Typologies of Culture

Shalin Chanchani
Shared Services Bureau
Toronto
Canada
Fax: (416) 326-4992

and

Paul Theivanathampillai
Department of Accountancy & Business Law
University of Otago
New Zealand
e-mail: priyan@business.otago.ac.nz

Abstract

Cultural related business research requires robust frameworks for analysis and application of this complex phonomena. Business research has largely relied upon and applied Hofstede's dimensions to cultural problems. This paper investigates and discusses plausible alternatives (Triandis, Trompenaars and Fiske) to Hofstede's classification; identifies meaningful criteria to assess these classification, and; evaluate each classification against these criteria. The identified criteria are: simplicity; ability to transcend levels of analysis; lending itself to different research methods; providing richness in identifying themes, and ; enabling a richer understanding cultural change. In addition to offering viable alternatives to Hofstede, this paper suggests cultural researchers adopt a framework based on their research objectives; forwards criteria to shape and direct cultural research, and; provides researchers with a framework to develop more robust typologies.

1 Introduction

The major consideration for this study is the almost exclusive reliance of business literature on Hofstede's classification of national culture and incognizance of other writers in this area[1]. Hofstede's dimensions of value have come under increasing scrutiny and criticism for its: limited ability to extend the dominant values present within a multinational to represent cultural values of a country (Hunt, 1983; Robinson, 1983; Triandis, 1982; Banai, 1982; Schooler, 1983), insufficient precision in definition across categories (Chow *et al*, 1999, Schwartz, 1992), and limited scope in methodology and measurement (Yeh, 1988; Dorfman and Howell, 1988; Roberts and Boyciligiller, 1984; and Robinson, 1983).

Given the growing criticisms of Hofstede's framework, there is an increasing imperative to study other classifications. Business literature also lacks a meaningful synthesis of cultural classifications. Culture however remains a growing research area. New vistas in cultural research include culture with ownership strategies and joint ventures (Kogut and Singh, 1988; Harry G Barkema and Freek Vermeulen, 1997; Hennart and Larimo, 1998; Brouthers &andBrouthers, 2001), cognitive styles (Abramson *et al, 1993,* Bailey, Chen and Dow, 1997*),* and culture with global information management (see Myers and Tan, 2002 for a useful review). Thus objectives of this paper are to: explore alternative classifications of culture; identify criteria to evaluate classifications, and; analyse these frameworks along the identified criteria. The following section contrasts the more established values based view of culture with the ontological view.

1.1 The concept and manifestations of culture

An early definition of culture is 'that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.' (Tylor 1871, p1). Subsequent scholars have identified 164 definitions (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952) which largely view culture as the properties of an average citizen or modal personality (Inkeles and Levinson, 1969). Cultures can be learned, acquired, and reflects the patterns of thinking, feeling and acting (Harris, 1987); reacting (Kluckhohn, 1951a, p86); values, ideas and other symbolic meaningful systems (Kroeber and Parsons, 1958). The underlying theme is that culture is an abstraction from concrete behaviour but is not behaviour itself. Culture is transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting distinctive achievement of human groups, including the embodiments in artefacts (Kluckhohn, 1951a, p86). Such a transmission has been viewed as the 'Collective programming of the mind which distinguishes members of one human group from another' (Hofstede, 1980, p25). Hofstede admits that his is not a complete definition of culture, but simply includes what he has been able to measure. Hofstede emphasises 'values' as the building blocks of culture, which is consistent with other authors.

Values are programmed early in lives and determine subjective definition of rationality. Values are manifested at the individual and collective levels (Parsons and Shils, 1951) and are regarded as 'end states' rather than 'means' (Bem, 1970). This distinction of means (instrumental values) and ends (terminal values) (Rokeach 1973) is recognised by philosophers (Lovejoy, 1950; Hilliard, 1950), anthropologists (Kluckhohn, 1951a; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961), and psychologists (English and English, 1958). Values can be regarded as: 'nonconsciously-taken-for-granted-values' *zero-order beliefs* and 'directly-derived-values' as *first-order beliefs*.

Hofstede (1980, p19) followed Kluckhohn's definition of values of 'intensity and modality', and defined them quite simply as 'a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others'. Hofstede claimed that values have both intensity and direction or alternatively that they have a size and a sign. Values should be distinguished between the desired and the desirable: what people

actually desire against what they think ought to be desired. Equating the desired and the desirable is a 'positivistic fallacy' (Levitin, 1973) but Hofstede chooses to adopt a pragmatist view to aid measurement. This values based (or latent value) literature has faced growing criticisms from the cognitive or ontological view (ontologists). This debate is critically evaluated below.

1.2 Culture: Values-based *v*s Ontological view

The Ontological view is based upon the notion of cultural cognitivism which proposes that culture can be better understood in cognitive terms rather than appealing to a set of latent values. By studying cognition, the interpretive frameworks explain why people associate and discriminate ideas and phenomena in particular ways, thereby explaining culture. This idea of cultural cognitivism (and thereby Ontology) develops concepts such as: *shared cognitive representations* in the minds of individuals thereby shaping culture (Romney *et al*, 1996); *consistent patterns* of perceiving, relating and interpreting information that affects individual and group behaviour (Abramson *et al*, 1996); *domain-specific intuitive ontologies* which shape the tracks of acquisition and cognition that frame recurrent cultural representation (Boyer, 1996); *cognitive organization* in individuals is the primary locus of culture (Talmy, 1996); and *spatial language and cognition* vary across cultures (Levinson, 1996).

The ontological-view draws upon the cognitive processes of information gathering and decision making (Abramson *et al*, 1996) as the basic unit of analysis of culture (DeMaggio, 1997, Talmy 1995). By using this schema, researchers can find the mechanism by 'which culture shapes and biases' (DeMaggio 1997, p 254). The nature in which cultures vary ontologically in terms of categorisation, differentiation and abstraction will enable an analysis of manager perceptions, relationships and interpretations on information thereby affecting individual and group behaviour (Abramson *et al* 1996). Therefore ontologists claim to lay a foundation for working through the interaction of shared cognitive structures and phenomena (DeMaggio, 1997)[2].

While intuitively appealing at the outset, a deeper examination reveals that the ontological view faces three major challenges. First, the ontological literature asserts that culturally rooted interpretive frameworks explain a person's associations and discriminations better than conventional appeals to latent cultural values. This implies that an 'emic' based view of the world is *always* superior to an 'etic' view. This is an extreme and flawed position since the emic view would require external validity to allow a theory to be generalisable, thereby warranting an etic view to substantiate an emic view. Implicit in the ontological perspective, emic and etic are viewed as dichotomies whereas emic and etic views, when used together are complementary, enhance rigour and validity. Therefore, the ontological view needs to develop the subtleties of the emic and etic debate more clearly and adopt a position on the basis of knowledge and scientific rigour.

Second, ontologists assume that, moving from the level of the collective (the latent view of values) to the level of the individual (the cognitive view), focuses the concept of culture to be stable and visible (manifest). This assumption is critical, flawed and refuted because an individual's preferences, cognition and awareness may change depending on a number of internal (e.g., sleep, mood) or external (e.g., weather) conditions. Therefore, the cognition of the individual is at least just as latent as the concept of collective values. Moving from the collective to the individual does not get the devil off the back (Campbell, 1977).

Third, the cognitive framework when applied to empirical analysis provides a view of self and time similar to that forwarded by the latent values literature. This similarity can be explained in

two ways. Initially, the framing of the individual cognition may rely on the collective values, i.e., what the peer or reference group perceive the phenomenon to be. This means that individual cognition may be shaped by forces (Redding, 1980) that are supra-individual, that is, the latent values of culture. There is a well-established body of work that demonstrates that culture affects the conception of the self (Erez and Earley 1993; Markus and Kitayama 1991; Triandis 1990). Therefore individual cognition and perceptions are driven or shaped by latent values of culture.

Importantly, the change in individual cognition (media, education, and interaction with other reference groups or cultures) may, over time, drive changes in the latent values of culture. As such, the latent values and individual cognition are inexorably linked. This nexus of relationships cannot be clarified by focusing solely on individual cognition. Therefore, any notion of abandoning latent values is misplaced and this paper explores more fully the values based literature [3].

