Was the Grass Trampled When the Two Elephants Fought?
Measuring Societal Cultures: Project GLOBE vs. Hofstede

Gillian Warner-Søderholm
Senior University Lecturer
Department of Communication, Culture and Languages
BI Norwegian Business School
Oslo
Norway

Author's email: Gillian.warner.soderholm@bi.no
Tel: 00 47 46410697
Postal Address: BI Norwegian Business School, Nydalsveien 37, N-0442, Olso, Norway

Dr. Gillian Warner-Søderholm holds a Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) in Intercultural Management and Leadership (2010) and an Advanced Postgraduate Diploma in Management Consultancy (2009) from Henley Business School at Reading University. She is a full-time faculty member of the BI Norwegian Business School, where she holds the position of senior university lecturer and researcher, teaching on a number of programs in intercultural communication, international business, Scandinavian culture, study strategies, negotiations, and presentations. She also holds a Bachelor degree in Education and Administration and a Master's degree in English Literature. Gillian is from England and has lived and worked in Norway for 16 years.

Abstract

In quantitative-based research within the field of societal cultural studies, two of the foremost research teams, namely Hofstede (2001) and House et al. (2004), have held the limelight during the last half decade. During this period, numerous research journals have published critiques of these two approaches to quantifying cultural dimensions. These are critiques written either both 'camps' in a written battle, or are reviews written by other scholars who show a preference for either Hofstede or Project GLOBE's research. The title of this article refers to Smith's seminal paper (Smith, 2006) and, to an African proverb that states that when two elephants (two great forces) meet, the grass (the research environment) can be damaged. Hence, this article has two aims: Firstly, to offer a brief literature review of the research environment of cross-cultural studies. Secondly, to review this 'battlefield'.

Key words: cross-cultural studies, quantitative research, Hofstede, Project GLOBE.

Introduction

The exchange of opinions in academic journals about Hofstede (2001) and Project GLOBE (House et al., 2004) marks a new era in the development of cross-cultural research. In this paper, I firstly offer a literature review, within a historical perspective, of major cross-cultural studies carried out during the last five decades in order to map the research field. Secondly, I review the main critiques of both Hofstede's pioneering work and Project GLOBE's milestone cultural study (House et al., 2004) in order to consider to what degree the current debate has damaged or fortified this research field.

Predominant cross-cultural studies

Without the pioneering work within cultural studies of the following key scholars, and the subsequent discussions related to their empirical findings, there would have been little scholarly data to either critique or follow. Figure 1 below presents an overview of some predominant cross-cultural studies during the last 50 years, to set the scene for the debate between Hofstede and Project GLOBE's research.

Figure 1. Predominant cross cultural studies

Predominant cross-cultural frameworks 1952-2007

Researchers:	Predominant constructs	Major findings	Level of analysis	Key informants	Measurements
Parsons & Shils (1951)	Foundation laid for a socia-psychological theory of human behaviour	Culture is 'ways of orienting and acting' and 'embedded in meaningful symbols' and 'patterns of value orientation'	Qualitative: Individual and group	9 of America's foremost cultural scholars represented qualitative research papers	NA Ethnographic qualitative data
Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961)	Culture is society's / individual's solution to common human problems, our value orientation	5 value orientations: 1. Time orientation 2. Relationship to nature 3.Basic human nature 4.Activity orientation 5. Relationship to people	Qualitative and quantitative: Individual	US participants	Quantitative survey: hypothetical questions with 3 alternative answers which revealed value orientation 5 value dimensions
Hall (1959)	Patterns of communication	1. High vs. Low context 2. Proxemics 3. Polychronic vs. Monochonic	Qualitative: Individual and group	NA Ethnographic study of cultures	1. High vs. Low context 2. Proxemics 3. Polychronic vs. Monochonic
Haire et al. (1966)	Cross-cultural leadership theory: first important study	Two poles: autocratic, directive styles of leadership vs. democratic, participatory	Qualitative and quantitative: Individual and group	3.600 managers in 14 countries	Construct: attitudes related to autocratic - directive to democratic-participatory showed 4 country clusters

Predominant cross cultural frameworks 1951-2008 (cont.)

Researchers	Predominant constructs	Major findings	Level of analysis	Key informants	Measurements
Rokeach (1968)	Culture is people's responses to two fundamental questions: 1. What do they want to pursue in life 2. How do they pursue these goals	36 individual values. Two poles: freedom vs. equality	Qualitative and Quantitative: Individual and group	US participants	Quantitative survey: Rokeach value survey (RVS): 2 x 18 values to define 2 value dimensions
Hofstede (1967/1980)	National culture is a component of our mental programming People carry mental programmes that are developed in the family in early childhood and re-inforced in schools and organizations	1. Individualism vs. collectivism 2. Power distance 3. Uncertainty avoidance 4. Masculinity vs. Femininity 5. Confusion dynamism 6. Indulgence vs. Restraint 7. Monumentalism vs. Self-effacement	Quantitative: group	88,000 IBM managers from 72 societies	Quantitative survey, 34 items
Geertz (1973)	Culture as a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols	Thick description theory	Qualitative: Individual and group	NA: Ethnographical research (Mostly South East Asia and North Africa)	NA Ethnographic research: field data
Denison (1984)	Related to 1) the level of participation in decision making, 2) consistency of values, 3) ability to adapt, 4) the existance of shared view of a company's mission	Empirical data to prove the existence of 4 key organizational cultural dimensions	Quantitative: group	43,747.00 work groups in 34 US firms, 25 different industries	4 dimensions of organizational culture: 1. Involvement 2. Consistency 3. Adaptability 4. Mission

