

**THE APPLICABILITY OF WIDELY EMPLOYED  
FRAMEWORKS IN CROSS-CULTURAL MANAGEMENT  
RESEARCH**

DR. HAMID YEGANEH

SO 324, College of Business, Winona State University  
Minnesota, USA, 55987  
Tel: (507)457-5423  
hyeganeh@winona.edu

DR. ZHAN SU

Faculté des sciences de l'administration  
Université Laval  
Québec (QC), Canada, G1K 7P4

DR. DANIEL SAUERS

SO 324, College of Business, Winona State University  
Minnesota, USA, 55987

***Abstract***

*This article aims to analyze and assess the applicability of widely employed frameworks in cross-cultural management research. First, some criteria are conceptualized and then, eight cultural frameworks are examined and their relevance with respect to defined criteria is determined. At the end, all cultural frameworks are compared, their overall applicability is assessed, and suggestions for empirical research are presented. Results and discussion might be useful not only in applying cultural typologies, but also in improving existing frameworks.*

***Keywords:*** *Culture, Cross Cultural Management, Cultural Dimensions, Cultural Frameworks*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since culture is a complex notion, a practical and popular approach among researchers is to identify several of its major characteristics and compare them across borders. The cross-cultural literature provides us with several conceptual frameworks based on various orientations/dimensions along which cultural traits can be analyzed and compared (e.g. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars, 1993; Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1994; Schwartz, 1992). All these frameworks intend to provide us with an operational and simplified model of culture; however, they have dissimilar scopes, represent distinct traditions, and hinge upon different methodological paradigms. As a result, each framework can be useful in understanding some aspects of culture, but has a narrow applicability in empirical research. In line with this view, the current article aims to analyze, assess and synthesize the applicability of the most employed frameworks in cross-cultural management research. More specifically, we intend to analyze different cultural frameworks and make sense of their shortcomings, strengths and particularities. We maintain that the resulting examination will be useful not only in applying cultural typologies, but also in developing new cultural frameworks.

The manuscript is organized in three major parts. First, based on the extant literature some criteria are conceptualized. Then by referring to these criteria, eight widely employed cultural frameworks are examined. Finally, all cultural models are compared, and their overall applicability is assessed. Moreover, some recommendations for future research are presented.

## 2. DEFINING THE APPLICABILITY CRITERIA

In this part, we define some major criteria along which cultural frameworks will be analyzed. Defining these criteria is challenging, because they should be both appropriate and comprehensive to compare dissimilar frameworks.

### 1. *Theoretical versus empirical basis*

This criterion is related to framework development that may be based on theory or empirical investigation.

### 2. *Discipline*

The discipline of cultural framework seems important, since different disciplines of social science have dissimilar conceptions of culture and rely on different epistemological traditions.

3. *Cognition versus values*

The cognitive-based view emphasizes the importance of cognitive systems rather than appealing to set of values. Cognitive systems are defined as consistent modes of thought that introduce systematic preferences for particular kinds of information that are used in the problem-solving process. Accordingly, culture is translated into cognitive systems, which affect behavior at individual and collective levels (Abramson et al. 1993). In contrast, the value-based perspective considers values as the building blocks of culture (Hofstede, 1980). Cultural values are defined as desirable trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or social entity (Schwartz, 1994). Cultural values can be related to beliefs and attitudes but they are not neutral and cold ideas (Schwartz, 1994).

4. *Data gathering/Questionnaires*

Culture is a multi-layer concept consisting of artifacts, practices, attitudes, values, and basic assumptions (e.g., Hofstede, 2001; Trompenaars, 1993). Accordingly, it is possible to assess culture by measuring practices, situational scenarios, attitudes, values, or desired values. This criterion discusses the extent to which practices, attitudes, values, and basic assumptions are incorporated in the cultural frameworks.

5. *Number of elements/dimensions*

This criterion deals with the number of elements/dimensions incorporated in every framework.

6. *Level of analysis*

Culture can be considered as “the collective programming of the mind” which distinguishes one group from others. In line with this view, the concept of culture can be applied to various levels such as region, nation, industry, corporation, department, function, etc. This criterion concerns the level of analysis addressed or measured by the cultural framework.

7. *Nature of data*

This issue is related to the nature of data gathered via framework instruments that can be nominal, ordinal or interval.

8. *Validity history*

This criterion considers the validity history of the framework in organizational and social sciences.

9. *Framework comprehensiveness*

Since culture is a broad concept, a cultural framework should have a large converge and incorporate different aspects of social life. Comprehensiveness is defined as the breath of cultural framework.

10. *Dimensions' exclusiveness*

This criterion addresses the elements/dimensions' exclusiveness as concepts. Since most of cultural dimensions are incorporated in statistical models, it is very important to have mutually exclusive dimensions.

11. *Dichotomy*

Cultural elements can be conceptualized as dichotomous Aristotelian categories with extreme points at each end. Dichotomy implies that cultures are static points on dual axis and one cultural category excludes its opposite. Accordingly, cultural traits are supposed to be on a straight line with two extreme poles, e.g., individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity and so on. An alternative to this dichotomy is to view cultures as circular which dance from one preferred point to their opposite. According to this assumption, cultural categories do not exclude each other, but they seek to manage their opposites (Trompenaars, 1993).

12. *Intensity measurement*

This criterion is the capacity of the framework in measuring the intensity of cultural values. According to Kluckhohn (1951) and Hofstede (1980), values have both direction and intensity. That is if we hold a value, it implies that there are some relevance (intensity) attached to this value, and with respect to this value we consider some good or bad outcomes (direction).