2 Classifications of Culture

The literature is replete with cultural typologies drawn from theory and statistical techniques of factor analyses (Cattell, 1949; Sawyer, 1967; Rummell 1972; Hofstede, 1980); smallest space analyses (Schwartz, 1990, 1992; Rokeach 1973); and standard analytic issues (Inkeles and Levinson, 1969). In addition, Ackoff and Emery (1972) developed a valid cultural typology, and; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) offer classification of cultures on five value orientations. More recent typologies of culture include Hamilton *et al* (1988), Dore (1990), Whitley (1992) and Inglehart and Baker (2000).

Given the plethora of writers on culture, focussing on selected writers aids parsimony[4]. While Hofstede's is the most well-known classification, this paper selects three other classifications, which provide insights into culture and poses an alternative to Hofstede. These writers are Trompenaars, Triandis and Fiske, scholars whose writings draw upon psychology, cross-cultural psychology, and sociology respectively. These classifications of culture are developed and assessed along five evaluation criteria. These criteria form the benchmark for evaluating the sufficiency and adequacy of each classification scheme. The criteria are:

Simplicity: Classifications should be succinct and parsimonious. Cultural classifications should synthesise rich, complex constructs into a small number of easily understandable, simple concepts. Simplicity in both substance and form should not however compromise analytic rigour and richness of the schema. Substance is characterised by the ability of the classification schema to be exclusive and exhaustive[5]. Form is the elegance and parsimony with which the classification is held together. Thus the greater the balance between simplicity and richness-of-content, the more advanced the classification.

Ability to transcend levels of analysis: Cultural classifications are often limited by levels or unit of analysis to which they can be applied. Culture is studied at the sub-group level, the group level, the organisational level, the national level or for a cluster of nations. Clearly, choosing the correct level of analysis is important (Rousseau, 1985) but empowering multi-level analyses can allow useful insights (Hofstede, Bond and Leung, 1993)[6]. Some classifications enable application of the schemas to certain levels or units thereby restricting their usefulness. Such analytical restriction is confining to researchers in understanding the schemas, applying this to other subjects and extending the classifications itself. A more advanced schema, upon application, would readily enable multiple levels of analysis.

Applicability to multiple research methods: A useful classification is flexible in enabling researchers to adopt and apply a variety of research methods (such as experimental, quasi-experimental, case, field study or qualitative methods) in investigating problems (Newman and Benz, 1998). Replicating the study using different methods would substantiate that findings are explained by the underlying theory than by the idiosyncrasies of the method. If a classification scheme allows plurality of method, any investigation can only gain in robustness, validity, reliability and generalisability (Sekaran and Martin, 1982; Sekaran, 1983). Thus the more readily a framework lends itself to adoption and application on a variety of research methods, the more advanced is the classification.

Identifying dominant themes: Cultures may have certain themes that are more dominant than other themes. A more useful cultural classification should be sufficiently advanced to enable researchers in identifying any dominant theme within a culture upon application of the classification. As an analogy, a beautiful tapestry, rich in colour, vibrant in design may be examined in two fundamental ways. First, decompose meaning from the dominant theme of the tapestry. Second, study the more subtle and peripheral themes at the margin. The latter, marginal investigation may be just as rich and insightful for the viewer as a study of the more dominant theme. And as a corollary, studying less dominant forms may increase our understanding of the dominant form. Thus, the richer a framework in allowing dominant and peripheral themes to be clearly identified, the more advanced the classification.

Flexibility in understanding cultural change: Cultures change over time and the specific dimensions within each taxonomy may also be variable. The ability of a taxonomy to analyse change is powerful because this enables researchers to explain, describe and predict changes in attitudes, values and norms. Thus the more flexible the classification in explaining change, the more advanced it is. While this is a difficult criterion for classifications to excel on, this is also probably a valuable one, for a classification that explains, describes and predicts cultural chance will be widely accepted.

These criteria are not ordered by importance or any other metric. Each criterion is not sufficient on its own and must be complemented with others. The above criteria itself are probably not exhaustive but are presented as a benchmark to evaluate four cultural classifications. Hofstede, Triandis', Trompenaars' and Fiske's classifications are presented next. These sections are structured to first discuss the key concepts of the typology followed by an evaluation of the typology on the five evaluation criteria discussed above. Conclusion provides a comparison of these typologies and directions for future research.

2.1 Hofstede's Dimensions of Value

Hofstede's dimensions of Individualism, Masculinity, Power distance and Uncertainty avoidance are richly suggestive of psychological processes (Bond *et al.*, 1987). By locating cultures on a four-factor map, this seminal work has enabled cross-cultural psychologists to select cultures for comparison on *a priori* basis (Bond and Forgas, 1984). Such operationalisations of culture are essential if empirical research is ever to build a theoretical structure for explaining cross-cultural differences in behaviour (Foschi and Hales, 1979). Hofstede introduced four dimensions in 1980 and the fifth in 1988 (Hofstede and Bond, 1988):

Individualism versus Collectivism: Individualism stands for a preference for a loosely knit social framework in society wherein individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families only. Collectivism stands for a preference for a tightly knit social framework in which individuals can expect their relatives, clan, or other in-group to look after them in exchange for

unquestioning loyalty. The key issue is the degree of interdependence a society maintains among individuals. It relates to people's self-concept: 'I' or 'We'.

Large versus Small Power Distance: Power Distance is the extent to which the members of society accept unequal distribution of power. This affects the behaviour of both less powerful and more powerful members. People in Large Power Distance societies accept a hierarchical order in which everybody has a place which needs no further justification for power inequalities. The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is how a society handles inequalities among people. This has consequences for building institutions and organizations.

Strong versus Weak Uncertainty Avoidance: Uncertainty Avoidance is the degree to which members of a society feel comfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity. Strong Uncertainty Avoidance societies maintain rigid codes of belief and behaviour, promising certainty and protecting conformity. These societies are intolerant towards deviant persons and ideas. Weak Uncertainty Avoidance societies maintain a more relaxed atmosphere and deviance is more easily tolerated. Fundamentally, this dimension addresses how society views linearity of time and to control future or let it happen. Uncertainty Avoidance has consequences for the way people build their institutions and organizations.

Masculinity versus Femininity: Masculinity stands for a preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material success. Its opposite, Femininity, stands for a preference for relationships, modesty, caring for the weak, and the quality of life. The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is the way in which a society allocates social (as opposed to biological) roles to the sexes.

Long versus Short Term Orientation: Short term orientation stands for a society fostering virtues oriented towards persistence and perseverance, thrift, ordering relationships by status and observing this order by having a sense of shame. Long term orientation stands for a society fostering virtues of personal steadiness and stability, protecting face, respect for tradition and reciprocation of greetings, favours and gifts.

2.2 Evaluation of Hofstede's Dimensions

Upon evaluation, Hofstede's classification scores high on simplicity. This is because the dimensions are relatively straightforward concepts and rich in meaning in relation to form. With regard to substance, the classification is neither exhaustive nor exclusive for two reasons. First, Uncertainty Avoidance faces criticism for not validly capturing oriental values, thereby not being exhaustive. Second, the late inclusion of Confuscinism (Hofstede and Bond, 1988) or long term orientation (Hofstede, 1991) demonstrates lack of exclusivity. Moreover, Hofstede does not exclude the possibility of finding new dimensions. Thus, with regards to simplicity, Hofstede's classification rates are moderate in substance and high in form.

With regards to levels of analysis, Hofstede argued that his classification could only be applied at the national level. Although the precise arguments building upto this are unclear, Hofstede asserts that applying his dimensions to any other level is incorrect and is an ecological fallacy. This severely restricts the use of his schema and receives a low rating for the criterion of levels of analysis.

In applying the criterion of different research methods, the application of any other method other than that specified by Hofstede (using the VSM to compare mean-differences between countries) is considered incorrect. While Hofstede's data has been used widely, there appears to be little other

application of these dimension in other research methods (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental and field research). Thus, this receives a rating of low on the research method criterion.