Researchers	Predominant constructs	Major findings	Level of analysis	Key informants	Measurements
Kogut and Singh (1988)	Cultural distance: based on equating Hofstede's country scores	Effective Composite index: (to avoid common method variance)	Quantitative: group	As Hofstede, above	$CDj = \sum [(I\ ij - I\ iN)2 / V\ i] / 4, i=1$ Kogut and Singh's formula (Evans, 2007)
Schwartz (1992)	45 individual values And 7 cultural level dimensions: 1. Conservatism 2. intellectual autonomy 3. Affective autonomy 4. Egalitarian commitment 5. Mastery 6. Hierarchy 7. Harmony	Application of the Schwartz Value Survey: to study values rather than behaviour	Qualitative and quantitative: individual and group	35,000 teachers and students from 67 countries	Schwartz Value Survey: 7 cultural level dimensions: 1.Conservatism 2. Intellectual autonomy 3.Affective autonomy 4.Egalitarian commitment 5.Mastery 6.Hierarchy 7.Harmony
Schein (1992)	Cultures differentiated in 3 levels	3 levels of culture: Visible (superficial) Vales and beliefs Core assumptions (deepest level)	Qualitative: organisational	NA Study applying secondary literature and theoretical observation	Deeper cultural dimensions impact external adaptation issues and internal integration issues
Trompenaars (1996)	Culture is the way people solve problems related to 3 issues: 3. Ralationships 2. Time 3. Environment	7 cultural dimensions	Qualitative and quantitaive : group	46,000 managers from different countries and companies	Quantitative scales : 1.Universalism vs. Particularism 2.Individualism vs. Communitarianism 3.Neutral /Emotioanal 4.Inner-directed vs. Outer-directed 5.Specific vs. Diffuse 6.Achieved /Ascriptive based status 7.Attitudes to time

Researchers:	Predominant constructs	Major findings	Level of analysis	Key informants	Measurements
Harich & LaBahn (1997)	Cultural sensitivity: a customer's perception that the salesperson accommodates the customer's buying needs	3 dimensions of cultural sensitivty: 1. To establish friendship 2. To understand and appreciate culture 3. To show flexibility	Qalitative: individual Quantitative: firm	52 US and Mexican manufacturers, senior sales, marketing and distribution executives	One-dimesnional construct consisting of 4 items: International experience; country experienec; open-mindedness; adaptive business style
Inglehart et al. (2004)	Cultural change and its consequences: strong links between values and beliefs of mass publics and democracy	Two cultural dimensions dominate the global picture: 1) Traditional – secular-rational vales 2) Survival-self expression values	Qualitative and quantitative: group	85% of world's population in over 80 countries	World Values Survey designed to provide a comprehensive measurement of all areas of human concern from religion to politics, to economic and social life.
GLOBE project (House et al., 2004)	1) Assertiveness orientation 2) Gender egalitarianism 3) Institutional collectivism 4) Family collectivism 5) Power distance 6) Uncertainty avoidance 7) Future orientation 8) Performance orientation 9) Humane orientation	Global Leadership and Organisational Behavioural Effectiveness measures to compare societal and organisational cultures in 62 countries	Quantitative: group	17,370 respondents worldwide from 3 industries: telecommunications, finance and food processing in 62 societies	9 constructs measured in 2x2 ways: as prctices 'as is' and espoused values 'should be': Measurements taken 'within societies' and 'within organisations'

Parsons and Shils' work sought to lay a foundation for a socio-psychological theory of human behaviour. Patterns of value orientation were singled out as the most crucial cultural elements in the organization of systems of action. Culture was distinguished from other elements of action by the fact that it is intrinsically transmissible from one action system to another, from personality to personality by learning and from social system to social system by diffusion. This is because culture is constituted by 'ways of orienting and acting', these ways being 'embodied in meaningful symbols' (Parsons and Shils, 1952; Cardon, 2008).

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck define five common human problems for which nations collectively seek solutions. These value orientations are 'constructs' that are commonly shared within any community and therefore resemble a pattern of expected/agreed behaviour. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck suggest the following five basic types of problems to be solved by every society:

1) On what aspect of time should we primarily focus – past, present, or future?

2) What is the relationship between humanity and its natural environment – mastery, harmony, or submission?

3) How should individuals relate with others – hierarchically (lineal), as equals (collateral), or according to their individual merits?

4) What is the prime motivation for behaviour – to express oneself (being), to grow (being-in-becoming), or to achieve (doing)?

5) What is the human nature – good, bad (or evil), or a mixture?

Hall is most associated with qualitative research into cultures in terms of 1) high-context versus low-context communication patterns, 2) the theory of proxemics, and also 3) cultural values in terms of monochromic versus polychromic approaches to tasks (Hall, 1976). Hall claims that in a high-context culture most of the information to be communicated is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message (Brown and Levinson, 1987:3). Hall's seminal work continues to command interest both in undergraduate university study programmes and as a foundation for present cultural studies (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1993; Gesteland, 2008; Cardon, 2008).

Haire et al. specifically studied leadership, the role of the manager in his culture and motivation satisfaction among 3,600 managers. The focus of their work in 'In Managerial Thinking' was to adopt a behavioural approach in order to examine the values and attitudes that actually guide managerial actions and practices. Haire et al. focused on management attitudes in 14 countries: n attitudes related to autocratic – directive or democratic – participatory values.