13. *Ranking measurement*

Cultural values may have different relative importance. Arguably, some are central to individual/collective behavior and overshadow the effects of other values. Therefore, this criterion is related to the capacity of framework to determine the hierarchical importance of cultural values.

14. *Structure of values*

In addition to intensity, direction, and ranking, structure of cultural values may be considered. This criterion is borrowed from Schwartz (1992, 1994) suggesting the values are organized in structures that are almost consistent across cultures (Schwartz, 1992).

15. *Parsimony*

The criterion of parsimony implies a simple and straightforward framework that can be incorporated in empirical research.

16. *Thickness*

Inspired by positivistic tradition, organizational researchers consider culture as existing and real systems of beliefs and values with deterministic relations among the constituent parts. This approach recognizes that culture as an objective phenomenon can be accurately measured, observed and investigated. However, culture cannot be described solely in terms of mathematical language because it is essentially a semiotic concept and its analysis should be interpretive in search of meaning (Geertz, 1974). Interpretive analysis of culture requires an empathic approach in which the attempt is made to understand culture holistically and from the perspective of the participants, rather than through objective analysis by surveys and questionnaires. The results of interpretive studies have been described as “thick” (Geertz, 1974), in-depth, meaningful, historical and linguistically rich. In line with this view, ‘Thickness’ is defined the property of framework that can provide us with a profound, interpretative, and holistic understanding of culture.

17. *Appropriate areas in empirical research*

The use of cultural frameworks should be in conformity with the research setting, its objectives and its methods. In this part, some areas of organizational studies that fit with the framework are described.

18. *Overall assessment*

Finally, based on all previous criteria, the overall applicability of the framework is assessed.

### **3. CULTURAL FRAMEWORKS**

#### **3.1. HALL’S CULTURAL ELEMENTS**

Edward T. Hall (1960) an American anthropologist, identified three elements based on his experience in Foreign Service, which are essential in understanding and study of cultural orientations: context, space and time. Hall distinguished between high and low context cultures. A high-context communication is one in which most of the meaning is in the context while very little is in the transmitted message. On the other hand, “in low-context cultures most of the information must be in the transmitted message in order to make up for what is missing in the context” (Hall, 1976). Space is another central concept of Hall’s model, which may have different meanings and implications. He distinguished intimate, public and social spaces, which are perceived differently across cultures. “Each person has around him an invisible bubble of space which expands and contracts depending on a number of things” (Hall, 1976). For instance, in most Western cultures, people preserve a personal space and do not

touch each other unless they have an intimate relationship. The third concept, time orientation, deals with the ways in which cultures structure their time. The monochronic time concept follows the notion of “one thing at a time”, while the polychronic concept focuses on multiple tasks being handled at one time. According to Hall, Northern European cultures tend to include monochronic people while people from Mediterranean and Latin American cultures tend to be polychronic.

#### *Applicability*

Hall was an anthropologist and developed his framework through many years of observation in foreign services around the world. As such, his model is not based on questionnaires and rigorous statistical analysis. At first glance, this issue may be considered a shortcoming; however, considering all inherent discrepancies in using questionnaires, we believe that Hall’s extensive and meticulous observations are a solid foundation for his theory. Hall’s work represents a classic model relying on three significant elements that correspond mainly to cognitive systems: conception of time, space and communication patterns. This cognitive-based characteristic differentiates Hall’s agenda from other cultural typologies that rely mainly on value systems.

Hall’s framework concerns societal level and is assessed moderately comprehensive as it deals with broad issues such as time, space, and communication. A major concern with Hall’s elements is that they are not mutually exclusive and seem subjective. For instance, the notions of high/low context and monochronic/polychronic are conceptually overlapping. Furthermore, Hall’s framework does not distinguish any ranking between its elements and does not provide objective yardsticks for cross-cultural comparisons. In spite of aforementioned concerns, Hall’s elements provide us with a very profound understanding of cultural differences. The high/low context is one of the most important elements in cross-cultural communication. Similarly, the notions of monochronic/polychronic time and space are very fundamental and can explain many aspects of cross-cultural behavior.

Overall, Hall’s framework may be more appropriate in comparisons between unrelated cultures, in qualitative studies, and in areas such as communication, negotiation, organizational behavior and consumer behavior.

### **3.2. ROKEACH VALUE SURVEY (RVS)**

Rokeach’s model is based on two assumptions: 1) Most of values are in common among people of different cultures (i.e., the universality of cultural values); and 2) These values can be ranked according to their relative importance. Based on previous research, Rokeach (1973) developed an instrument for measuring cultural values, the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). The RVS consists of two sets of values, with each set containing eighteen individual value items. One set, called terminal values, refers to desirable end-states of existence; the goals that

a person would like to achieve during his or her lifetime. The other set, called instrumental values, refers to preferable modes of behavior, or means of achieving the terminal values. Rokeach asked respondents to rank two sets of values, one consisting of eighteen end-states ("terminal values") and the other including eighteen modes of behavior ("instrumental values"). Using these rankings, Rokeach examined the relative importance of specific values within segments of the populations under investigation.

#### *Applicability*

Rokeach' Value Survey is a very simple and practical tool that can be used for comparisons of values both at individual and collective levels. The number of values in the RVS is 36 (18 instrumental values and 18 terminal values). Because of this large number of elements, application of the RVS in research is relatively difficult and conclusions may seem less straightforward. While the RVS can be used to rank cultural values, it cannot provide us with information about the intensity with which a value is held. For instance, even if two cultural groups rank "Pleasure" as their foremost value, we cannot conclude that this value has the same intensity in both cultures. Therefore, the RVS is a useful tool to evaluate what values are central to cultural groups, but it is not appropriate to measure the intensity of cultural values.