In relation to the ability to identify dominant themes, the dimensions may be used in identifying dominant themes both within a specific culture as well as across cultures on one or more dimensions. While this is subject to Hofstede's caveats, theme identification is internally consistent. Hofstede's classification however fails to indicate which of his four dimensions, if any, is likely to provide deeper insights for a specific culture. Thus this receives a rating of medium on the criterion of identifying dominant themes.

In terms of understanding cultural change, Hofstede's framework does not explicitly allow for the systematic study of cultural change. However, prescribed application of the instrument and method may enable snapshots of culture at various points in time. These snapshots are not indicative of the process of change but merely of magnitude and direction of change. Thus Hofstede's model is only moderately useful in understanding and explaining cultural change.

Despite the growing criticisms of Hofstede's work, four reasons are identified for the extensive adoption of his classification. First, Hofstede's is the first study to integrate previously fragmented constructs and ideas from the literature and present a coherent framework for classifying different cultures. The second reason for widespread adoption of Hofstede's classification of culture lies in the simplicity of his dimensions. His dimensions are straightforward and intuitively appealing to both the academic research and business readers across disciplines. The third reason is that he offers an instrument to measure values. Fourth, Hofstede is the first author to offer an extensive data set for empirical analysis, which is extensively appealing to researchers.

3 Triandis' cultural syndromes

According to Triandis (1994) 'Culture is a set of human-made objective and subjective elements that in the past have increased the probability of survival and resulted in satisfaction of the participants in an ecological niche, and thus became shared among those who could communicate with each other because they had a common language and lived in the same time and place' (p22). Although the definition of culture is very broad, Triandis distinguishes objective elements of culture from the subjective ones. Objective aspects of culture include tools, roads and radio stations while subjective aspects include categorisations, associations, norms, roles and values which form some of the basic elements effecting social behaviour. The subjective elements of each culture are organised into unique patterns of beliefs, attitudes, norms and values. Triandis identifies four cultural syndromes that apply to all cultures: cultural complexity; cultural tightness; individualism and collectivism.

3.1 Cultural complexity

In complex cultures, people make large numbers of distinctions among objects and events in their environment. The ecology and history of a society determines its complexity, as does the number of occupations in a society where non-literate cultures have barely twenty occupations (Triandis 1994). Societies that subsist on hunting and gathering tend to be simple; agricultural societies tend to be somewhat complex; industrial societies are more complex; and information societies are the most complex. The contrast between simple and complex cultures is the most important factor of cultural variations in social behaviour (Ember and Levinson, 1991). However, Triandis does not offer any objective method of measuring and rating cultural complexity. Carneiro (1970), Lomax and Berkowitz (1972), and Murdock and Provost (1973) have constructed several indexes and obtained reliable rank orders of cultural complexity.

3.2 Tight and loose cultures

In 'tight' cultures people are expected to behave according to clear norms and deviations are likely to be punished with sanctions. Tight cultures exhibit such characteristics as: the corporate control of property, corporate ownership of stored food and production, power, strong religious leaders, hereditary recruitment into priesthood and high tax. Such relationships suggest that tightness is correlated with Collectivism (Pelto, 1968). In tight cultures, if one does what everyone is doing, one is protected from criticism. Tightness is more likely when norms are clear and this requires a relatively homogenous culture.

Loose cultures either have unclear norms or tolerate deviance from norms. Cultural heterogeneity, strong influences from other cultures and physical space between people can lead to looseness. Loose cultures are often found at the intersections of major distinct cultures that are rather different from each other (Triandis, 1994, p160). Urban environments are usually more loose than rural ones. Looseness is caused by conflicting norms or is traceable to norms that are not especially functional. Moreover, if occupations permit much solitary action (e.g., hunting or writing) norms may be weak and loosely imposed (Triandis, 1994, p160).

3.3 Individualism and Collectivism

Individualists are emotionally detached from their in-groups and emphasise self-reliance, independence, pleasure, affluence and the pursuit of happiness. Individualists do not switch their behaviour dramatically when an out-group member becomes an in-group member, whereas collectivists do. The behaviour of individualists tends to be friendly but non-intimate toward a wide range of people outside the family. Triandis further recognises a correlation between cultural complexity and Individualism: the more complex the culture, the more individualistic it is, because in complex cultures a person has the choice of becoming a member of various groups.

There are two kinds of Collectivism: *horizontal* (interdependence and oneness) and *vertical* (serving the group) which are correlated in the .3-.4 range (Triandis, 1994, p164). In collectivistic culture self is defined in terms of membership on in-groups, a priority among vertical collectivists. Collectivists are often, but not always organised hierarchally and tend to be concerned about the results of their actions on members of their in-groups, share resources with in-group members, feel interdependent with in-group members, and feel involved in the lives of in-group members (Hui and Triandis, 1986). They also feel strongly about the integrity of their in-groups (Triandis, *et al.,* 1986). If an individual is an in-group member, the behaviour is very associative, and may reflect self-sacrifice. If the individual is an out-group member, the behaviour is indifferent or disassociative.

Triandis identifies individualism and collectivism as distinct but related constructs. For example the !Kung culture exhibits both individualistic (equality and self-reliance) *and* many collective elements (interdependence and sharing) (Lee and DeVore, 1976). Such a view contrasts with others, particularly Hofstede's where individualism-collectivism is a continuum implying that collective cultures may not possess individualism.

3.4 Evaluation of Triandis' Cultural Syndromes

Upon evaluation along the five criteria, Triandis' syndromes score moderate on simplicity. In considering substance, the syndromes are insufficiently exhaustive as the concept of time is not considered adequately. Because there is little overlap between the syndromes, syndromes rate high on exclusivity.

In its ability to transcend levels of analysis, the syndromes have a strong potential because these may be applied at different units for analysis. However, Triandis does not explicitly articulate the consequences of applying the syndromes across levels. For example, would these syndromes be stable and interpretable at the individual level as they are at the national level? Will these syndromes require modification, if so, what? Although the syndromes seem to be in their early stages of development, they have significant potential to be applied across levels and therefore rated moderate on this criterion.

In terms of lending itself to variety of research methods, the definition of syndromes while conceptually sound appears vague and provides little guidance to measurement. Because the syndromes do not have any formal metrics or a specified method, its current form does not enable application of quantitative research methods. The syndromes are rich and have the potential to be developed more fully to satisfy this requirement. For these reasons, syndromes score low on the applicability of research methods.

In identifying dominant themes, the syndromes are quite useful but imprecise given lack of any ordinal ranking. Therefore identifying dominant themes from the rich but diffused syndromes is problematic. Comparing themes using Triandis' Syndromes will be harder still, if at all. Thus the syndromes get a low rating for its ability to identify dominant themes.

In its ability to help understand cultural change, Triandis' syndromes are rather limited. Unless clearer, more precise characteristics are established to identify and order syndromes, meaningful analysis will remain a matter of subjective application. Due to the inexact nature, syndromes are rated low in explaining cultural change.

In summary, Triandis presents a unique and interesting interpretation of cultural typology through his syndromes. The syndromes are rich with meaning and replete with pioneering insights, often drawn from deep knowledge of cultural-history. The syndromes are embryonic, and if developed fully offer fertile grounds for insights into culture.

4 Trompenaars' dimensions of culture

Trompenaars (1993, p6) views culture as *a way in which a group of people solve problems.* This is based directly on Schein's (1985) definition of organizational culture. From the solutions to three types of problems (relationship with others; time; and the environment), he identifies seven fundamental dimensions of culture[7]. Trompenaars' definition of culture is generic across national and organisational cultures and there therefore often confounds the two. Five of his dimensions are identical to Parsons' (1951) *The Social System*: affectivity versus affective neutrality; self-orientation versus collective-orientation; universalism versus particularism; ascription versus achievement; and specificity versus diffuseness.

4.1 Universalism versus particularism

Universalist cultures stand for rather strictly implied rule-based behaviours reflecting a general mistrust in humanity while particularist cultures tend to focus more on the exceptional nature of present circumstances. Zurcher *et al.,* (1965) support this classification. This dimension contrasts the extent to which a respondent is willing to interpret socially formed rules in favour of ones friends or relations and to an extent overlaps the dimension of Individualism described below. This dimension finds application in various aspects of international business including contracts, timing business trips, role of head office and job evaluation and rewards (1993, p40).