Rokeach claimed that for most people life is not an aimless, mindless drift; their actions and activities are conscious or unconscious manifestations of their responses to two fundamental questions: 1) What do they want to pursue in life? and 2) How do they pursue these goals? He defines this dilemma as the choice we have between freedom and equality. In a survey presented in 1967, he suggested that 36 values are widely and perhaps universally held by human beings, and that they lead to the choice a society makes concerning whether to value freedom or equality (Rokeach, 1968). Values, according to Rokeach, are historically related, and deal with what is required or forbidden, what is judged to be good or bad, right or wrong. Thus in any given cultural group, values represent standards by which behaviour is evaluated and hence lead to the choice we make concerning whether to value freedom or equality in our specific society.

Hofstede: Perhaps the most influential classifications of cultural dimensions are those of Geert Hofstede. Over two decades have passed since the publication of *Culture's Consequences: International differences in work related values* (Hofstede, 1980), inspiring thousands of empirical studies (Kirkman et al., 2006). At first, four and later five main dimensions on which country cultures differ were revealed through theoretical reasoning and statistical analysis: Individualism-Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity vs. Femininity, and Long-Term Orientation vs. Short-Term Orientation. Similar to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's theories, Hofstede's claim is that these five dimensions of culture reflect basic problems that any society must cope with, but for which the solutions differ. In January 2008, a new survey instrument, the Values Survey Module 08, was introduced by Hofstede in collaboration with Geert Jan Hofstede, Michael Minkov, and Henk Vinken. This instrument will measure the original five dimensions plus an additional two: Indulgence vs. Constraint and Monumentalism vs. Self-Effacement.

Individualism-Collectivism: Where individualism is defined as 'a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and of their immediate families only', and collectivism 'is characterized by a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups, they expect their in-group to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it' (Hofstede, 1980, 45). *Power Distance* is defined as 'the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally' (Hofstede, 1980, 45). *Uncertainty Avoidance* is defined as 'the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviours' (Hofstede, 1980, 45). *Masculinity-Femininity*: Masculinity is defined as 'the extent to which the dominant values in society are "masculine" that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things, and not caring for others, the quality of life, or people' (Hofstede, 1980, 46). *Long-term Orientation* refers to future-oriented values such as persistence and thrift, whereas short-term orientation refers to past- and present-oriented values such as respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligation (Kirkman et al., 2006, 286). *Indulgence vs. Restraint:* The indulgence dimension stands for a society which allows relatively free gratification of some desires and feelings, especially those that have to do with leisure, merrymaking with friends, spending, consumption, and sex. Its opposite pole, Restraint, stands for a society which controls such gratification, and where people feel less able to enjoy their lives. *Monumentalism vs. Self-Effacement:* Monumentalism stands for a society which rewards people who are, metaphorically speaking, like monuments: proud and unchangeable. Its opposite pole stands for a society which rewards humility and flexibility.

Geertz has conducted extensive ethnographical research in South East Asia and North Africa. He proposed that culture is both a model of and a model for experience and this theme is a key point in many of his research papers (Ellison, 1975:637). As an anthropologist, he drew upon his own intensive fieldwork for empirical data. His work deals with topics such as religion, ideology, political order, and cultural analysis. In his ethnographic research he argues against locating culture 'in the minds and hearts of men' (Geertz, 1973:11). Geertz is perhaps best known for his application of the term 'thick description theory', where he states 'cultural analysis is (or should be) guessing at meanings, assessing the guesses, and drawing explanatory conclusions from the better guesses' (Ellison, 1975).

Denison assesses organizational culture among 6,671 work groups, in 34 US firms, from 25 industries. The study identified four dimensions of organizational culture: 1) *Involvement*: the level of participation by an organization's members in decision making), 2) *Consistency*: the extent to which beliefs, values, and expectations are held consensually by members, 3) *Adaptability*: the degree to which an organization has the ability to alter behaviour, structures, and systems to cope with environment change, and 4) *Mission*: the existence of a shared view of the organization's purpose (Holt, 2007).

Kogut and Singh developed a composite index of cultural distance based on Hofstede's country scores. Thus their work can also be defined as having a quantitative-based approach. The deviations along Hofstede's first four dimensions – Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism vs. Collectivism and Masculinity versus Femininity – are calculated. The index is represented algebraically as:

Figure 2. Kogut and Singh's formula (Evans, 2007)

$$CD_j = \sum_{i=1}^{4} [(I_{ij} - I_{iN})2 / V_i] / 4,$$

Thus 'CD*j*' above is the cultural difference of the country being studied compared to the US culture. Many studies have used the Kogut and Singh (1988) formula or an adapted version to test for the effect of, for example, cultural distance on an MNE's establishment mode choice (Agarwal, 1994; Barkema et al., 1996).

Schwartz has developed seven culture-level dimensions which he labeled 1) *Conservatism –* which represents a culture's emphasis on maintaining status quo and propriety; 2) *Intellectual Autonomy –* which refers to the extent to which people are free to independently pursue their own ideas and intellectual directions; 3) *Affective Autonomy –* referring to the extent to which people are free to pursue their affective desires; 4) *Egalitarian Commitment –* which refers to the extent to which people are inclined to voluntarily put aside selfish interests to promote the welfare of others; 5) *Mastery –* expressing the importance of getting ahead by being self-assertive; 6) *Hierarchy –* which denotes the extent to which it is legitimate to distribute power

and resources unequally; and 7) *Harmony* **–** which denotes the importance of fitting in harmoniously into the environment (Schwartz, 1994:112–115). Some texts may refer to three higher order continua: independence, openness to change, and self-enhancement, along with the following sub-dimensions: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security.

