance been responsible for the correlation between the results of the two studies? To what extent had irrelevant questions been asked and relevant questions been omitted?

Michael Bond, a Canadian having lived and worked in the Far East since 1971, found a creative solution to the Western bias problem. He asked a number of his Chinese colleagues from Hong Kong and Taiwan to help him compose a list of basic values for Chinese people. The new questionnaire was called the Chinese Value Survey (CVS). It was administered in translation to one hundred students, fifty men and fifty women, in each of twenty-three countries around the world. A statistical analysis of the CVS results yielded again four dimensions. Across twenty overlapping coun-

tries, three dimensions of the CVS replicated dimensions earlier found in the IBM surveys, but the fourth CVS dimension was not correlated with the fourth IBM dimension: uncertainty avoidance had no equivalent in the CVS. The fourth CVS dimension instead combined values opposing an orientation on the future to an orientation on the past and present.[13] Geert labeled it *long-term versus short-term orientation* (LTO) and adopted it as a fifth universal dimension. Twenty years later Misho Minkov unraveled from the World Values Survey a dimension that was correlated with LTO and helped us to redefine it and extend it to many more countries. The full story will be told in Chapter 7.

Validation of the Country Culture Scores Against Other Measures

The next step was showing the practical implications of the dimension scores for the countries concerned. This was done quantitatively by correlating the dimension scores with other measures that could be logically expected to reflect the same culture differences. These quantitative checks were supplemented with qualitative, descriptive information about the countries. This entire process is called *validation*.

Examples, which will be elaborated upon in Chapters 3 through 8, are that power distance was correlated with the use of violence in domestic politics and with income inequality in a country. Individualism was correlated with national wealth (GNI per capita) and with mobility between social classes from one generation to the next. Masculinity was correlated negatively with the share of the gross national income that governments of wealthy countries spent on development assistance to the third world. Uncertainty avoidance was associated with Roman Catholicism and with the legal obligation of citizens in developed countries to carry identity cards. Long-term orientation was correlated with national savings rates.

Relationships between measurable phenomena in the world can be complex. The dimensions of national cultures described in the following chapters are meant to improve our understanding by reducing this complexity, but they cannot eliminate it. For each dimension, we describe with which phenomena it is most strongly correlated. Sometimes we need two, or rarely three, dimensions for our explanation, but our goal is to keep it as simple as our data permit.

Altogether, the 2001 edition of *Culture's Consequences* lists more than four hundred significant correlations of the IBM dimension scores with

other measures; in one out of six cases, we need two dimensions, and in one out of fifty, we need three.[14] A striking fact of the various validations is that correlations do not tend to become weaker over time. The IBM national dimension scores (or at least their relative positions) have remained as valid in the year 2010 as they were around 1970, indicating that they describe relatively enduring aspects of these countries' societies.

Culture Scores and Personality Scores: No Reason for Stereotyping

American social anthropologists in the first half of the twentieth century saw a close relationship between cultures and the personalities of the people in them. What we now call *national culture* was then called *national character* or *modal personality*; American pioneer anthropologist Ruth Benedict saw human cultures as "personality writ large."[15]

A criticism of this viewpoint was that it led to the *stereotyping* of individuals. Stereotypes are literally printing plates; figuratively they are conventional notions that are usually associated uncritically with a person on the basis of his or her background. The accusation of stereotyping individuals has sometimes also been raised against the national culture dimensions paradigm.

The relationship between national culture and personality received new attention at the end of the twentieth century, due to the availability of better data. On the culture side, these came from our values research; on the personality side, from developments in personality testing. In a personality test an individual answers a number of questions about him- or herself. In the mid-twentieth century there used to be a confusing variety of competing personality tests, but in the 1990s a consensus was growing that a useful common denominator of most personality tests in most countries is a set of five dimensions of personality variation (the so-called Big Five):

O: Openness to experience versus rigidity

C: Conscientiousness versus undependability

E: Extraversion versus introversion

A: Agreeableness versus ill-temperedness

N: Neuroticism versus emotional stability

U.S. psychologists Paul T. Costa and Robert R. McCrae developed a self-scored personality test based on the Big Five, the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). By the end of the century, it had been translated from American English into a number of other languages and used on samples of the same kind of people in many countries.

In a joint article, McCrae and Hofstede explored the relationship between personality dimension scores and national culture dimension scores. Mean scores on the five NEO-PI-R dimensions for comparative samples from thirty-three countries correlated significantly with all four IBM culture dimensions.[16] We will meet some of these correlations in the following chapters. Our joint study showed that culture and personality are not independent. Refer again to Figure 1.1: while there is a wide range of different personalities within every country, the way these individuals describe themselves in personality tests is partly influenced by the national culture of the country.

