

Sebastian D. TOCAR
University „Al. I. Cuza”, Iasi, Romania

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOME CULTURAL DIMENSIONS SYSTEMS: A QUALITATIVE VALUE-BASED APPROACH

Case
Study

Keywords

Culture;
Intercultural;
Cultural dimension;
Value;
Content analysis

JEL Classification

Z13, Z19

Abstract

This paper presents a qualitative approach to the comparative analysis of the existing cultural dimensions systems. It selected three of the most appreciated cultural dimensions systems elaborated by Hofstede, Trompenaars and the GLOBE project. The characteristics of the cultural dimensions of each approach were subjected to a content analysis in order to identify the values captured by each dimension. The system of cultural values proposed by Milton Rokeach was established as the basis for coding peculiarities. The results of the analysis demonstrated conceptual similarities and differences among the above mentioned cultural dimensions systems, the level of their conceptual development and the extent to which they match the system of human values. These results allowed the author to identify the shortcomings of these cultural dimensions systems and the issues that require more attention in the context of intercultural research.

INTRODUCTION

The most successful and widespread way to approach the cultural factor is represented by the concept of cultural dimensions. The cultural dimensions approach derives from the idea that dimensions are based on cultural values which, representing stable cultural elements, shape the significant differences between specific cultural patterns of different groups (collectivities) and are the starting point for an intercultural research. Each dimension has two opposing poles, representing the extremities with peculiar characteristics, cultures being placed between these extremities.

Over time, several visions of the meaning, content and number of cultural dimensions have been proposed, starting with Geert Hofstede's system, and continuing with Fons Trompenaars, the GLOBE project, Shalom Schwartz etc. Hofstede's approach to culture has already become classic, being most often applied in intercultural research due to the concretization, transparent and relatively simple methodology, and effectiveness proven over time. The approaches proposed by Trompenaars and GLOBE are also very appreciated and cited in the scientific community, having many similarities with Hofstede model despite of the numerous differences. Highlighting the importance, popularity and proximity of the systems elaborated by Hofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE, Brendan McSweeney even calls them "the Trio" (McSweeney, 2015).

Since dimensions represent comparable aspects of cultures (Hofstede et al., 2012), and values represent stable elements of cultures, the aim of this paper is to analyze different approaches to cultural dimensions (elaborated by Hofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE) on the basis of the values they incorporate in order to identify conceptual proximities and differences, the level of their conceptual comprehensiveness and the extent to which they cover the system of human values.

In order to achieve this objective the author needed a standardized system of human values, the operation with an undefined list of values being inefficient and inappropriate in this case, though none of the studies analyzed operate with such a systematized value system. There are several studies that propose a systematized list of values, though most of them include already processed values that are represented by value profiles (Allport et al., 1960), types of problems to be solved by a society, which actually remind of cultural dimensions (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) or by some incomplete lists of values which cover more or less narrow fields of human action (e.g. Sarnoff, 1966, apud Ionescu and Toma, 2001). Rokeach (1973) managed to reduce several hundred values collected by a survey and a

literature review to a brief list of 36 values. Subsequently, he organized them into two separate categories depending on their nature and purpose: instrumental and terminal. The author considers this system the most complex, comprehensive and well-systematized (compared to the other identified from the specialty literature) and therefore the author applied it in his analysis.

Hofstede's system evolved from a number of four dimensions in the first edition of "Culture's consequences" (Power distance, Individualism vs. collectivism, Masculinity vs. femininity, Uncertainty avoidance) to six cultural dimensions in the most recent version of the study (Long-term orientation and Indulgence vs. restraint were added to the previous).

The studies developed by Trompenaars and the GLOBE project have some similarities to Hofstede's model, the differences emerging for methodological and improvement purposes. Hofstede criticizes these models, suggesting empirical and methodological arguments (although Hofstede's model is also often criticized). Nevertheless, the author recognizes that they are worth analyzing at least to make a comparison and to have a more complex view of the subject.

The author's contribution is reflected in the application of a qualitative value-based approach, which permits to provide a comparative analysis of cultural dimensions models from a new perspective, and in the provision of conclusions regarding the advantages and shortcomings of the analysed approaches, and the accents for eventual research in the field of cross-culturality.

A comparative analysis of the cultural dimensions models is provided by several studies from the specialty literature. These studies differ from the analysis of a narrow number of models (e.g. Warner-Soderholm, 2012) to the investigation of the principal cultural dimensions systems, including the approaches of Hofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE (e.g. Magnusson et al., 2008; McSweeney, 2015). However, none of the identified studies proposed a similar approach to the author's.

Further, the author will present his results for each of the three studies, accompanied and followed by comparative remarks and conclusions.