Schein specifically studies organizational culture rather than cross-national culture. Nevertheless, his theories are also applied in cross-cultural studies. He argues in his third edition of *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2006) that culture is pervasive and ultimately embraces everything that a group in concerned about and must deal with (Schein, 2006:2). He stresses that besides corporate culture, subcultures must also be considered, and thus he differentiates culture in three levels. The term 'level' refers to the degree to which a cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer: 1) The deepest level includes the basic assumptions, unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs which he defines as the essence of culture; 2) The middle level is characterized by the norms, values, and rules of behaviour that members of a culture use to distinguish members of a different culture 'espoused values'; and 3) The top level includes the artifacts, the visible organizational structures and processes that are superficial – what people can see, hear, and feel when one person encounters an unfamiliar culture (Schien, 2004).

Trompenaars, together with co-researcher Hampden-Turner, draws upon the work by Parsons and Shils (1952), Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), and Hall (1976), and defines the concept of culture as the way people solve problems, particularly related to relationships, time, and the external environment (Trompenaars, 1996). He suggests the following scales on which individual responses to problems are interpreted: *Universalism vs. Particularism*: Are rules universal in a society, or specific in terms of who you are? *Individualism vs. Collectivism*: Is your identity part of a group, or are your individual identity and success paramount? *Neutral vs. Emotional*: To what extent do you show feelings? *Inner-directed vs. outer-directed*: To what extent do you hope to dominate or live in harmony with your environment? *Specific vs. Diffuse*: Is your business relationship restricted to a specific contract, or does the friendship permeate your life? *Achievement-status vs. Ascriptive-based status*: Are you respected for your track record, or is status ascribed to you according to your gender, position, and family? *Attitudes to time, linear vs. Cyclical*: When time is perceived as a linear function vs. as a repetitive cycle.

Harich and LaBahn study cross-cultural performance within the fields of sales and marketing. In their seminal article 'Enhancing International Business Relationships: How Mexican distributors rate US Manufacturers' they state that for many manufacturers success in the international marketplace depends largely on how well they manage their relationships with retailers, distributors, and agents in foreign cultures. Trust, dependence, idiosyncratic investments, continuity, and cultural sensitivity are seen as key determinants to a successful cross-national business relationship (Gooderham et al., 2003:287).

Inglehart et al.'s (2004) ongoing research, the World Values Survey, focuses on cultural change and its consequences. These data show that there are strong links between the values and beliefs of mass publics and the presence or absence of democratic institutions, thus supporting the thesis that political culture plays a crucial role in the emergence and survival of democracy. Inglehart et al. propose that two cultural dimensions dominate the global picture: 1) *Traditional/Secular-rational (y axis)* and 2) *Survival/Self-expression values (x axis).* These two dimensions explain more than 70% of the national variance in a factor analysis of ten indicators. The Traditional/Secular-rational values dimension reflects the contrast between societies in which religion is very important and those where it is not. The values of Survival vs. Self-expression are linked to a society's transition from being industrial to being post-industrial, as unprecedented wealth accumulation in many industrialized nations means that survival is now taken for granted. Thus a central component of this emerging dimension involves the polarization between materialist and post-materialist values. Self-expression values, on the other hand, give high priority to environment protection, tolerance of diversity, and rising demands for participation in political and economic decision making.

Project GLOBE: A total of 170 social scientists and management scholars from 62 cultures representing all major regions of the world are engaged in this long-term programmatic series of inter-cultural studies. Data on both societal practices and societal values have been collected from over 17,300 respondents. *Power Distance* is defined as the degree to which members of an organization or society expect and agree that power should be stratified and concentrated at higher levels of an organization or government (House et al., 2004:12). Project GLOBE presents *Performance Orientation* as the degree to which a society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence (House et al., 2004:12). High-

scoring cultures tend to focus on achievement, the future, taking initiative, and job-related accomplishments. Low-scoring countries, on the other hand, tend to focus on tradition, family, affiliation, and social ties. Hence, social relationships are valued more than achieving is. *Future Orientation* is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying individual or collective gratification (House et al., 2004:12). *Gender Egalitarianism:* One of the most fundamental ways in which societies differ is the extent to which each prescribes and proscribes different roles for women and men (Hofstede, 1980:11). Some societies are more Gender Egalitarian and seek to minimize gender role differences (House et al., 1999). This research focuses on the degree to which women and men are represented in the workforce, hold positions of authority, and participate in child rearing and housework. *Assertiveness*: Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) discussed dominance as an element of assertiveness in relation to the nature of the relationship of individuals, groups, and societies with the outside world. Assertive societies will thus view relations in terms of dominance (House et al., 2004:12). *Individualism and Collectivism*: *Institutional Collectivism* takes the form of laws, social programs, or institutional practices that encourage collective behavior (House and Javidan, 2004). *In-group Collectivism* measures the degree to which members would prefer making decisions at the group level rather than at the individual level (Schneider and Barsoux, 2002). Further, In-Group Collectivist societies will submit to the will of the group in determining beliefs and behaviors (Adler, 2008). *Humane Orientation*: This is a dimension that, although unique to Project GLOBE's model of cross-cultural research, is grounded in the theory of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) Basic Human Nature and McClelland's (1985) concept of the affiliative motive (House and Javidan, 2004). Project GLOBE claims that there is a correlation between decreasing unhelpfulness and urbanization with increasing population density (House et al., 2004:563).Values such as altruism, benevolence, kindness, love, and generosity are salient motivating factors guiding people's behavior in societies characterized by a strong Humane Orientation. *Uncertainty Avoidance* is the extent to which members of an organization or society strive to avoid uncertainty by relying on established social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices. Hence, people in high uncertainty avoidance cultures actively seek to decrease the probability of unpredictable future events that could adversely affect the operation of an organization or society and to remedy the success of such adverse effects (House et al., 2004:13).