Rather than treating culture at its core, Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) is related to the more external layers of culture and their manifestations, as a result, the model falls short in comprehensiveness. The distinction between instrumental and terminal values seems somewhat subjective. Some values overlap and may have blurring borders and their conceptual equivalency is not assured within and across cultures. The RVS can be criticized because of its arbitrary, subjective, ethnic, and ethnocentric approach to choosing values (Triandis, 1994). Most of values incorporated in the RVS reflect the realities of middle class Americans. It is suggested that the extent to which these values can be extrapolated to other cultures is questionable (Bigoness and Blakely, 1996).

To put it briefly, the overall applicability of this framework is limited. Rather than a means for cultural assessment in its broad meaning, RVS is more useful in the case of cultural comparisons among some groups of people to verify possible similarities and differences. Since Rokeach value survey consists of 36 values (18 instrumental + 18 terminal values), one practical suggestion would be to use only terminal values. Even though Rokeach value survey does not measure the intensity of values, it is possible to treat ordinal data by some statistical techniques such as Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA. Considering the description of the Rokeach value survey, this instrument can be applied very efficiently in areas such as consumer behavior or in cross-cultural comparisons.

### **3.3. KLUCKHOHN AND STRODTBECK'S CULTURAL ORIENTATIONS**

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) developed a model for analyzing culture based on three principal assumptions: 1) there is a limited number of common human problems for which all people must find some solutions; 2) despite the variability there is a range of possible solutions; and 3) all alternatives of all solutions are present in all societies at all times but are differentially preferred (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961). In line with this view, they suggested that the solutions for the problems reflect a society's culture. Consequently, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck suggested a framework for cultural assessment that includes six major orientations:

1. Relationship to nature: dominance, subjugation or harmony.
2. Relationships among people: individualism, collectivism or hierarchical structure.
3. Time orientation: focus on the present, past or future.
4. Human activity: focus on being, doing or thinking.
5. Human nature: good, bad or a combination of both.
6. Conception of space: private, public or a mixture of both.

#### *Applicability*

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) relied on previous research (Parsons and Shils, 1951) and conducted rigorous analyses to develop their theory. The framework relies mainly on cultural values, but some orientations such as conception of space may be related to cognitive structures. The cultural orientations as proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) are straightforward and meaningful notions corresponding to a culture's core and are presumed to be found in all societies (Maznevski et al., 2002). Furthermore, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) shaped and guided later research; therefore, it is possible to find considerable similarities between the elements of their framework and models proposed by Hofstede (1980), Trompenaars (1993), and Hall (1960, 1976). For example, the 'Relationship orientation' is repeated in Hofstede's individualism and power distance concepts (Hofstede, 1980), and Trompenaars' individualism–communitarianism, achievement–ascription, and equality–hierarchy dimensions (Trompenaars, 1993), while Hall's concepts of private and public space (Hall, 1966; 1973) correspond to the space orientation.

In contrast to some frameworks such as Hofstede (1980, 1988), Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's model is based on cultural orientations that are not necessarily dichotomous. That is a high preference for one orientation does not necessarily mean a low preference for the other orientation (Thomas, 2002). This characteristic may allow a better understanding of cultural phenomena in the area of organizational research (Maznevski et al., 2002).

A major limitation with this framework is the lack of objective and quantitative yardsticks for measuring cultural orientations. To overcome this shortcoming, Maznevski and her colleagues have developed the Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire (CPQ), which operationalizes Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's model (Maznevski et al., 2002). For example, the CPQ-version 4 measures 11 variations of four cultural orientations: relationships among people, attitude environment, nature of humans, and activity (Maznevski et al., 1997). The instrument has been tested in a few studies and is quite reliable. However, this instrument does not distinguish any ranking among cultural orientations.

The framework proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) is marked by many advantages such as comprehensiveness, dimensions' exclusiveness, and parsimony. The data collected by the CPQ are interval, allowing the application of a wide range of statistical techniques. Another major advantage in applying this framework is that it distinguishes between individual and aggregate levels. In that way, researchers can make hypotheses and test them at the individual level or aggregate measures to develop descriptions to examine variance both within and between cultures (Maznevski et al., 2002).

Overall, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's framework is assessed highly applicable and is suitable to be employed in a wide range of areas such as management, organizational behavior, human resource management, cross-cultural comparisons, marketing, and consumer behavior.

### **3.4. TRIANDIS' CULTURAL SYNDROMES**

Triandis (1994) conceptualized culture at two levels: objective and subjective. The objective level includes tangible aspects of culture such as artifacts, while the subjective level is related to categorizations, norms and values. The subjective elements of each culture are organized into unique patterns of beliefs and values. Based on this view, Triandis (1994) distinguished three cultural syndromes that apply to all cultures: complexity, tightness and individualism/collectivism. According to Triandis (1994) as societies move from hunting and agriculture toward industrialization, they become more complex. In complex cultures, people make distinctions among objects and events in their environment. Triandis (1994) maintains that the degree of complexity is a major factor in explaining social behavior (Ember and Levinson, 1991). Another element in Triandis' model is culture tightness/looseness. Tight cultures are those with clear norms and regulations that punish deviations. On the other hand, loose cultures have unclear norms or tolerate deviance from norms. The third notion in Triandis'

model is the degree of individualism/collectivism. Individualist cultures attach much importance to independence, individual life, and affluence. On the other hand, collectivists tend to be concerned about their group's interests, share resources with in-group members and feel interdependent with in-group members (Hui and Triandis, 1986). Triandis further distinguishes two kinds of collectivism: horizontal (interdependence and oneness) and vertical (serving the group).