4.2 Individualism versus Collectivism

Trompenaars recognises this dimension representing the conflict between individual and group interests. Following Parsons and Shils, Trompenaars (p47) describes Individualism as a *prime orientation to the self* and Collectivism as a *prime orientation to common goals and objectives*. In international management, negotiations, decision-making and motivation are affected by individualistic or collectivistic preferences. Trompenaars, like Hofstede, views Individualism and Collectivism on a continuum which implies that collectivists have little Individualism. Such a conclusion is challenged by Triandis (1994) and Lipset (1990).

4.3 Neutral versus affective

This dimension includes the range of feelings expressed. Reason and emotion both play a role in relationships between people. Which of these will dominate depends upon whether members are *affective* (display emotion) or *neutral* (do not display emotion). Members of neutral cultures keep their feelings and expressions carefully subdued and controlled. People in affective cultures tend to be demonstrative.

Trompenaars adds humour and communication (verbal and non-verbal) as a context for understanding Parson and Shils' dimensions of affective and neutral cultures. This measure is however confounding and clearly inapplicable in a national cultural context. Humour is subjective and individual-dependent and determining what is amusing and therefore affective is likely to be an arbitrary exercise.

4.4 Diffuse versus specific

Diffuse (low-context) and specific (high-context) cultures explore the way in which individuals are engaged in specific areas of communication (high level of shared knowledge is required). In specific cultures, task-relationships are segregated from other dealings. In specific cultures, a boss and subordinate have a tacit communication ground for work settings, which is different from social setting, indicating adaptability and flexibility. In diffuse cultures, the CEO not only runs the company but this individual's values are shared across the organisation work and social settings. This dimension appears to have particular significance to the issues of evaluation and assessment in an international setting, and does not appear to be relevant in a national cultural context.

4.5 Achievement versus ascription

Members of some societies are ascribed higher status than others indicating that unusual attention should be focused upon such persons and their activities. While some societies accord status to people on the basis of their achievements, others ascribe it to them by virtue of age, class, gender, education and such other factors. The former is labelled *achieved* status and the latter as *ascribed* status which respectively refers to *doing* and *being*. Although Trompenaars does not recognise this, Parsons (1977, p14) suggests that the evolution of societies replaces particularism by universalism and ascription by achievement. An extrapolation would conclude that such an evolution would eventually foresee all societies joining the US in the universalism-achievement quadrant of Parsons' taxonomy. This dimension which recognises ascribing status seems to be very similar to Hofstede's construct of Power distance, Fiske's AR would also seem to include aspects of ascription.

4.6 Attitude to time

Perception of time can range from sequential (linear series of passing events) to synchronic (inter-related past, present and future). This orientation of time from past, present and future is a central dimension of culture (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) enabling members to co-ordinate activities (Durkheim, 1960). This construct has implications for both individuals and groups since an agreed meeting time may be precise or approximate. Time allocated to complete a task may be

critical or merely a guide. Thus depending on the individual's attitude to time, managers may plan for the next century or get obsessed by monthly-reporting.

4.7 Attitude to environment

Trompenaars identifies attitude to the environment as a major cultural variable[8]. Societies have two major orientations towards nature: they either believe that they can and should control nature by imposing their will upon it, or they believe that man is part of nature and must go along with its laws, direction and forces. The former kinds of culture tends to identify with mechanisms, that is the organisation is conceived of as a machine that obeys the will of its operators and may be described as *inner-directed*. The latter or *outer-directed* cultures tend to see an organisation as a product of nature, owing its development to the nutrients in its environment and a favourable ecological balance. This idea is based upon Rotters' (1969) *locus of control* and in some ways seems to overlap Hofstede's cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance.

4.8 Evaluation of Trompenaars' Dimensions of Culture

An assessment of Trompernaars' dimensions of culture reveals that dimensions score low on simplicity. Intuitively, seven dimensions should be straightforward to apply, but in fact, these are quite complex constructs. For example, the attitude to environment seems simple but the underlying themes, such as ascription, are complex to understand and apply. The dimensions rate high in exhaustiveness but poor on exclusivity. Two concepts are similar, namely attitude to environment and individualism. Attitude to environment is drawn from locus of control where 'internals' have *control lying within them*, a concept identical to *individualism*.

In assessing the application to various units of analysis Trompenaars' dimensions may be applied freely to varying levels of analysis. Stability in application of these psychological characteristics to higher levels of abstraction (from individual to national level) is untested and poses an imposing challenge for future research. Thus the classification rates moderate in transcending levels of analysis.

In terms of relevance of different research methods, the constructs lack quite considerably in both precision and clarity, thereby limiting any attempt at measurement. The dimensions and the applications seem to have been directed towards a business readership satisfied with anecdotal evidence rather than one demanding scholarly insights into theory, a high level of rigour, triangulated by empirical evidence. Application into different research methods will be subjective, imprecise and of questionable value. Thus these dimensions are fairly restricted in lending themselves to the rigour of various research methods and thus rated low.

Trompenaars' dimensions are also fairly limited in its ability to identify dominant themes, because the dimensions are fine grained and zoomed in at the psychology of the individual, zooming out to identify and extract dominant themes, will be extremely difficult if possible at all. Thus for this criterion, Trompenaars is assigned a low rating.

In explaining cultural change the concepts lack any sense of measurement either within or across dimensions. In particular dimensions that rely upon completely subjective measurement like 'attitude to time and environment' have little hope of ever explaining change. Thus, a low rating is assigned to Trompenaar's ability to explain cultural change.

5 Fiske's forms of social reality

Fiske collated and presented an array of inductive evidence on a wide range of subjects from five cultures supported by ethnographic field work and nineteen experimental studies using seven different methods (Fiske, 1990, 1991, 1992). He proposed a theory of the *elementary forms of social behaviour* which postulates that people in all cultures use just four elementary mental modes or relational models: *communal sharing (CS), authority ranking (AR), equality matching (EM)* and *market pricing (MP).* These psychological models are similar to Stevens' (1946, 1951, 1958) four classic scale model. Fiske's psychological models have formal axiomatic properties: The properties of CS correspond to the structure of equivalence relations; AR is defined as Linear ordering; EM has the structure of ordered Abelian groups and MP is axiomatically formalised in terms of Archimedean ordered fields.

5.1 Communal sharing

CS relationships are based on a conception of a bounded group of people as equivalent and undifferentiated. The members of a group treat each other as all the same, focusing on commonalities and disregarding distinct individual identities. Close kinship is dominant and includes intense love, ethnic and national identities. In a CS context, people treat material objects as things they have in common. Such sharing is common in many societies; Fortes (1965, 1970, 1983) calls it prescriptive altruism, Polanyi (1947) calls it householding and Sahlins (1965) calls it generalised reciprocity.

Decision making in CS is consensus based and ideas to the group are contributed from a position of uniformity and selflessness that unites and transcends individual attributes of members. CS shapes how people behave in a group and is also the basis for constituting a social group. CS can assume the forms of a motive, value, norm, moral standard or ideology. Fiske's description of CS is largely similar to Hofstede's and Triandis' construct of Collectivism.

5.2 Authority ranking

AR relationships are based on a model of asymmetry among people linearly ordered by a hierarchal social dimension. AR relationship is ordered such that a person is ranked above or below another person. In conformity with such an order, people higher in rank have prestige, prerogatives, and privileges that their inferiors lack, but subordinates are often entitled to protection and pastoral care by those in higher ranks. Thus the relationship is not only of linear rank but of hierarchical inclusion. People in successively higher ranks are entitled to make decisions, but those in higher ranks are entrusted with certain responsibilities[9]. The concept of self for the individual in an AR group structure comes from knowing one's place in the hierarchy. In cultures in which AR is recognised as important, the self may be defined in terms of what kind of authority one has and whom one respects or obeys or whose follower one is. More precisely, authority ranking is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric. AR respects the identity relation: two different people cannot outrank each other; if P has a rank at least as high as O and, in the same relational system, O has a rank at least as high as P, then P and O are the same person. The relational models theory posits that when people are thinking in terms of such linearly ordered structures, they treat higher rank as superior. Fiske's concept of AR is akin to Hofstede's Power Distance representing respect for authority, a view supported by Triandis (1994).