The paper proceeds as follows. The second section presents the methodology and data sources, while the further presents the results for each approach. The last section draws conclusions and discusses the limitations and the directions for future research.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling

The analysis was performed based on the studies relevant to the approaches of Hofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE. For the Hofstede model the author focused on “Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival” translated into Romanian, 2012 Edition (Hofstede et al., 2012); for the cultural dimensions proposed by Fons Trompenaars the author used the book “Riding the Waves of Culture. Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business”, second edition (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1997), and for the GLOBE dimensions – the article “Cultural Acumen for the Global Manager”, published by the leading GLOBE project researchers: Robert House and Mansour Javidan (Javidan and House, 2001).

Method

In order to identify the values specific to different approaches, the author performed a content analysis of the peculiar characteristics of each dimension presented in the above mentioned studies with an a priori coding of the groups of words.

To encode the selected features, the author used the Milton Rokeach value system, which includes two value categories: instrumental and terminal, each encompassing 18 values (subcategories).

Instrumental values include the following subcategories: ambition, broadmindedness, capability, cheerfulness, cleanliness, courage, forgiveness, helpfulness, honesty, imagination, independence, intelligence, logic, love, obedience, politeness, responsibility and self-control.

The category of terminal values incorporates: a comfortable life, an exciting life, a sense of accomplishment, a world at peace, a world of beauty, equality, family security, freedom, happiness, inner harmony, mature love, national security, pleasure, salvation, self-respect, social recognition, true friendship and wisdom (Rokeach, 1973).

RESULTS

Hofstede’s cultural dimensions

The author should mention that Hofstede’s dimensions are the most elaborated: their meaning is explained in details and examples, and their manifestation in the most different spheres of life is analyzed. As a result, the number of values identified for each cultural dimension was the highest for the model proposed by Geert Hofstede. The first dimension in Hofstede’s model is Power distance index (PDI). This construct evaluates the extent to which members of the group (collectivity)

accept and expect the power to be disproportionately distributed. Low levels of Power distance are associated with the instrumental value of capability (being competent, effective) and the terminal value equality (brotherhood, equal opportunities). On the opposite side, there are societies that prioritize values such as obedience (being dutiful, respectful) and helpfulness (working for the welfare of others) as tools for achieving their goals, and wisdom (a mature understanding of life) together with family security (caring for loved ones) as terminal values (Table 1).

The dimension of Individualism vs. collectivism (IDV) expresses the extent to which members of the community take care of their own person and of the close family (on the one extreme) or are integrated into strong groups that largely determine their priorities (on the other extreme). The author’s analysis suggests that individualist societies highlight values such as being independent (self-reliant), honest (sincere, truthful) and cheerful (lighthearted, joyful) as instruments, and self-respect, true friendship, and a sense of accomplishment as the proper aims (Table 2). This does not mean that collectivist societies do not cultivate these values, but it is not specific for collectivism to emphasize them, unlike values such as helpfulness (working for the welfare of others) and a world at peace (without war and conflict).

The next dimension (MAS) distinguishes between societies in which gender roles are strictly determined (masculinity) and those in which gender roles coincide (femininity). Masculinity is based on instrumental values such as being ambitious (hard-working, aspiring) and capable (competent, effective), and on terminal values such as an exciting life (active, stimulating life), social recognition (respect, admiration) and a sense of accomplishment (a lasting contribution). Feminine societies value the relationships between people, cultivating love (affection, tenderness), politeness (courtesy, manner), helpfulness (working for the welfare of others) and responsibility (dependability, reliability), together with the terminal values of equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity), a world at peace (without war or conflict) and a comfortable life (Table 3).

Uncertainty avoidance (UAI) is another cultural dimension identified by Hofstede. It quantifies the extent to which the members of society feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations. Groups with low Uncertainty highlight values such as self-control (restraint, self-discipline) and are more innovative due to the emphasis on imaginative (daring, creative) and broadminded (open-minded) values; these communities pay additional attention to a sense of accomplishment (sustainable contribution) and a comfortable life (a prosperous life) as terminal values (Table 4). Cultures with a high level of Uncertainty avoidance

have a necessity of predictability and highlight cleanliness (neatness, tidiness) as an instrumental value, while the need for security is reflected in the terminal values of family security and national security.

Long-term orientation vs. short-term orientation (LTO) is a dimension identified from The Chinese Value Survey and correlated with economic growth. This cultural dimension evaluates the extent to which societies cultivate values related to work for a future reward, or values related to past (tradition) and present. The values the author has identified confirm the description made by Hofstede: Short-term oriented cultures cultivate instrumental values such as being independent (self-reliant), capable (competent, effective), logical (consistent, rational) and helpful (working for the welfare of others), while the end-states of existence are represented by freedom (independence, free choice) and a sense of accomplishment (a lasting contribution). On the other hand, Long-term oriented cultures accentuate instrumental values such as being self-controlled (restrained, self-discipline), ambitious (hard-working, aspiring), obedient (dutiful, respectful) and terminal values of social recognition (respect, admiration) and true friendship (Table 5).