#### *Applicability*

Triandis' syndromes are useful notions in understanding cultural differences. The notion of tightness/looseness is similar to diffuse/specific (Trompenaars; 1993) and the notion of individualism/collectivism is in common with many other models (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Hofstede, 1980, Trompenaars; 1993). Triandis, however, identifies individualism and collectivism as distinct but related constructs that are not located on a dichotomous dimension. This implies that a culture may show both individualistic and collectivistic elements (Lee and DeVore, 1976). This view is different from other models, especially Hofstede's, where individualism and collectivism are considered as dichotomous elements on a bipolar continuum.

The notions presented in this model seem rich, but they are neither straightforward nor exclusive. It is possible to distinguish some overlap between culture complexity and individualism on one hand and culture tightness and collectivism on the other. Furthermore, it seems very difficult to measure some of syndromes such as complexity and looseness. Triandis does not offer any objective method of measuring cultural complexity. Due to this lack of objective measures, it is not very practical to use this model in empirical research. Moreover, this model does not consider other important issues such as attitude to time and environment, which are very important in understanding the effects of culture on organizational behavior. As a result, Triandis' model is of limited comprehensiveness.

A major concern with Triandis work is lack of measurement instruments and low level of dimensions' exclusiveness. As a result, Triandis' model cannot be incorporated conveniently in empirical research. However, considering the richness of cultural notions, Triandis' framework can be used in acquiring a broad understanding of the effects of cultural differences on organizational behavior and human resource management.

### **3.5. HOFSTEDE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS**

According to Hofstede's framework (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede and Bond, 1988), national cultures are described in five dimensions: power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term versus short-term orientation. The first dimension, individualism versus collectivism, refers to the relationship between the individual and others. Hofstede views an individualistic society as one in which beliefs and behaviors are determined by the individual, whereas in a collectivist society, loyalty towards one's family, job, and country

tend to determine the attitudes. The second dimension, power distance, focuses on the inequality that exists between people within the society. Uncertainty avoidance, the third dimension, denotes the extent to which individuals within a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown events, and the corresponding degree to which society creates rules, espouses absolute truth, and refuses to go against nature in order to avoid risks. In a masculine culture, there are higher concerns for achievement, promotion, and challenges in work while in a feminine culture, good relationships, security in work and a desirable living environment are of prime importance. The fifth dimension is long-term orientation versus short-term orientation, which is also referred to as “Confucian dynamism”.

#### *Applicability*

Hofstede’s typology is an accepted paradigm among researchers. In addition to a large empirical database, Hofstede based his typology on an extensive literature review and was inspired by previous scholars such as Kluckhohn (1951), Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), and Kroeber and Parsons (1958). In that sense, Hofstede’s typology integrates fragmented ideas from the literature and presents a coherent framework for comparing world cultures. Hofstede’s framework is one of the most widely employed models in cross-cultural research. The major strength contributing to its popularity is the simplicity in framing a complex and abstract notion such as culture into five clear-cut, nearly exclusive and bipolar dimensions. The model is parsimonious and the cultural dimensions can be easily incorporated into research design. In addition, it provides an instrument to measure cultural values and since the collected data are interval, it is possible to analyze the results using many quantitative techniques.

Despite its popularity, Hofstede’s work has been subject to extensive criticism. With regard to methodology, it is argued that the Hofstede’s research is entirely based on an attitude-survey questionnaire, which is not appropriate to study culture (Tayeb, 1994). In addition, it is criticized that the sample is not representative, because it is drawn from a single company comprising middle-class employees (Robinson, 1983). Hofstede’s scales have been criticized with regard to the validity of the four dimensions at the individual level of analysis (Robinson, 1983; Sondergaard, 1994; Dorfman and Howell, 1988; Goodstein, 1981). At conceptual level, Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1994) state that Hofstede’s categories are linear and exclusive. The dichotomy implies that a society that is individualistic cannot be collectivistic and vice versa. In that way, every increment of individualism necessarily reduces the collectivism.

Hofstede insisted on the notion of national culture and argued that his cultural dimensions could only be applied at the national level; however, he did not provide a clear argument in support of this assertion. According to the definition of Hofstede (1980), culture has a collective nature that can be applied to various groups of society. In fact, if he could use mean scores for analyzing culture at national level, it is possible to use them at different levels such as industry, corporation, department, function, etc.

Hofstede's dimensions can be used to measure and analyze the intensity of cultural values, however, they cannot be used to determine the relative importance of each dimension (ranking). Therefore, Hofstede's model fails to indicate which of dimensions are central to organizational behavior.

Hofstede's framework benefits from a high degree of simplicity, comprehensiveness, and dimensions' exclusiveness. As a result, it can be conveniently incorporated into empirical research. Hofstede's framework seems especially appropriate in describing organizational behavior. Hofstede himself has emphasized that his research is about work-related values. Apparently, work related values are not very appropriate in some areas such as marketing, advertisement, and finance that are not related to work settings.

### **3.6. HAMPDEN-TURNER AND TROMPENAARS' DIMENSIONS OF CULTURE**

Trompenaars and his colleagues (1993) developed a framework for cultural analysis based on a broad 10-year study involving the administration of approximately 15,000 questionnaires among managers in 28 countries. Trompenaars (1993) views culture as the way in which a group of people solves problems. This process of problem solving is concerned with three important issues: relationship with others, time, and the environment. Consequently, he identified seven major cultural orientations that correspond to these three basic issues. Five of the orientations are related to relationships among people, and two are concerned with time and environment. Trompenaars' orientations are labeled as Universalism versus Particularism, Individualism versus Collectivism, Neutral versus Affective, Diffuse versus Specific, Achievement versus Ascription, Attitude to Time, and Attitude to Environment. Universalism is a belief that what is good and true can be discovered and applied universally, whereas particularism is a belief that unique circumstances are the determinant (Thomas, 2000). Individualism and collectivism are related to the extent to which importance is given to individual versus group interests. The third orientation is related to the importance of reason and emotion among people. In neutral cultures, people control their feelings and expressions, but in affective cultures, people tend to be demonstrative. Diffuse and specific cultures are contrasted in their attitude toward space and communication. In specific cultures, people separate the private part of their lives from the public, whereas in diffuse cultures these aspects may overlap (Thomas, 2002). The fifth dimension is related to the orientation of people to achievement and ascription. While some societies attach importance to achievements, others may consider other issues such as age, social class, gender and education. Attitude to time can be related to the past, present or future orientations or the extent to which time is regarded as linear or holistic. Attitude to the environment is a major cultural factor. Societies have two major orientations towards nature: controlling nature by imposing their will upon it, or living as a part of nature.