5.3 Equality matching

EM relationships are based on a model of even balance and one-for-one correspondence, as in turn taking, egalitarian distributive justice, in-kind reciprocity, or compensation by equal replacement (Fiske, 1992)[10]. People within EM relationships keep an account of, and are concerned with the extent of imbalance of the relationship. Such imbalances, within an EM relationship are often corrected by very meticulous and precise acts of rebalancing the relationship by comparing and

contrasting objects in a one to one correspondence. The central idea underlying such actions is that all people involved in an EM relationship are entitled to equal amounts and imbalances or inequalities in distribution, if any, are meaningful. Egalitarian exchanges are found globally and have been given different labels. A *rotated credit association*[11] is clear example of an EM transaction. Many theorists have described EM operating as a social influence mechanism (Cialdini, 1988; Clark, 1983; Cook, 1987). The essential principle is that when people relating in an EM mode receive a favour, they feel obliged to reciprocate by returning the favour. However, EM does not presuppose the prior existence of a group because EM is itself a common blueprint for connecting people. In sum, EM involves a conception of distinct but equal individuals whose relationship is based on an assessment of socially significant differences between people; the reference point, the equilibrium around which the relationship oscillates is an even balance.

5.4 Market pricing

MP is pervasive in Western society and is fundamental to cultural conceptions of human nature and relationships. Other theorists have however postulated that all human social behaviour is based on more or less rational calculations of cost-benefit ratios in self-interested exchange (Blau, 1964 and Becker, 1976). However, others have demonstrated that there are essential differences between the three transactions (CS, AR, EM) and MP (Sahlins, 1965 and Polanyi, 1966).

Blau (1964) regards *strictly economical exchange* as the expression of asocial, selfish individualism, and Sahlins (1965) places MP on a continuum approaching the pole of *negative reciprocity*, but both recognise MP as a distinct kind of interaction. Polanyi (1947, 1966) clarifies that like the other three models, market exchange is not natural, inevitable or inherently connected to material production or exchange; all four are culturally formulated social processes. Polanyi recognises the crucial point that MP like the other models, is a mode of relating to other people. Polanyi, Sahlins and Blau focus on how MP mediates relationships by shaping and giving meaning to exchange processes, but Fiske (1992, p706) argues that MP is not limited to organising the transfer of objects or benefits.

Hofstede's constructs of Power distance and Individualism relate closely to AR. CS, as noted earlier, seems to relate closely to Collectivism. Fiske's theory however is silent on Hofstede's constructs of Uncertainty avoidance and Masculinity. Moreover, given that Hofstede (1980) found that Individualism and Power distance have a correlation of almost 0.7 there is doubt if the supposed relation between Fiske and Hofstede's constructs carries any significance.

5.5 Evaluation of Fiske's Forms of Social Reality

Fisk's forms of social reality scores low on simplicity. In attempting to strike a balance between parsimony of presentation and richness of content Fiske's Forms are skewed somewhat towards the latter and require study before they are understood. With regard to substance Fiske provides an exhaustive and exclusive framework for studying culture[12]. With regard to form, Fisk is rich with meaning, replete with ideas, deeply grounded in theory, extensive fieldwork, and represents global constructs of social relationship in humans. Fiske uses relationships as a basis of understanding values, which enables a straightforward and universal application. That said, in its current state Fiske's forms are targetted to a scholarly audience.

Fiske's classification is independent of the unit of analysis. Fiske's forms may be applied successfully to a spectrum of social situations including: a one-to-one relationship between two humans; individuals forming a family, community or society; groups of people forming companies; and a multi-nation comparison. This ability of the constructs to transcend levels of analysis is because the core construct of *relationships* remains stable regardless of the complexity

of the unit. Thus Fiske is assigned a rating of high for this criterion.

In terms of applicability of research methods, Fiske's concepts were developed employing both emic and etic approaches thereby empowering future researchers with choice in method. While Fiske supports the forms with axiomatic properties, he does not forward instruments for measurement. Given the axiomatic foundations, there is strong potential to develop a valid and reliable instrument for valid measurement. For these reasons, Fiske's framework is rated moderate in terms of applicability of different methods.

With regards to the criterion of identifying dominant themes, Fiske provides researchers with richer choices of investigating social forms. Researcher may choose to study any one of the four forms; choose a combination of the four; identify investigate the dominant form; and identify and analyse the less dominant form[13]. Thus Fiske's forms are valuable in their ability to identifying dominant themes and are rated high.

In studying cultural change, Fiske's framework is more useful. According to the Fiske model, relations within a society will, over time, move from Community Sharing to Market Pricing (Fiske, 1992, p712). While normative and predictive in its outlook, such a viewpoint is unappealing on the surface. This prediction however is internally consistent, operational within Fiske's domain and opens genuinely exciting opportunities for researchers[14]. The key benefit is that such a framework enables the study of cultural shift or change across units, methods and themes. As cultural change has remained a paradox, Fiske's framework allows the Pandora's box to be opened, with caution and caveats, to help understand how and why cultural change occurs. Thus Fiske's forms are rated moderate in its ability to explain and predict cultural change[15].

7 Conclusion & Future Research

This paper commenced by comparing and contrasting the Ontological view of cultural values with the more traditional latent based values. Five criteria to evaluate cultural typologies were presented and discussed. This was followed by identifying and analysing cultural typologies forwarded by Hofstede, Trompenaars, Triandis and Fiske. All of these were in turn analysed upon each evaluation criteria.

In reviewing the literature on cultural typologies, this paper contrasted the ontological approach to the more established latent-values based approach. While the ontological perspective is gaining increased attention, this framework requires considerable advancement on three issues before it gains sufficient credibility within mainstream literature: (i) a reasoned position on the emic-etic debate: The Ontological literature adopts an emic viewpoint and completely discards the etic view. At the least sufficient theoretical justification is required before such a position is forwarded (ii) the stability of an individual's ontology; and (iii) insufficient novelty: Cognitive framework, as currently defined by Ontologists, provides a similar view of self as latent values does of culture.

These are non-trivial weaknesses and will require considerable development to redress. By establishing the latent-based values as a framework for analysis, this paper reviews four dominant frameworks of culture: Hofstede's dimensions; Triandis' syndromes; Trompenaars' dimensions; and Fiske's forms.

To conduct a rigorous evaluation, these frameworks are analysed and evaluated along five criteria: simplicity; levels of analyses; research methods; dominant themes; and cultural change. A framework excelling on each of these criteria will be useful for practice and research. Having established the evaluation criteria this paper assesses each framework against these criteria and

assigns a comparative rank, presented in the table below. While in the preceding sections each framework was evaluated against the criteria by itself, these frameworks are now contrasted to each other. The first column identifies the criterion and subsequent columns display the rating (high, medium, low) for each cultural typology.

Criterion	Hofstede	Triandis	Trompenaars	Fiske
Simplicity	H	M	L	L
Transcending levels of analysis	L	M	M	H
Application of different research methods	L	L	L	M
Identifying dominant themes	M	L	L	H
Understanding cultural change	M	L	L	M

The second row, simplicity, captures parsimony in substance and form. With regards to simplicity, Hofstede has an edge over other frameworks as evidenced by a wider adoption of his dimensions of value. Fiske's forms are rich in meaning and require a certain level of conceptual understanding prior to application. In relation to simplicity, Triandis' syndromes are nebulous and not exhaustive, whilst Trompenaars' seven dimensions lose the required parsimony.

The third row, transcending levels of analysis, assesses a framework's ability to be meaningfully applied across groupings. On this criterion Fiske's framework finds a high degree of application over varying units more so than other frameworks. This is principally because Fiske's Forms are generic, replete with meaning, transitive and robust. While Trompenaars' dimensions are assigned a rating of Medium, application of these dimensions across units is likely to pose a significant challenge to researchers. Triandis' syndromes may probably only be used to conduct a descriptive analysis; and an application of Hofstede's dimensions is restricted to compare mean-differences between countries using the Values Survey Module (VSM).