Possible limitations of Project GLOBE include the constraints it imposes upon any future research project in terms of time resources. Asking participants to answer a 116-item questionnaire may make getting a valid and sufficient response rate difficult. A more in-depth critique of Project GLOBE and of Hofstede's work will now be presented.

The current debate: a summary of the critique of the Project GLOBE study

Table 1 below offers a review of the critique of the Project GLOBE study and clarifies the corresponding response or discussions by the Project GLOBE team.

Table 1. Summary of the critique of Project GLOBE

Summary critique of Project GLOBE by:	The critique	Response / related discussions by Project GLOBE
Minkov and Blagoev (2011)	Globe has added only one validated new dimension: assertiveness norms. The remaining GLOBE dimensions are of a dubious nature. Their meaningfulness is unclear	The process through which the GLOBE questionnaire was developed has been clearly articulated and demonstrates a collaborative and internationally inclusive exercise in cross-cultural research. GLOBE comprises over 160 scholars from 64 societies. 145 of these are country co-investigators who have been directly involved in creating and facilitating the project. They commented on relevance, understandability, translatability and face validity of the items as they pertain to their societies (Javidan et al., 2006)
McCrae (2008)	The 'as is' practices variants are closer to stereotypes than objective reality	As above.
Hofstede (2006)	The GLOBE values measures have no necessary logical linkage with the prior measures of values used by for instance Schwartz (1994) or Inglehart et al. (2004).	Scales showed convergent and discriminant validity with respect to unobtrusive measures, archival data and other national surveys such as the world survey (Inglehart et al., 1998). All of this evidence attests to the construct validity of the scales (Gupta, Sully de Luque, and House, 2004).
Smith (2006)	The complexity demanded of analyses built upon nine dimensions (with 116 items) will defeat many research designs.	Hofstede's survey with only 34 items and four (five) dimensions is too simplistic and not sufficiently comprehensive (House et al., 2004).

Summary critique of Project GLOBE by:	The critique	Response / related discussions by Project GLOBE
Smith (2006)	At no point in the 818 pages did the GLOBE researchers (House et al., 2004) make plain whether they have aggregated the score for each individual survey item to the national level before the interrelations between items are explored.	Hanges and Dickson (2006) have now provided details of the rather more complex sequence of confirmatory analyses that were employed.
Peterson and Castro (2006)	House et al. followed the wrong scale development: They used individual level scales and aggregate (ILSA) rather than create aggregate scales approach (CSA) recommended by cross-cultural researchers.	The stated objectives for the GLOBE scales were constant with the CSA approach. House et al. believe that Peterson and Castro's statements about the individual-level nature of the GLOBE are based partly on a misreading of the GLOBE scale construction process (Javidan et al., 2006).
Graen (2006)	The GLOBE authors claim much cross-cultural ecological and construct validity for any meaningful practical recommendations to emerge.	The leadership and organizational culture scales demonstrated validity within a nomological network .All scales had reliability of .85 based on Cronbach alpha and correlation analysis. Additionally, the scales were tested for external validity using sources of information collected independently (Hanges and Dicksen, 2004).

Summary critique of Project GLOBE by:	The critique	Response / related discussions by Project GLOBE
Graen (2006)	The GLOBE questionnaires were developed through an insular process, without the collaboration of a larger group of heterogeneous scholars, thus the resulting constructs are not valid.	The process through which the GLOBE questionnaire was developed has been clearly articulated and demonstrates a collaborative and internationally inclusive exercise in cross-cultural research. GLOBE comprises over 160 scholars from 64 societies. 145 of these are country co-investigators who have been directly involved in creating and facilitating the project. They commented on relevance, understandability, translatability and face validity of the items as they pertain to their societies. The archival data served as a mechanism for construct validation of the culture dimension scales. In his work on leader-member relations, Graen provides no such evidence of his measure or construct validity.
Peterson (2006)	The book does an incomplete job of describing how several methodological issues central to cross-cultural research have been handled and description of the measurement-development is ambiguous.	Hanges and Dickson (2006) have now provided details of the rather more complex sequence of confirmatory analyses that were employed.
Graen (2006)	The GLOBE research is 'a large number of one-shot, self- report culturally biased survey studies'.	The GLOBE project used an extensive range of qualitative and quantitative analyses, including media analyses, individual and focus group interviews, archival data and unobtrusive measures in an integrative approach (House et al., 2004).
Graen(2006)	GLOBE used convenience sampling.	The sample is a selected sample; all industries were domestic organizations to ensure cross-cultural comparability. Middle managers were used in the sample because House et al. sought to query respondents who had experience both as a leader and as a follower (Hanges and Dicksen, 2004).