The association between personality and culture, however, is statistical, not absolute. It does not justify the use of national culture scores as stereotypes for individuals from these nations. The range of personalities within each country is far too wide for that. National culture scores are not about individuals, but about national societies.

Other Classifications of National Cultures

The basic innovation of *Culture's Consequences*, when it appeared in 1980, was classifying national cultures along a number of dimensions. As we argued at the beginning of this chapter, this represented a new paradigm in the study of culture—that is, a radically new approach. A paradigm is not a theory, but one step before a theory: a way of thinking that leads to developing theories. New paradigms invariably lead to controversy, as they reverse cherished truths but also open new perspectives. Since *Culture's Consequences*, several other theories of national cultures have used the same paradigm, each suggesting its own way of classifying them.

An elaborate and widely known application of the dimensions paradigm was by the Israeli psychologist Shalom H. Schwartz. From a survey of the literature, he selected a list of fifty-six value items. A major inspiration for his list was the work of the American psychologist Milton Rokeach (1973), who compared different groups in the American population on eighteen "terminal values" (nouns describing desirable end states,

sources—he extracted three dimensions, which he labeled *exclusionism versus universalism, indulgence versus restraint,* and *monumentalism versus flexhumility.*[29]

As a result, Misho has joined our authors' team, and we have integrated our research results.[30] From the three Minkov dimensions, exclusionism versus universalism was strongly correlated with collectivism versus individualism, and references to it will be included in Chapter 4. Monumentalism versus flexhumility correlated significantly with short- versus long-term orientation. This led to another search of the WVS database, which has produced a new measurement of the LTO dimension, enriching our understanding of its implications and drastically increasing the number of countries for which reliable scores are available. All of this will be described in Chapter 7. Indulgence versus restraint (IVR) has been added as an entirely new, sixth dimension in Chapter 8.

Cultural Differences According to Region, Ethnicity, Religion, Gender, Generation, and Class

Regional, ethnic, and religious cultures account for differences within countries; ethnic and religious groups often transcend political country borders. Such groups form minorities at the crossroads between the dominant culture of the nation and their own traditional group culture. Some assimilate into the mainstream, although this process may take a generation or more; others continue to stick to their own ways. The United States, as the world's most prominent example of a people composed of immigrants, shows examples of both assimilation (the melting pot) and retention of group identities over generations (for example, the Pennsylvania Dutch). Discrimination according to ethnic origin delays assimilation and represents a problem in many countries. Regional, ethnic, and religious cultures, in so far as they are learned from birth onward, can be described in the same terms as national cultures: basically the same dimensions that were found to differentiate among national cultures apply to these differences within countries.

Gender differences are not usually described in terms of cultures. It can be revealing to do so. If we recognize that within each society there is a men's culture that differs from a women's culture, this recognition helps to explain why it is so difficult to change traditional gender roles. Women are not considered suitable for jobs traditionally filled by men, not because

they are technically unable to perform these jobs, but because women do not carry the symbols, do not correspond to the hero images, do not participate in the rituals, or are not supposed to foster the values dominant in the men's culture, and vice versa. Feelings and fears about behaviors by the opposite sex can be of the same order of intensity as reactions of people exposed to foreign cultures. The subject of gender cultures will return in Chapter 5.

Generation differences in symbols, heroes, rituals, and values are evident to most people. They are often overestimated. Complaints about youths' having lost respect for the values of their elders have been found on Egyptian papyrus scrolls dating from 2000 B.C. and in the writings of Hesiod, a Greek author from the end of the eighth century B.C. Many differences in practices and values between generations are normal attributes of age that repeat themselves for each successive pair of generations. Historical events, however, do affect some generations in a special way. The Chinese who were of student age during the 1966–76 Cultural Revolution stand witness to this. Chinese young people who in this period would normally have become students were sent to the countryside as laborers and missed their education. The Chinese speak of "the lost generation." The development of technology may also lead to a difference between generations. An example is the spread of television, which showed people life in other parts of the world previously outside their perspective.

Social classes carry different class cultures. Social class is associated with educational opportunities and with a person's occupation or profession. Education and occupation are in themselves powerful sources of cultural learning. There is no standard definition of social class that applies across all countries, and people in different countries distinguish different types and numbers of classes. The criteria for allocating a person to a class are often cultural: symbols play an important role, such as manners, accents in speaking the national language, and the use and nonuse of certain words. The confrontation between the two jurors in *Twelve Angry Men* (Chapter 1) clearly contains a class component.

Gender, generation, and class cultures can only partly be classified by the dimensions found for national cultures. This is because they are categories of people within social systems, not integrated social systems such as countries or ethnic groups. Gender, generation, and class cultures should be described in their own terms, based on special studies of such cultures.

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