The last cultural dimension proposed by Geert Hofstede (actually it was identified by his collaborator, Michael Minkov) was called Indulgence vs. restraint (IND). It places the cultures between facilitating a relatively free satisfaction of aspirations related to joy and fun, and limiting (adjusting) this satisfaction by means of strict norms. According to the author's results, Indulgence is associated with cheerfulness (being lighthearted, joyful) as instrumental value, and freedom (independence, free choice), true friendship and happiness (contentedness) as terminal values. Restraint is based on self-control (restraint, self-discipline) and cleanliness (tidiness) on the one hand, and on national security on the other hand (Table 6).

GLOBE cultural dimensions

Unlike Fons Trompenaars, who affirms the originality of his study (the author must point out that indeed it is a particular approach), the members of the GLOBE project admit that they started from the Hofstede's research in order to make a better and expanded reproduction of it. This is the reason why the author will present the model of cultural dimensions proposed by the GLOBE project firstly.

However, Hofstede criticized the questionnaire applied by the members of the GLOBE project and from which the data for cultural dimensions were extracted, on the grounds that the questions were formulated in a scientific and incomprehensible language for the respondents (Hofstede et al.,

2012).

The GLOBE project study separates the theoretical and the practical aspect of cultural dimensions, i.e. values and practices; two sets of questions were developed for each dimension, and two sets of results were identified: the "as is" dimension and the "should be" dimension. As will be further demonstrated, the elements of certain GLOBE dimensions can be negatively correlated with each other, resulting in an opposite correlation of these elements with corresponding dimensions from Hofstede's study.

The authors kept two of Hofstede's dimensions unchanged (Power distance and Uncertainty avoidance), the others being divided or renamed (perhaps even reconsidered).

The Power distance is the first of the dimensions preserved without proper changes (conceptually, not methodologically) in the GLOBE study. For the high Power distance, the connection with the instrumental value of obedience (being dutiful, respectful) and the terminal value of social recognition (respect, admiration) has been identified, while the low Power distance could only be associated with equality (Table 7).

Geert Hofstede conducted an analysis of the correlation between his dimensions and the dimensions provided by the GLOBE project; the results of this analysis will help the author present a more comprehensive picture of the subject. Hofstede's analysis demonstrates that of 18 GLOBE dimensions (nine "as is" and nine "should be" dimensions) nine are significantly correlated with PDI. According to the outcomes, only the Power distance "as is" correlates (weakly) with the corresponding dimensions from Hofstede's research, while the Power distance "should be" does not show any correlation in this respect. However, both "as is" and "should be" Power distance have a stronger correlation with Uncertainty avoidance from Hofstede's model (Hofstede et al., 2012). At the conceptual level, the author's analysis has identified only two common values for the homonymous dimensions: equality and obedience (the author must take into account the fact that in Hofstede's study this dimension is associated with six values). Besides, no common value was identified with Hofstede's Uncertainty avoidance.

According to the author's results, the Uncertainty avoidance dimension of the GLOBE project is based only on instrumental values (Table 8). The high Uncertainty avoidance is based on values such as cleanliness (tidiness) and logic (consistent), and cultures with a low Uncertainty avoidance cultivate the value of broadmindedness (open-mindedness). In the case of this dimension, an ambiguous situation is observed: Uncertainty avoidance "as is" has a strong negative correlation with UAI from the Hofstede model, and Uncertainty avoidance

"should be" is correlated weakly positive with UAI. First of all, there is a strong positive correlation of the Uncertainty avoidance "should be" with PDI of Hofstede, although at the theoretical level they do not have common characteristics (and, respectively, common values) (Hofstede et al., 2012). For this dimension, the author identified two common values with UAI from the Hofstede study: clean for high UAI and broadminded for low UAI (Hofstede UAI is based on eight values).

Hofstede's IDV was divided into two separate dimensions: Institutional collectivism and In-group collectivism.

Institutional collectivism assesses the extent to which social institutions encourage individuals to integrate into groups at the level of organizations and society. The analysis of the characteristics of this dimension presented in Table 9 demonstrates the connection of Institutional individualism with the instrumental value of independence (being self-reliant) and the terminal value of freedom (independence, free choice), while Institutional collectivism is associated with help (working for the welfare of others).

As regards the connection with Hofstede's dimensions, Institutional collectivism "as is" correlates only with Uncertainty avoidance, and Institutional collectivism "should be" has a weak negative correlation with IDV and a stronger one with Uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede et al., 2012).