Summary critique of Project GLOBE by:	The critique	Response / related discussions by Project GLOBE
Graen (2006)	The GLOBE participants' responses were based on social desirability.	This is a gross misrepresentation of the instructions given to respondents. They were asked to indicate the way things are (Hanges and Dicksen, 2004).
Graen (2006)	Claims the labelling of the types of GLOBE leadership types was poor.	Graen misquoted the dimensions. Not 'types' – these are dimensions. Not 'Autocratic', as Graen incorrectly used, but 'Autonomous' and not 'shared' but 'participative and not defensive but 'self protective'. The incorrect labels provided by Graen reveal his own ethnocentric bias.
Graen (2006)	Inaccurate country clustering.	Graen's harsh criticism of the GLOBE clustering demonstrates a lack of knowledge generally about cluster analysis. The final GLOBE clustering labels were based on results from the GLOBE analysis and previous empirical studies as well as other factors such as common language, geography, religion and historical accounts.

The current debate: a summary of the critique of Hofstede's study

Table 2 below offers an overview of the critique of Hofstede's studies by key researchers in the field. Hofstede's responses or related discussions to the critique are also listed.

Table 2. Summary of the critique of the Hofstede's study

Critique of Hofstede by:	Critique	Response / related discussions by Hofstede
Warner-Søderholm (2010)	It is problematic in quantitative research to claim as Hofstede does that 'Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients are irrelevant'. He does not report internal reliability results nor does he detail the step-wise EFA and CFA procedures and detailed findings	Through a factor analytical treatment of country averages for his value measures, Hofstede identified three cultural dimensions, one of which he further split into two components […]The four dimensions can be related to basic anthropological societal issues (Hofstede et al., 2010)

Critique of Hofstede by:	Critique	Response / related discussions by Hofstede
GLOBE team (Javidan et al., 2006)	Hofstede's work is not action research based. Action research involves a spiral of steps including fact finding, planning, action steps, evaluation, amended plans and further action.	Nations may not be the best units for studying cultures but they are usually the only kind available […]. Surveys should not be the only way to measure cultural differences. […] The dimensions found are assumed to have centuries-old roots; only data, which remained stable across two subsequent surveys, were maintained (Hofstede, 2002:1356).
GLOBE team (Javidan et al., 2006)	Ambiguous psychometric instrument design process with unclear properties on established psychometric requirements Hofstede's work is US centred and old: his work is based on a consulting project that he and his European colleagues conducted for IBM in the 1960s.	Data have since been validated against all kinds of external measurements; recent replications show no loss of validity (Hofstede, 2002: 1356). The IBM project locally recruited company researchers with local degrees - they conducted the pilot interviews and contributed substantially to the questionnaires and the interpretation results (Hofstede, 2006:885).
Kirkman et al. (2006)	Hofstede's framework does not tell us what complementary cultural values exist beyond Hofstede's five dimensions and what individual attributes (e.g. cognitive) might be more proximate to employee feelings or actions than cultural values.	Additional items should be both conceptually and statistically independent of the five dimensions already defined, and they should be validated by significant correlations with conceptually related external measures; candidates are welcome to apply (Hofstede, 2002:1356).

Critique of Hofstede by:	Critique	Response / related discussions by Hofstede
Kirkman et al. (2006)	As models are developed using moderators as key contingency factors, both theory development and advice to practitioners becomes increasingly narrow.	The five dimensions in the Hofstede model have both an empirical base and a theoretical (or even philosophical) rationale. Supported (at least in the case of the first four) by a classic and fundamental review of the existing insights about 'national character' and 'model personality' half a century ago (Inkeles and Levinson, 1954). Their presence in the GLOBE material speaks in favour of the thoroughness and professionalism of the GLOBE project (Hofstede, 2006:898).
McSweeney (2002)	Extreme, singular theories such as Hofstede's model of national culture are profoundly problematic. His conflation and uni-level analysis precludes consideration of interplay between macroscopic and microscopic cultural levels between the cultural and the non-cultural (McSweeney, 2002: 113).	These should not be the only way to model culture (Hofstede, 2002:1356).
McSweeney (2002b)	Hofstede credits absolute causality to national cultures. Essentially he endorses national cultural determinism (McSweeney, 2002:92).	What was measured were differences between national cultures. Any set of functionally equivalent samples from national populations can supply information about such differences. The country scores obtained correlated highly with all kinds of other data, including results obtained from representative samples of entire national populations (Hofstede, 2002:1356).

Critique of Hofstede by:	Critique	Response / related discussions by Hofstede
McSweeney (2002)	Hofstede relies on notions of national cultural sharedness: those values are common to all individuals within a nation and he applies a statistical aggregation, which can be problematic. Kirkman et al. further this critique to note that they strongly encourage greater attention to such important methodological details to strengthen the robustness of research in this category.	The cross-national analysis developed its concepts from the database file (Hofstede, 2006: 885). The five dimensions in the Hofstede model have both an empirical base and a theoretical (or even philosophical) rationale.
McSweeney (2002)	Hofstede inconsistently relies on a statistical averaging of heterogeneous 'components'. Using a large number of respondents does not itself guarantee representativeness.	Hofstede claims that 'if a sample is homogenous with regard to the criteria under study, there is very little to gain in reliability over an absolute sample size of 50 (respondents per country). I could therefore have done my research on 40 (countries) x 50 (respondents per country) x2 (survey rounds) – or 4000 respondents in total' (Hofstede, 2002:1356).
McSweeney (2002)	Hofstede's principle data comes from respondents working for one multi-national company: IBM. Questions arise as to whether the data reflect an organizational culture rather than cross-national data.	This data have proven to show valid cross-cultural differences (Hofstede, 2001).
Sivakumper and Nakata (2001)	Hofstede's work ignores within-country heterogeneity.	This does not matter so long as respondents were non-representative in the same way across countries.
Schwartz (1994)	The survey Hofstede designed may not have contained all relevant questions for a societal cultural study as it was originally designed for an organizational study.	Large-scale studies published since the 1980s have sustained and amplified my conclusions.