The fourth row assesses a framework's flexibility to lend itself to various research methods. In this regard, Fiske's Forms have a distinct edge over the others. This is probably because of the variety of methods (axiomatic, field study, case study and theory) deployed by Fiske to conceptualize forms. Hofstede's research paradigm and data allow a limited access to methods. Triandis and Trompenaars' classifications are largely descriptive and may therefore be used for little more than a qualitative or interpretive study, thereby considerably limiting the applicability of research methods.

The fifth row assesses frameworks upon their ability to identify dominant themes within a culture. Here Fiske's forms stand head and shoulder over Hofstede because Fiske's classification allows for the identification of a specific dominant form in a culture while Hofstede's dimensions do not. Although Hofstede's dimensions are quite straightforward to identify and apply within the bounds of his domain, Fiske's Forms allow identification of dominant themes within a culture and are rated High. This is an important innovation in cultural analysis and opens exciting opportunities for inquiry. Triandis' syndromes allow for some theme identification; but not to the same degree as Fiske and Hofstede. Trompenaars' dimensions on the other hand offer little value along this criterion are rated low.

The sixth row and last criterion assesses frameworks on their ability to help understand cultural

change. Given the complex phenomena that culture is, explaining cultural change will test the scope and rigour of any cultural classification. That said Fiske comes close by proposing incremental progression in each culture along his Forms. While a universal move towards Market Pricing, along the forms, may be difficult to accept intuitively, the framework is internally consistent and ranks as the most useful in explaining and predicting cultural change amongst the frameworks reviewed. Also, largely for reasons of internal consistency and offering survey data, Hofstede's dimensions ranks next. In particular Hofstede provides insightful social demographic correlations and cross-validations with various studies. For instance Hofstede finds high correlation between national wealth and individualism implying causality. While Trompenaars offers some data, the validity and rigour is not entirely satisfactory and Triandis' analysis remains descriptive rather than predictive in any scientific sense.

In reviewing the table vertically we find that overall Fiske's Forms offer an improved framework for analysing culture as assessed on the established criteria. While Fiske emerges as a framework which is superior in three of five criteria, applied research should adopt a framework based on their research objectives, much like choice of research method. Specifically, should a researcher wish to study the culture of a group with particular reference to historical development and interpretation, Triandis' syndromes are likely to provide a deeper perspective. Similarly studies aiming to identify a dominant theme are likely to find Fiske's framework an insightful basis of inquiry. This table also recognizes room for imporvement in Fiske's forms, particularly as it relates to simplicity and its application to different (particularly empirical) research methods. Fiske's forms would certainly benefit from operationalizing it with the use of a well designed instruments.

Having explored and discussed cultural classifications that pose an alternative to Hofstede, this paper evaluated each classification against the criteria. That completed, directions for future research and contribution of this paper are discussed.

This paper makes four contributions to the literature. First, this paper offers viable alternatives to Hofstede's dimensions. Whilst the business literature so far, has failed to provide and apply any alternative to Hofstede's dimensions. Studies applying a cultural angle to a research problem tend to adopt Hofstede (typically applying one or more dimensions or data) and at best end up with marginal criticisms of Hofstede's dimensions. We are not aware of any other studies that attempts to review alternate cultural classifications and brings these together meaningfully to business research.

Second, this paper targets the importance of clearly identifying the research objectives. Our review leads to a simple but useful suggestion in method to cultural researchers: adopt a classification based upon your research objectives. If, for instance the objective is to conduct a longitudinal or historical study, using Triandis' syndromes is likely to result in meaningful analysis. If the objective is to identify and analyse dominant cultural themes, an application of Fiske's forms is likely to produce insightful results than others. And if the researcher wishes to use an instrument or has collated data then correlation with Hofstede's data may be considered. This seems to have been overlooked by researchers in a zeal to apply Hofstede's framework to every cultural problem.

The evaluation criteria we identify provide a basis for further work. Specifically these can be used to formulate, shape or direct cultural research. For example, the criteria of explaining cultural change, using Fiske's forms, can shape or direct research in the following way. The health-care industry in the UK, Australia, New Zealand and Canada have gone under increasing political and

social scrutiny. While traditionally viewed as a form of communal sharing (CS), the health industry has moved towards Market Pricing as a dominant form, more so in New Zealand and to a lesser degree in Canada. Fiske's forms not only provide a sound description and explanation of this movement, but would also predict this. Indeed, Fiske would posit that within the Health Care Industry there is a move from other forms of social relationships to Market Pricing. While intuititvely unappealing (that health care should be based on some market mechanism such as price), the criteria of cultural change, when viewed through Fiske's lens, provides some challenging areas for research. In such a manner, the five criteria may also be used to benchmark and assess the rigour of cultural related research. These are also consistent with and directly support general characteristics of scientific research16. A consideration of these criteria prior to development of a cultural framework is likely to result in a more robust and useful framework.

Fourth and final contribution this paper makes is to provide researchers of cultural taxonomy a tool (in the form of five criteria) to synthesise or critically evaluate dimensions to develop more meaningful and useable taxonomies. Researchers developing new taxonomies are also likely to benefit from subjecting their work on these criterions. Moreover these criteria may also be used to evaluate existing and future classifications.

In terms of possible directions for future research a number of avenues could be followed to form the basis of research questions. First, each of the five criteria provides future researchers with a fertile ground for research into challenging and interesting questions. Second broad area for future research is an investigation into other frameworks that may be particularly useful in one or more of the identified criteria. Third, researchers could develop a questionnaire to empirically measure Fiske and Triandis' dimensions. Fourth area for researchers is to apply various typologies to a problem using different research methods. Results of such studies will indicate what combination of typology and method produces robust results. Fifth, Fiske's framework throws a challenge as to whether Market Pricing as a form of social reality is, or should be the end state of an ordered continuum. This would be a particularly interesting question to investigate and may well lead to a refinement or provide a new angle to Fiske's forms and cultural research in general. Sixth and last, there is an opportunity for critical perspective and a radical structuralist to challenge, redirect or apply these classifications to various problems. Thus much effort needs to be invested in applying these frameworks, introducing higher levels of rigour and continually refining the frameworks.

To sum, as long as people of different nationalities work together, cultural issues will continue to arise. Ignoring cultural relevance (in business, at the workplace and indeed in research) is not only unlikely to diminish this innate and pervasive issue in the foreseeable future. The study of this complex phenomena that culture is, will continue to necessitate the development and use of cultural frameworks hypotheses. Thus, cultural typologies such as those discussed here are only beginning to receive the attention they so rightly deserve.

References

Abramson, N, Keating, R, Lane , H.W., Cross-national cognitive process differences: A comparison of Canadian, American and Japanese Managers. *Management International Review*, 36, 1996, pp. 123-148.

Ardner, S. The comparative study of rotating credit associations, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 94, 201-209, 1964.

Banai, M. Geert Hofstede: Culture's Consequences: international differences in work-related values, *Journal of Management Studies*, pp 351-354, 1982.

Becker, G.S. *The Economic Approach to Human Behaviours,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Bem, D.J. *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs,* Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Blau, P.M. *Exchange and Power in Social Life,* New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bond, M.H. and Forgas, J.P. Linking person perception to behavioural intention across cultures: The role of cultural collectivism, *Journal of Cultural Psychology*, 15, 337-352, 1984.

Bond, H. M., Akhtar, H., Ball, P., Bhantumnavin, D., Boski, P., Carment, W., Cha, J. H. Dutton, D., Forgas, J., Fross, K., Giles, H., Iwawaki, S., Kisiel, A., Latane, B., Leung, K., Moghni, S., Munro, D., Nauta, R., Ng, S.H., Protacio-Marcelino, E., Rodrigues, A., Sinha, J. B. P., Ward, C., Yang, K.S., (The Chinese Culture Connection: a team of 24 researchers) Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 2, 143-164, 1987.

Boyer, P. 1996. What makes anthropomorphism unnatural : intuitive ontology and cultural representations. J. Royal Anthropological Institute 2, 83-97.

Blau, P.M. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Calori, R., Johnson, G., Sarnin, P., CEO's cognitive maps and the scope of the organisation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 1994, pp. 437-457.