*Applicability*

Trompenaars' model is based on data collected from managers in different countries of the world. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's questionnaires asked respondents for preferred behavior in a number of both work and leisure situations. Trompenaars' definition of culture is common for national and organizational cultures and the two concepts are not distinguished from each other. It is possible to find many similarities between Trompenaars' elements and those presented by Hofstede (1980), and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). However, in contrast to Hofstede (1980), Trompenaars does not consider cultural dimensions linear and dichotomous.

The seven dimensions of this model correspond to major cultural values and appear exhaustive and intelligible. Despite this comprehensiveness, the exclusiveness of the model is low. For instance, some dimensions such as universalism/particularism, individualism/collectivism and defuse/specific have blurring borders. This shortcoming decreases the applicability in cross-cultural research especially in the case of causal design, which requires conceptually separated constructs. Trompenaars' model measures the intensity of cultural values, however, it is not appropriate to measure or compare the relative importance of every cultural value with respect to other values.

Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars' work is essentially similar to Hofstede but offers some additional dimensions. This framework has not received much attention and seems complicated to be applied in empirical research. Apart from overlap among some dimensions, the framework does not provide a practical approach to measure culture.

**3.7. SCHWARTZ VALUE INVENTORY (SVI)**

According to Schwartz (1992), values are "desirable goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in peoples lives" (Schwartz, 1992, 1994). For Schwartz, values are seen as continuous constructs, which can overlap each other, and which are organized in structures that are almost consistent across cultures. Schwartz (1992; 1994) has described culture in three pairs of value types: Conservatism/Autonomy, Hierarchy/Egalitarianism, and Mastery/Harmony. The Conservatism value type is characterized by social order, respect for tradition, family security and wisdom. In conservative societies, the person is viewed as embedded in a group, finding meaning in life largely through social relationships. Cultural emphasis is put on maintenance of the status quo, propriety, and restraint of actions or inclinations that might disrupt the solidarity or the traditional order. By contrast, the Autonomy value type is related to cultural emphasis on the desirability of individuals independently pursuing their own ideas and intellectual directions. Another pair of value types is Hierarchy/Egalitarianism. In Hierarchical societies, cultural emphasis is on the legitimacy of an unequal distribution of power, roles and resources, authority and wealth. By contrast, Egalitarianism corresponds to features such as equality, social justice, freedom, responsibility, and

honesty. Mastery/Harmony is the third pair of Schwartz cultural values. Mastery is characterized by active self-assertion, ambition, success, daring and competence. On the other hand, Harmony involves acceptance of the world as it is, and cultural emphasis is on unity with nature, protecting the environment and a world of beauty. *Table-1* summarizes the Schwartz’s value types and their descriptions.

*Applicability*

Schwartz’ work represents a large-scale and innovative study that improves upon previous cross-cultural research in many respects. Schwartz made a clear distinction between individual and cultural levels of analysis and presented the results of each level separately. Furthermore, Schwartz’s questionnaire is not based on outcomes, but on preferences for values that guide one’s life. This approach is supposed to produce results that are more accurate by minimizing the effects of situational factors. The most important characteristic of Schwarz’s model is that he studied both the content and structure of human values. The content of every value is related to the criteria people take into account when evaluating a situation or taking an action. By contrast, the structure is related to the organization of these values based on their similarities and differences. Furthermore, Schwartz distinguished clearly between value types and value directions. According to Schwartz, a ‘value type’ is a group of values that can conceptually be combined into one meaningful description. Value types identified by Schwartz represent rich concepts and some of them have commonalities with the dimensions proposed by Hofstede (1980) and Trompenaars (1993). The work of Schwartz represents a novel way in analyzing cultural traits; however, the model was not developed to be used in cross-cultural management research. Some value-types represent broad notions with blurring borders, which render them difficult to be incorporated in a research design. Additionally, despite its richness, this framework does not indicate which value types are more or less essential in each culture.

<b>Value Type</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>1-Conservatism</b> (embeddedness)	The person is viewed as embedded in a collectivity, finding meaning in life largely through social relationships and identifying with the group. A cultural emphasis is placed on the maintenance of the status quo, propriety, and restraint of actions or inclinations that might disrupt the solidarity of the group or the traditional order (social order, respect for tradition, family security, and wisdom).
<b>2-Intellectual Autonomy</b>	The person is an autonomous, bounded entity and finds meaning in his/her own uniqueness, seeking to express his/her own internal attributes (preferences, traits, and feelings) and is encouraged to do so. Intellectual Autonomy has a cultural emphasis on the desirability of individuals independently pursuing their own ideas and intellectual directions (curiosity, broadmindedness, and creativity).
<b>3-Affective Autonomy</b>	The person is an autonomous, bounded entity and finds meaning in his/her own uniqueness, seeking to express his/her own internal attributes (preferences, traits, and feelings) and is encouraged to do so. Affective Autonomy promotes and protects the individual's independent pursuit of his/her own affectively positive experiences (pleasure, exciting life, and varied life).