As shown in the tables above, each study has inherent strengths and weaknesses, and neither can be considered as providing the best way to denote national culture. Nevertheless, competing to develop the most suitable measures has proven to be healthy for both parties. The debate has led to further improvement to both research projects: Hofstede et al. in 2008

launched a pilot study of a new value survey measurement – the VSM2008, which tests Hofstede's current five dimensions plus two new cultural constructs of *Indulgence vs. Restraint* and *Monumentalism vs. Self-Effacement*. In addition, the Project GLOBE team have now made their survey and SPSS syntax freely available to academics (GLOBE, 2009).

Concluding remarks: the research field today

This author's recent journal search shows that during the last five years, academic journals have published at least 61 articles on the impact of societal culture upon elements of business communication (Warner-Søderholm, 2010).. Since 2004, with the availability of Project GLOBE data, researchers have no longer been limited to using Hofstede's predictive model in such studies – they have had a choice. Nevertheless, the great majority of these researchers have continued to apply Hofstede's cultural dimensions rather Project GLOBE's. Even though the application of the Project GLOBE's data has been limited, it can be argued that the this dataset may be more up to date and may offer a more comprehensive predictive model of culture. Hofstede's 34 questionnaire items, on the other hand, can be seen to be more manageable, in terms of both data collection and data analyses compared to GLOBE's ambitious 116-item questionnaire. Furthermore, even though very little tradition exists for specifically documenting validity and reliability with Hofstede research, his reputation and referral to face and construct validity are generally accepted as sufficient for many reviewers. A way forward for new research projects could be to combine elements of both Hofstede and Project GLOBE's research and thus combine specific dimensions for specific projects.

Conclusions

The title of this article was taken from an African proverb which questions whether a fight between two forces can in fact hurt the environment they belong to. The title questions whether such conflict between Hofstede and Project GLOBE has damaged the current cross-cultural research field. On reflection, the launch of Project GLOBE's research almost a decade ago seems to have acted as a catalyst for change in cross-cultural research. As stated by Minkov (2011), the debate may not have been so fierce had the Project GLOBE authors not presented their dimensions as improvements to Hofstede's five-dimensional model. Indeed, critiques of both camps concur that Hofstede and Project GLOBE may even have both failed to universally measure what they thought they were measuring (Minkov 2011). Clearly, there is no quick fix to the challenges researchers meet in terms of measuring culture. Scholars who follow in the

footsteps of giants such as Hofstede and Project GLOBE must always bear in mind that when we ask ordinary respondents to describe their own societies or their 'ideal managers', respondents' minds interpret such questions very differently, depending on variables such as gender, background, culture, age, industry, etc. We know we are measuring important underlying values in every case, but what is being specifically measured can always be questioned.

To return to my original question, I would propose that the elephants have fought a noble battle, but it is now time to make peace. The grass was trampled in the debate following the launch of Project GLOBE. Nevertheless, the research field of cross-cultural studies today seems to be flourishing. In conclusion, we are indebted to all the scholars who have contributed to this cross-cultural debate – especially Hofstede and the Project GLOBE team, as they have helped to place cultural studies firmly upon the map of management research this century. Thus the field, even if somewhat trampled, has been fortified.

References

Brown, P. and Levinson S. C. (1987), *Sociolinguistic models of politeness: some universals in language usage,* Cambridge University Press, New York.

Barker, E. (1975), "Review of the nature of human values by Milton Rokeach". *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 26. 2, pp. 252–253.

Cardon, P. W. (2008), "A critique of Hall's contexting model". *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, Vol. 22 (4), pp. 399–428.

Denison, D. R. (1984), "Bringing Corporate Culture to the Bottom Line", *Organizational Dynamics*, 13, pp. 5–22.

Ellison, E. (1975), *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 4. No. 6, pp. 638–639.

Geertz, C. (1973), *The interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz.* Basic Books, New York.

Gesteland, R. (2008), *Cross-cultural business behaviour,* Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen.

GLOBE AUTHORS (2006), *Guidelines for the use of GLOBE culture and leadership scales* available at http://www.thunderbird.edu/index.htm (accessed 02.06. 2008)

Gooderham, P. and Nordhaug O. (2003), *International management. Cross boundary Challenges*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Graen, G. (2006), "In the eye of the beholder: cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE: a response viewed from the third culture-bonding model of cross-cultural Leadership", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, pp. 95–100.

Gupta, V., Sulley de Luque, M. and House, R.J. (2004), Multisource construct validity of GLOBE scales, In House, R.J., Hanges, P.J, Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. and Gupta, V. (Eds.). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: the GLOBE study of 62 Societies*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Haire, G., Ghiselli, E.E. and Porter L.W. (1966), *Managerial Thinking: an International Study,* John Wiley, New York.