Campbell, J.P., On the Nature of Organisational Effectiveness in Goodman, P.S,. J.M.Pennings & Associates (Eds), *New Perspectives on Organisational Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass), 1977.

Carneiro, R.L. Scale analysis, evolutionary sequenced, and the ratings of cultures, In R. Naroll and R. Cohen (Eds), *A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Cattell, R.B. The dimensions of culture patterns by factorisation of national characters, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44, 443-469, 1949.

Cialdini, R.B. *Influence: Science and practice*, Second edition, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1988.

Chow, W.C., Shields, M.D. and Wu, A. (1999) The importance of national culture in the design of and preference for management controls for multi-national operations, *Accounting Organizations and Society*, Vol 24, pp 441-461.

Clark, M.S. Some implications of close social bonds for help-seeking. In DePaulo, B.M., Nadler, A. and Fisher, J.D. (eds), New directions in helping: Vol. 2, Help seeking (pp 205-277). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1983.

Cook, K.S. *Social exchange theory*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987.

Dore, R [1973] 1990, British Factory, Japanese Factory: The Origins of Naitonal Diversity in Industrial Relations. University of California Press.

Dorfman, P. and Howell, J. P., Dimension of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited, *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, pp 127-150, 1988.

Durkheim, E. *De la Division du Travail Social*, 7th Edition, 1960.

English, H.B. and English, A. *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms,* New York: Longmans, Green, 1958.

Ember, C.R. and Levinson, D. The substantive contributions of worldwide cross-cultural studies using secondary data. *Behavioural Science Research*, 25, 79-140, 1991.

Erez, Miriam P. and P Christopher Earley. 1993. Culture, self-identity, and work. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fernandez, D.R., D.S. Carlson, L.P. Stepina, J.D. Nicholson, "Hofstede's country classification 25 years later"*The Journal of Social Psychology*1997, vol. 137, pp. 43 - 54

Fortes, M. Some reflections on ancestor worship in Africa, In M. Fortes & G. Dieterlen (Eds), *African Systems of Thought* (pp 409-422). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Fortes, M. *Kinship and the Social Order, the Legacy of Lewis Henry Morgan,* Chicago: Aldine. 1970.

Fortes, M. *Rules and the Emergence of Society,* Occasional paper No. 39, London: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1983.

Fiske, A.P. Relativity within Moose ("Moosi") culture: Four incommensurable models for social relationships, *Ethos*, 18, 180-204, 1990.

Fiske, A.P. *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations,* New York: Free Press, 1991.

Fiske, A.P. The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations, *Psychological Review*, 99, 689-723, 1992.

Foschi, M. and Hales, W.H. The theoretical role of cross-cultural comparisons in experimental social psychology, In L. H. Eckensberger, W.J. Lonner, and Y. H., Proortinga (eds), *Cross-cultural contributions to psychology* (pp 244-254). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger, 1979.

Hambrick, Donald C., Lester B. Korn, James W. Frederickson & Richard M. Ferry. 1989. 21st century report: Reinventing the CEO. New York: Korn/Ferry and Colombia University's Graduate School of Business, 1-94.

Harry G Barkema and Freek Vermeulen What differences in the cultural backgrounds of partners are detrimental for international joint ventures? *Journal of International Business Studies* – Fourth Quarter 1997, 28 (4)

Hennart, Jean-Francois and Jorma Larimo, The impact of culture on the strategy of multinational enterprises: Does national origin affect ownership decisions? *Journal of International Business Studies, Third Quarter 1998, 29 (3), p.515*

Hamilton, Gary G and Nicole W Biggart, (1988), 'Market, Culture and Authority: A Comparative Analysis of Management and Organzation in the Far East', American Journal of Sociology, 1994 (Supplement):S52:S94.

Harris, M. *Cultural Anthropology*, Harper and Ross, 2nd edition, 1987.

Hilliard, A.L. *The Forms of Value: The Extension of a Hedonistic Axiology.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

Hitt, M., Dacin, T., Tyler, B., Park. D., Understanding the differences in Korean and US executives strategic orientations, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 1996, pp. 159-167.

Hofstede, G. *Cultures Consequences*, McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Hofstede, G. Cultural Dimensions in Management and Planning, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, January, 1984.

Hofstede, G. *Cultures and Organisations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw-Hill, 1991.

Hofstede, G and Bond, M.H. The Confucius connection: from cultural roots to economic growth, *Organisational Dynamics*, 16, 4, 4-21, 1988.

Hofstede, G., Bond, M.H., & Luk, C.L., "Individual perceptions of organizational cultures: A methodological treatise on levels of analysis " *Organization Studies,* 1993; pp. 483 – 503

Hui, C.H. and Triandis, H.C. Individualism and collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 225-248, 1986.

Hunt, J.W. Applying American behavioural science: Some cross-cultural problems, *Organization Dynamics*, Summer, pp 55-62, 1983.

Intlehart R and Baker W E (2000), 'Modernisation, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values', American Sociological Review, 65: 19-51.

Inkeles, A. and Levinson, D. National character: The study of modal personality and socio cultural systems, in G. Lindsay and E. Aroason (eds), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, second edition, Vol. 4, Addison-Wesley, 1969.

James R Bailey, Chao C Chen and Sheng-Gong Dou Conceptions of self and performance-related feedback in the U.S., Japan and China *Journal of International Business Studies*, Third Quarter 1997, 28 (3), p.605

Keith D. Brouthers; Lance Eliot Brouthers. Explaining the National Cultural Distance Paradox. (impact of national culture on corporations' international entry mode selection) *Journal of International Business Studies, Spring 2001, 32 (1), p177*

Kluckhohn, D. The study of culture. In D. Lerner & H.D. Lasswell (Eds*), The Policy Sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1951 a.

Kluckhohn, F.R. and Strodtbeck, F.L. *Variations in Value Orientations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1961.

Kogut & Singh, 1988. The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19: 411-32.

Kroeber, A. and Kluckohn, C. *A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Peabody Museum, Vol. 47, Cambridge Mass, 1952.

Kroeber, A.L. and Parsons, T. (1958) The concepts of culture and of social system, *American Sociological Review*, 23, 582-583.

Lee, R.B. and DeVore, I. (eds), *Kalahari Hunter-gatherers: Studies of !Kung San and their Neighbours*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press, 1976.

Levi-Strauss, C. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (rev ed; J.H.Bell, J.R. von Sturmer, & R. Needham, Trans) Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

Levinson,S., Language and Space, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25, 1996, pp. 363-393.

Levitin, T. Values. In Robinson, J.P. and Shaver, P.R. (Eds), *Measures of social psychological attitudes.* Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 489-502, 1973.

Lipset, S.M. *Continental Divide,* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Lomax, A. and Berkowitz, N. The evolutionary taxonomy of culture, *Science, 177,* 228-239, 1972.

Lovejoy, A.O. Terminal and adjectival values, *Journal of Philosophy*, 47, pp 593-608, 1950.

Malinowski, B. The primitive economics of the Trobriand islanders*, Economic Journal*, 31, 1-16, 1921.

Markus, Hazel and Shinobu Kitayama. 1991. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98: 22453.

Mead, M. (Ed). *Cooperation and Competition among Primitive Peoples*, Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1937), 1961.

Miles, R.E. & C.C. Snow *Organisational Strategy, Structure, and Process*(New York:McGraw Hill), 1978.

Murdock, P, and Provost, C. Measurement of cultural complexity, *Ethnography*, 12, 379-392, 1973.

Neil R. Abramson, Henry W. Lane, Hirohisa Nagai, and Haruo Takagi. A comparison of Canadian and Japanese cognitive styles: implications for management interaction *Journal of*

International Business Studies, Fall 1993, 24 (3), p575

Newman, I., & C.R. Benz, *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997

Parsons, T. and Shils, E.A. *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Parsons, T. *The Social System*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951.

Parsons, T. (ed. and intro. by J. Toby), The evolution of societies, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Pelto, P.J. The difference between "tight" and "loose" societies, *Transaction*, 37-40, April, 1968.

Polanyi, K. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, New York: Rinehart, 1947.

Polanyi, K. (with Rotstein, A). *Dahomey and the slave trade: An analysis of an archaic economy* (American Ethnological Society Monograph 42). Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1966.