<b>4-Hierarchy</b>	A hierarchical, differential allocation of fixed roles and of resources is the legitimate, desirable way to regulate interdependencies. People are socialized to comply with the obligations and rules and sanctioned if they do not. A cultural emphasis is placed on the legitimacy of an unequal distribution of power, roles and resources (social power, authority, humility, and wealth).
<b>5-Egalitarianism</b>	Individuals are portrayed as moral equals who share basic interests and who are socialized to transcend selfish interests, cooperate voluntarily with others, and show concern for everyone's welfare (equality, social justice, freedom, responsibility, and honesty). People are socialized to be autonomous rather than interdependent because autonomous persons have no natural commitment to others (equality, social justice, freedom, responsibility, and honesty).
<b>6-Mastery</b>	Groups and individuals should master, control, and change the social and natural environment through assertive action in order to further personal or group interests. A cultural emphasis is placed on getting ahead through active self-assertion (ambition, success, daring, and competence).
<b>7-Harmony</b>	The world is accepted as it is. Groups and individuals should fit harmoniously into the natural and social world, avoiding change and self-assertion to modify them (unity with nature, protecting the environment, and world of beauty).

*Table 1: Seven Value Types of Schwartz Model at Cultural Level*

The work of Schwartz offers many advantages that make it suitable to be employed in empirical research. The value types as defined by Schwartz (1992, 1994) are comprehensive, relatively mutually exclusive and parsimonious. Schwartz's model is the only model that offers insight into structure of value types. This unique characteristic can be useful in empirical research to produce visual demonstrations of values and their possible relationships. Considering that Schwartz typology concerns the very fundamental values, it is suitable to be applied in a wide range of research areas such as marketing, consumer behavior, human resource management, organizational behavior, cross national comparisons and even finance, and economics.

### **3.8. GLOBE DIMENSIONS**

An alternative and extension of Hofstede's model is the conceptualization of culture developed by the GLOBE project (House et al. 1999; 2004). The major constructs investigated in the GLOBE research program were nine attributes of culture, which are operationalized as quantitative dimensions: Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, Collectivism I: Societal Emphasis on Collectivism, Collectivism II: Family Collectivistic Practices, Gender Egalitarianism, Assertiveness, Future Orientation, Performance Orientation, and Humane

Orientation (House et al., 1999, 2004). *Table-2* depicts a summary of these nine cultural dimensions and their descriptions.

<b>Culture Construct Definitions</b>	
1.	<b>Power distance:</b> The degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally.
2.	<b>Uncertainty avoidance:</b> The extent to which a society, organization, or group relies on social norms, rules and procedures to alleviate unpredictability of future events.
3.	<b>Humane orientation:</b> The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring and kind to others.
4.	<b>Collectivism I:</b> The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action
5.	<b>Collectivism II:</b> The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their organizations or families.
6.	<b>Assertiveness:</b> The degree to which individuals are assertive, dominant and demanding in their relationships with others.
7.	<b>Gender egalitarianism:</b> The degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality.
8.	<b>Future orientation:</b> The extent to which a collective encourages future-oriented behaviors such as delaying gratification, planning and investing in the future.
9.	<b>Performance orientation:</b> The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence.

*Source: House et al. (1999, 2004)*

**Table 2: GLOBE Dimensions and their Descriptions**

*Applicability*

The GLOBE project appears robust from empirical standpoint, however, it does not offer any conceptual novelty. The first six dimensions of GLOBE are derived from Hofstede’s model (1980). The first three dimensions reflect the same constructs as Hofstede’s dimensions labeled Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, and Individualism. The Collectivism I dimension measures societal

emphasis on collectivism, with low scores reflecting an individualistic emphasis and high scores reflecting a collectivistic emphasis by means of laws, social programs or institutional practices. The Collectivism II scale measures group (family and/or organization) collectivism – pride in and loyalty to family and/or organization and family or organizational cohesiveness (House et al., 1999, 2004). The two dimensions labeled Gender Egalitarianism and Assertiveness refer to Hofstede’s Masculinity dimension. Future Orientation is derived from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) Past, Present, Future Orientation dimension, which focuses on the temporal mode of a society. Performance Orientation was derived from McClelland’s work on need for achievement. Humane Orientation has its roots in Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) work on the Human Nature Good versus Human Nature Bad dimension, as well as Putnam’s (1993) work on the Civic Society and conceptualization of the affiliative motive (House et al. 1999, 2004).

In contrast to other cultural models, the GLOBE claims to differentiate between societal values (termed “should be”) and societal practices (termed “as is”). Apparently, this distinction relies on the assumption that culture is a multi-layer concept represented by artifacts and practices at the surface and by attitudes, values, and basic assumptions at the core (e.g., Hofstede, 2001; Trompenaars, 1993).

A major criticism is the ambiguity about institutional collectivism and in-group collectivism constructs. While “in-group collectivism” resembles collectivism construct as put forward by other scholars (e.g. Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck; 1961), “institutional collectivism” as defined by the GLOBE corresponds to a very different notion. In fact, it is possible to find a negative correlation between institutional and in-group collectivism. Furthermore, some of GLOBE dimensions like “Performance orientation” reflect organizational phenomena and they are not broad enough to be considered as pure cultural values. The GLOBE dimensions have been used in some studies especially for exploring the effects of cultural differences on leadership styles (House et al., 1999, 2004). The use of Likert-type scales provides researchers with interval data that can be quantitatively analyzed.