Hall, E. T. (1959), *The Silent Language*, Doubleday, New York.

Hall, E. T. (1976), *Beyond culture*, Doubleday, New York.

Harich, K. and LaBahn D. (1998), "Enhancing International Business Relationships: A Focus on Customer Perceptions of Sales Person Performance Including Cultural Sensitivity", *Journal of Business Research*, (42), pp. 87–101.

Hanges, P. J. and Dickson M. W. (2006), "Agitation over aggregation: Clarifying the development of and the nature of the GLOBE scales", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, (5), pp. 522–536.

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International differences in work related values*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences*: *Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organisations across Nations. Sage,* Thousand Oaks, CA.

Hofstede, G. (2006), "What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds", *Journal of International Business Studies,* 37, pp. 882–896.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., and Minkov, M. (2010), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind,* McGraw Hill, New York.

Holt, G. (2007), organizational culture and performance: a survey in Norway and Pakistan. DBA thesis: Henley Management College. *Henley on Thames*, Brunel University.

House, R. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., and Gupta, V. (2004), *Culture, Leadership and Organisations: The Globe Study of 62 Societies,* Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.

Inglehart, R., Basáñez, M., Diez-Medrano, Halmal, I. and Luijkx, R. (Eds.). (2004*), Human beliefs and values: a cross-cultural sourcebook based on the 1999–2002 values surveys,* Siglo XXI, Mexico.

Javidan, M., House, R. J., Dorfman, P., Gupta, V., Hanges, P. J., and Sulley de Luque, M. (2004), Conclusions and future directions. In: House *et al.* (Eds.). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations*: *The GLOBE study of 62 Societies*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Javidan, M. *et al.* (2006), "Conceptualising and measuring cultures and their consequences: a comparative review of Globe's and Hofstede's approaches". *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, pp. 879–914.

Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., and Gibson C. (2006), "A quarter century of *Culture's Consequences*: a review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework", *Journal of International Business,* 37, pp. 285–320.

Kitay, J. (2002), "From prophets to profits: the occupational rhetoric of management consultants", *Human relations*. Vol. 60, (11), pp. 1613–1640.

Kluckhohn, F. and Strodtbeck, F. (1961), *Variations in Value Orientation*, Harper and Row, New York.

Kogut, B. and Singh, H. (1988), "The effect of National Culture on Choice of Entry Mode", *Journal of International Business Studies,* 19 (3), pp. 411–432.

McClelland, D. C. (1985), *Human Motivation*, Scott: Foreman, Glenview, IL.

McCrae, R. R. *et al.* (2008), "Interpreting GLOBE societal practices scales", *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 39, pp. 805–810.

McSweeney, B. (2002), "Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequence: a triumph of faith – a failure of analysis", *Human Relations,* 55(1), pp. 89–118.

McSweeney, B. (2002b), "The essentials of scholarship: A reply to Geert Hofstede", *Human Relations*, 55, pp. 1363–1372.

Miller, D. (2002), "Factors associated with workers inclination to participate in an employee involvement programme", *Group and Organizational Management*, 17, pp. 414–430.

Minkov, M. and Blagoev, V. (2011), "What do Project GLOBE's cultural dimensions reflect? An empirical perspective". *Asia Pacific Business Review*, pp. 1–17. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2010.496292 (accessed 20. 04. 2011)

Oyserman, D. (2002), "The lens of personhood: viewing the self and others in a multicultural society", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 65(5), pp. 993–1009.

Parsons, T. and Shils, E. (1951), *Toward a general theory of action*. New York, Harper and Row.

Peterson, M. F. and Castro, S. L. (2006), "Measurement metrics at aggregate levels of analysis: implications for organizational culture research and the GLOBE project". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, pp. 506–521.

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organisation and Change*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Schein. E. (1992), *Organisational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Schein, E. (2004), *Organizational culture and leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Schein, E. (2006), *Organizational culture and leadership*, (3rd ed) Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Schwartz, S. H. and Bilsky, W. (1990), "Toward a Theory of Universal Content and Structure values: Extensions and Cross-cultural Replications", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, pp. 878–891.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994), Cultural dimensions of values: towards an understanding of national differences, in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi and G. Yoon (Eds.) *Individualism and Collectivism: Theoretical and Methodological Issues,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA. pp. 85–119.

Schwartz et al. (1999), "Multi Method Probes of Basic Human Value" in J. Adamopoulos and Y. Kashima (Eds.), *Social Psychology and Cultural Context: Essays in honour of Harry Triandis,* Sage, Newbury Park, CA.

Sivakumar, K. and Nakata, C. (2001), "The stampede toward Hofstede's framework: avoiding the sample design pit in cross-cultural research", *Journal of International Business Studies*. 32 (3), pp. 555–574.

Smith, P. (2006), "When elephants fight, the grass gets trampled: the GLOBE and Hofstede projects", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, pp. 915–921.

Triandis, H. C. (1975), *The analysis of subjective culture*, John Wiley, New York.

Triandis, H. C. (2004), "The many dimensions of culture", *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, pp. 88–93.

Trompenaars F. and Hampden-Turner C. (1998), *Riding the waves of culture Understanding diversity in global business,* McGraw Hill, New York.

Warner-Søderholm, G. (2010), *Understanding Perceptions of Cultural and Intracultural Societal Practices and Values of Norwegian Managers*, Doctor of Business Administration thesis PowerGen Library, Henley Business School, University of Reading.