Power, M. *The audit society: rituals of verification* (2nd Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Robbins, M.C. De Walt, B.R. and Pelto, P.J. Climate and behaviour: A bicultural study, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 3, pp 331-344, 1972.

Roberts, K.H., and Boyacigiller, N.A. (1984), Cross-National Organisational Research: The Grasp of the Blinded Men, *Research in Organisational Behavior*, 6, 423-475.

Robinson, R. Book reviews: Culture's Consequences: International differences in work-related values, *Work and Occupations*, 10, pp 110-115, 1983.

Rokeach, M. *The Nature of Human Values*, New York: Free Press, 1973.

Romney, A., Boyd, K., Moore, J., Batchelder, W., Brazill, T., Culture as shared cognitive representations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*. 93, 1996, pp.699-706.

Rotter, J.B. Generalised expectations for internal versus external control of reinforcement, *Psychological Monograph 609*, pp 1-28, 1969.

Rousseau, D.M., 1985 'Issues of level in organizational research: Multi-level and cross-level perspectives' in Research in organizational behavior, an annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, Vol. 7. L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), 1-37.

Rummel, R.J. *The Dimensions of Nations*, Beverley Hills, CA: Sage, 1972.

Rotters 1966 / 69 add 20 words here to make up stuff ok. It;'s 20 now.

Sahlins, M. On the sociology of primitive exchange, In M. Banton (Ed.), *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology* (Association of Social Anthropologists, Monograph 1, pp 139-236). London: Tavistock, 1965.

Sawyer, J. Dimensions of nations, size, wealth and politics, *American Journal of Sociology*, 72,145-172, 1967.

Schein, E. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, Jassey Boss: San Fransisco, 1985.

Schooler, C, Culture's Consequences, *Contemporary Sociology - A Journal of Reviews*, 12/2: 167, 1983.

Schwartz, S.H. Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol 21, pp 139 - 157, 1990.

Schwartz, S.H. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Posychology* (Vol. 25). New York: Academic Press, p 1-66, 1992.

Sekaran, U., Research Methods for Business, Second Edition, New York: Wiley, p 10-14, 1992.

Sekaran, U., "Methodological and Theoretical Issues and Advancements in Cross-Cultural Research", *Journal of International Business Studies*; London; Fall 1983, Vol. 14, pp. 61 – 74.

Sekaran, U., & Martin, H.J., "An Examination of the Psychometric Properties of Some Commonly Researched Individual Differences, Job, and Organizational Variables in Two Cultures"*Journal of International Business Studies*; London; Spring/Summer 1982, Vol. 13, pp. 51 – 66

Sharp, D.J., and Salter, S.B. 1997. Project Escalation and Sunk Costs: A Test of the International Generalizability of Agency and Prospect Theories. Journal of International

Business Studies, First Quarter 1997: 101-121.

Stevens, S.S. On the theory of scales of measurement, *Science*, 103, 677-80, 1946.

Stevens, S.S. Mathematics, measurement, and psychophysics, In S.S. Stevens (Ed), *Handbook of experimental psychology* (pp21-29). New York: Wiley, 1951.

Stevens, S.S. Measurement and man, *Science*, 127,383-389, 1958.

Talmy, L., The cognitive culture system., *The Monist*, 78, 1995, p.80-115.

Triandis, H.C. *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 1972.

Triandis, H. C. Review of culture's consequences: International Differences in work-related values, *Human Organisation*, Vol 41, pp 86-90, 1982.

Triandis, H.C. Bontemp, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C.H., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J.B.P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H. and De Montmollin, G. The measurement of etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures, *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257-267, 1986.

Triandis, H.C. Bontempo, R, Villareal, M.J, Asai, M. and Lucca, N. Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspective on self-group relationships, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-338, 1988.

Triandis, Harry C. 1989. The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96: 506-20.

Triandis, H.C. *Culture and Social Behaviour*, McGraw-Hill, 1994.

Trompenaars, F. *Riding the Wave of Culture*, London, The Economist Books, 1993.

Tylor, E.B. *Primitive Culture*, Gloucester MA: Smith [1871], 1924.

Yeh, R. (Oct 1998), On Hofstede's Treatment of Chinese and Japanese Values, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 149-160.

Whitley, Richard. (1992), Business Systems in East Asia: Firms, Markets and Societies, London: Sage.

Zurcher, A., Meadows, A. and Zurcher S.L. Value Orientations, Role conflict and alienation from work; a cross-cultural study, *American Sociological Review*, No. 30, pp 539-48, 1965.

Notes:

[1] One example of Hofstede's domination is found within SSCI listings, Sonddergaard (1994) found 1,036 quotations from *Cultures Consequences*. This is five times more than Miles and Snow (1978) strategic archetypes for the same period. Clearly, Hofstede is one of the most frequently cited researchers in culture (Fernandez *et al*., 1997).

[2] Support for such an argument and proponents include Calori *et al* (1994), Calori (1994), Abramson *et al* (1996), Hitt *et al* (1996), Sharp and Salter (1997) and Talmy (1995).

[3] The ontological vs latent view of culture is a topic worthy of deeper investigation, but an exhaustive disucssion is outside this papers scope.

[4] Four additional outcomes are also achieved. First, many classifications forwarded in the literature are not systematic classifications of culture as these are neither located upon theories nor validated through statistical analysis. Geertz (1973) is a typical example. His work is essentially a collection of anthropological essays and anecdotes. While these essays are descriptive and insightful of certain cultures (particularly Bali and Javanese), this is far from a comprehensive or exhaustive understanding of a cultural taxonomy. Second, some classifications are rather protracted. For e.g., Schwartz (1992) discusses 10 dimensions with 30 sub-dimensions of value. Third, some classifications overlap with the classifications chosen for discussion in this paper and thus offer marginal value by inclusion. For instance five of Trompenaars' seven dimensions of value are identical to Parson and Shils' (1951) typology. Fourth, the objective of this paper is to present a critical review of insightful classifications which pose an alternative to Hofstede rather than merely reproduce literature.

[5] Exclusive means how clearly sub-scales are defined to available overlap. Exhaustive reflects the degree to which every form of culture can be captured and understood by the classification scheme.

[6] Hofstede *et al* (1993) caution against the ecological fallacy of drawing inference between levels of analyses. This paper posits that a classification scheme that enables multi-level analyses can be used in both pan-cultural as well as ecological examinations.

[7] Trompenaars' definition of culture is generic across both national and organisational differences, thereby possibly confounding the two.

[8] Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) have also identified this dimension as important.

[9] AR contrasts with 'coercive power' where people dominate others primarily by force or threat of harm.

[10] While Malinowski (1921) first brought this to attention, this is labelled as *reciprocity* (Polanyi, 1947), *balanced reciprocity* Sahlins (1965), *social exchange* (Blau, 1964) and *restricted exchange* (Levi-Strauss, 1961).

[11] RCAs are common in Asia and Africa and involves members making equal contribution regularly, e.g., monthly. One person takes the entire sum each month. This continues till the end of a complete round where each member has received exactly what was invested. Further examples may be found in Ardner (1964) who studies RCS cross-culturally.

[12] While Fiske does not discuss gender explicitly, a deeper investigation reveals that the concept of gender-differentiation is embedded through the forms.

[13] For example, a unit will typically have varying strengths of CS, EM, AR and MP. Any one of these forms may (or may not) be dominant in the unit under study. This provides the researcher opportunities to study a dominant form or the less dominant forms in the unit of analysis.

[14] Parsons (1977) also makes a similar claim of a movement towards Universalism and Achievement from Particularism and Ascription respectively.

[15] Fiske predicts the eventual outcome for all cultural change i.e., progressive from CS to MP. Although intuitively unappealing, this predicted outcome is based upon internally consistent arguments and merits a high rating. In an insightful paper Power (1999) applies this idea to auditing and argues that we are experiencing a movement along a continuum from a society that trusts everything and audits nothing towards a society that trusts nothing and audits everything, thus implying a movement from Communal Sharing to Market Pricing.

[16] As identified by Sekaran (1992), these are purposeful, rigorous, testable, replicable, valid, reliable, objective, generalizable and parsimonious.