Overall, GLOBE represents a very parsimonious model that falls short in applicability, as it deals only with work-related values. As a result, GLOBE dimensions may be suitable in areas such as leadership, organizational behavior or human resource management. For instance, a dimension labeled ‘performance orientation’ may seem meaningless in marketing and consumer behavior.

#### 4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this article, eight cultural frameworks were examined and their relative applicability with respect to some major criteria was assessed. *Table-3* summarizes the results.

As shown in *Table-3*, all these frameworks with exception of Hall's rely on a value-based perspective to analyze culture. The value-based perspective considers values as the only component of culture and overlooks other components such as cognitive structures, which are central to problem solving patterns. Obviously, this major shortcoming needs to be addressed in future research.

Schwartz, Hofstede, and Trompenaars claim empirical grounds; others are inspired by observation and/or theory. Following positivistic tradition, the academia is fascinated by what is "empirical". Therefore, in cross-cultural research, this group of empirically driven frameworks has received a good deal of attention and their results were considered as infallible. However, it is important to point out that even in empirical studies such as Hofstede (1980), the questions are imposed arbitrarily on respondents, and therefore, empiricism remains an illusion. Researchers need to bear in mind that sometimes purely theoretical frameworks can be as robust as empirical ones.

We observe that there is no agreement on the ideal number of elements/dimensions in cultural models. Of course, since culture is a very broad and complicated concept, addition of more elements/dimensions can provide us with a better understanding. However, additional elements/dimensions should be conceptually meaningful. Except Rokeach (1973), other frameworks have incorporated between 3-9 elements/dimensions. It seems that 5-8 should be a convenient number of dimensions to be applied easily in empirical research.

Among all the frameworks, only Schwartz distinguished between individual and societal levels. Hofstede has claimed that his dimensions are applicable only at national level. Other Frameworks do not distinguish very clearly between national, organizational and individual levels. Frameworks proposed by Hall (1960, 1976) and Rokeach (1973) are based on nominal and ordinal data which cannot be treated easily by statistical techniques. Other frameworks provide interval data that are more convenient in empirical research.

Hall and Triandis offer some meaningful and rich notions along which culture can be understood, however, some important issues are not addressed in their models. The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) is related to the more external layers of the culture onion and their manifestations. These frameworks do not cover all aspects of the concept of culture. Consequently, they are considered as medium with regard to 'comprehensiveness' criterion. As with Hofstede's model, we witness the absence of some important issues such as relationship with nature.

Moreover, the ‘Uncertainty Avoidance’ is a nebulous and confusing concept associated with contradictory meanings. In addition, the fifth Hofstede’s dimension (temporal orientation) suffers from many conceptual and methodological inaccuracies. While this dimension has been labeled Confucian dynamism, the extent to which it is appropriate in other cultures is a major concern. Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars provide a more comprehensive framework as they have incorporated more dimensions that deal with time and environment. Similarly, GLOBE has built on nine dimensions to present a more comprehensive model than Hofstede. The frameworks proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) and Schwartz (1992) may be considered more comprehensive because they incorporate meaningful notions that correspond to the hardcore of culture. An important advantage of these frameworks is that they are not derived from work-related values and arguably, they may provide a broader understanding of societal culture. There is a trade-off between comprehensiveness and parsimony. Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, Schwartz, Hofstede, Trompenaars, and GLOBE represent relatively comprehensive models with a good degree of parsimony. As a result, they may be applied conveniently in empirical research.

As of past applications in empirical research, no doubt, Hofstede’s work is the most employed. Hall, Rokeach, Triandis, and Trompenaars’ framework have received some attention from management researchers. GLOBE is a new project and over time, it may replace Hofstede’s framework in empirical research. After development of Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire (Maznevski et al., 2002), Kluckhohn and Strodbeck’s framework is receiving more attention from management scholars. Schwartz’s work has been tested and replicated in social sciences and it is gaining ground in management.

As of dimensions’ exclusiveness, Hall, Rokeach, Triandis are ranked “Low”. In other words, dimensions/elements incorporated in these models have blurring borders and do not represent distinct concepts. Even though Hofstede claimed that his dimensions are conceptually and statistically distinct, we may find a significant correlation between “Collectivism” and “Power Distance” that ultimately diminishes dimensions’ exclusiveness. Similarly in Kluckhohn and Strodbeck and GLOBE frameworks, it is possible to find considerable correlations between “Hierarchical Distance” and “Collectivism.

Except Hall that relies on qualitative data and Rokeach that ranks values, all other frameworks provide us with the intensity of cultural values. Moreover, Schwartz is the only one that provides insights into the structure of cultural values.

As of ‘Thickness’ criterion, despite some overlap, Hall’s categories such as high/low-context and mono/poly-chronic provide a very profound understanding of cultural differences. Rokeach, Triandis, Hofstede, Trompenaars, and GLOBE frameworks rely mainly on clear-cut dimensions to explain culture, however they cannot give a thick and holistic description of culture. Especially, Hofstede, Trompenaars, and GLOBE focus on work-related values and narrow their definitions. Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) and Schwartz (1992, 1994) stand for ‘thicker’ descriptions of culture, as they delve into fundamental aspects of culture.

Not surprisingly, these frameworks have been developed in anthropology and psychology disciplines.

In light of these discussions, it is possible to propose that all cultural frameworks represent dissimilar but useful approaches to understanding some aspects of culture. As a result, researchers need to understand the characteristics of each framework and take on those that accord with research design and objectives.

Criteria / Frameworks	Hall	Rokeach	K&S	Triandis	Schwartz	Hofstede	Trompenaars	GLOBE
<b>Date</b>	1959,1976	1973	1961	1994	1994	1980-88	1993	1997, 2004
<b>Discipline</b>	Anthropology	Psychology	Anthropology	Psychology	Psychology	Organization Science	Organization Science	Organization Science
<b>Basis</b>	Observation	Theory	Theory Investigation	Theory	Theory/ Empirical	Empirical	Empirical	Extension of Hofstede
<b>Value vs. Cognition</b>	Value/ Cognition	Values	Values/ Cognition	Values	Values	Values	Values	Values
<b>Data Gathering/ Questionnaires</b>	NA	Desired values	Context Analysis	Attitudes	Desired Values	Attitudes	Attitudes/Situations/Desired values	Desired Values/ Practices
<b>Number of elements</b>	3	18+18	6 + Sub-dimensions	3	7 Value Types	4 + 1	7	9
<b>Level of analysis</b>	Societal	Individual and group	Societal	Societal	Individual and Societal	National	National and Organizational	National Societal
<b>Measurement Instruments</b>	NA	Quantitative	Qualitative CPQ Quantitative	Qualitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative
<b>Nature of data</b>	Nominal	Ordinal	Nominal (CPQ: Interval)	Nominal	Interval	Interval	Interval	Interval
<b>Validity history</b>	Low to Medium	Medium	Medium	Low to Medium	Medium to High	High	Medium	Medium
<b>Comprehensiveness</b>	Medium	Medium	High	Low	High	Medium to High	Medium to High	Medium to High
<b>Parsimony</b>	Medium	Medium	Medium to High	Medium to High	High	High	Medium to High	Medium to High

Dimensions' Exclusiveness	Low	Low to Medium	Medium	Low	High	Medium to High	Medium	Medium
<b>Dichotomy</b>	NA	NA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Intensity Measurement</b>	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Ranking Measurement</b>	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>Structure of Values</b>	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
<b>Thickness</b>	High	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium
<b>Appropriate Areas in Empirical Research</b>	Communication, Negotiation, Conflict Management, OB, HRM, Consumer Behavior	Marketing, Consumer Behavior, Cross-cultural	Management, OB, HRM, Cross-cultural, Marketing, Consumer Behavior	OB, HRM, Negotiation, Conflict Management	Management, OB, HRM, Cross-cultural, Marketing, Consumer Behavior	Management, OB, HRM, Cross-cultural	Management, OB, HRM, Cross-cultural	Management, OB, HRM, Cross-cultural
<b>Overall Assessment</b>	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium

*Table 3: Applicability and Assessment of Widely Employed Frameworks*

## 5. REFERENCES

- Abramson, N. R., Lane, H. W., Nagai, H. & H. Takagi. (1993) "A comparison of Canadian and Japanese cognitive styles: Implications for management interaction." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 3: 575-87.
- Bigoness, W.J., Blakely, G.C., (1996) "A Cross-national Study of Managerial Values" *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27 (4) 739-752.
- Ember, C.R. and Levinson, D. (1991) "The Substantive Contributions of Worldwide Cross-cultural Studies Using Secondary Data" *Behavioural Science Research*, 25, 79-140.
- Geertz, C. (1974) "The Interpretation of Cultures" New York: Basic Books.
- Hall, E.T. (1960) "The Silent Language of Overseas Business" *Harvard Business Review*, May- June, 87-95.
- Hall, E.T. (1976) "Beyond Culture", Anchor Press, New York.
- Hampden-Turner, C. and F. Trompenaars (1994) "The Seven Cultures of Capitalism", Piatkus, London.
- Hofstede, Geert H., (2001) "Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations", second ed. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hofstede, G and Bond, M.H (1988) "The Confucius connection: from cultural roots to economic growth", *Organizational Dynamics*, 16 (4) 4-21.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) "Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values", London: Sage.
- House, R. et al. (2004) "Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies", Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., Gupta, V. and 170 co-authors (1999) *Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE*, In: W. Mobley (ed.) *Advances in Global Leadership*, vol. 1. JAI Press.
- Hui, C.H. and Triandis, H.C. (1986) "Individualism and Collectivism: A study of Cross-Cultural Researchers", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 225-248.
- Lee, R.B. and DeVore, I. (1976), "Kalahari Hunter-gatherers: Studies of Kung San and their Neighbors", Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Kluckhohn, C. K. (1951) "Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action" In T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (Eds.), "Toward a General Theory of Action" Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kluckhohn, F. R., and Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961) "*Variations in Value Orientations*", New York: HarperCollins.
- Kroeber, A.L. and Parsons, T. (1958) "*The Concepts of Culture and of Social System*", *American Sociological Review*, 23, 582-583.
- Maznevski, Martha L. and Gomez, Carolina B. and DiStefano, Joseph J. and Noorderhaven, Niels G. and Wu, Pei-Chuan, (2002), "*Cultural Dimensions at the Individual Level of Analysis The Cultural Orientations Framework*", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 2(3) 275-295.
- Maznevski, M.L. and Peterson, M.F. (1997) "*Societal Values, Social Interpretation, and Multinational Teams*", in C.S. Granrose and S. Oskamp (Eds) *Cross-cultural Work Groups*, pp. 61-89. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parsons, T. and Shils, E.A. (1951), "*Toward a General Theory of Action*", Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1973), "*The Nature of Human Values*", New York: Free Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994) "*Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values*", in U. Kim et al. (eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications* (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA), 85-122.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992) "*Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 Countries*" In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Tayeb, M. (1994), "*Organizations and National Culture: Methodology Considered*", *Organization Studies*, 15(3), 429-444.
- Thomas, D.C., (2002) "*Essentials of International Management, a Cross-cultural Perspective*", Thousand Oaks, Calif., Sage Publications.
- Triandis, H.C. (1994) "*Culture and Social Behavior*", McGraw-Hill.
- Trompenaars, F., (1993), "*Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Business*", London: Economist Book.