In-group collectivism differs from the previous dimension by estimating the degree of individuals' pride in membership in small groups (such as family, circle of close friends and organization). The societies with a high In-group collectivism highlight values such as helpfulness and family security (taking care of loved ones), and those with a low In-group collectivism underestimate these values (Table 10).

For the "as is" element of this dimension, Hofstede identified a strong positive correlation with Individualism vs. collectivism (IDV), a weaker correlation with PDI, and a negative correlation with the Indulgence vs. restraint (IND) dimension. On the other hand, In-group collectivism "should be" is negatively correlated with IND, and strongly negatively correlated with Long-term orientation (LTO). Generally, 10 out of 18 cultural dimensions developed by the GLOBE project are significantly correlated with Hofstede's IDV (Hofstede et al., 2012).

The content analysis shows that each of the GLOBE's collectivist dimensions shares two values with Hofstede's Individualism vs. collectivism: helpful and independent in the case of Institutional collectivism, and helpful together with family security in the case of In-group collectivism. The Masculinity vs. femininity dimension disappeared from the GLOBE model, being also divided into two dimensions: Assertiveness and

Gender differentiation (egalitarianism).

Assertiveness can be defined as the extent to which society encourages individuals to be strong, confrontational, assertive, and competitive. Societies with a high degree of Assertiveness emphasize the importance of courage (standing up for your beliefs) and ambition (being hard-working, aspiring) as instrumental values and of a sense of accomplishment (a sustainable contribution) as an ultimate goal of existence. Cultures characterized by low Assertiveness cultivate values such as love (being affectionate, tender), helpfulness (working for the welfare of others) and inner harmony (Table 11).

Assertiveness "as is" is the only dimension of the GLOBE model that is significantly correlated with Masculinity vs. femininity (MAS) from the Hofstede's study. The other element, called "should be", is negatively correlated with IND dimension (Hofstede et al., 2012). The content analysis identified four common values (more than for any other dimension) between Assertiveness and MAS: ambition, a sense of accomplishment, love and helpfulness, confirming Hofstede's view that this dimension had achieved the assertiveness aspect of the MAS (Hofstede et al., 2012).

Gender differentiation (egalitarianism) is the dimension that measures the extent to which society highlights differences in gender roles. The results of the content analysis allow the author to assert the existence of an explicit connection only with one value from Rokeach's list, i.e. equality (equal chances). Societies characterized by a low Gender differentiation (highly egalitarian) will cultivate equality, while in highly differentiated societies this value will be of little importance (Table 12). It should also be noted that equality is common to this dimension and Hofstede's MAS.

Both elements of this dimension are positively correlated with Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV), although the strongest correlation was identified between Egalitarianism "should be" and Indulgence vs. restraint (IND) from the Hofstede study. There is no correlation between this dimension and MAS (Hofstede et al., 2012).

Long-term orientation vs. short-term orientation (LTO) represents another Hofstede dimension which was revised, so that the GLOBE model includes Future orientation, defined as the extent to which society encourages future-oriented behavior (e.g. planning, future investments, etc.). The characteristics of the strong Future orientation presented in the GLOBE study highlight the instrumental value of self-control (restraint, self-discipline), while the weak Future orientation is associated with an emphasis on the terminal value of pleasure (an enjoyable leisurely life), as shown in Table 13. None of the elements of this dimension is significantly correlated with LTO, unlike other six elements out of a total of 18

proposed by GLOBE (though they are not relevant). However, the content analysis identified self-control as a common value to strong Future orientation (GLOBE) and Long-term orientation (Hofstede), which means that, at least conceptually, the members of the GLOBE project were inspired by the Hofstede's dimension.

The GLOBE's study introduces two brand new cultural dimensions which have not been encountered before: Performance orientation and Humane orientation. However, Hofstede considers that these were also inspired by certain characteristics of the Masculinity vs. femininity dimension (Hofstede et al., 2012).

The first of these dimensions, Performance orientation, aims to capture the extent to which society encourages performance improvement and excellence. High Performance orientation is based on the instrumental value ambition (being hard-working, aspiring), while low Performance orientation is associated with love (affectionate, tender), as it appears in Table 14. The "as is" element of this dimension is negatively correlated with Uncertainty avoidance from the Hofstede's study, and the "should be" element is positively correlated with Indulgence vs. restraint and strongly negatively correlated with LTO (Hofstede et al., 2012).

The content analysis demonstrates that Hofstede's MAS could possibly represent the starting point for elaborating this dimension, since strong Performance orientation and Masculinity have the common value of ambition, and weak Performance orientation together with Femininity have in common the value love.

The other cultural dimension, Humane orientation, quantifies the degree to which society encourages good, gentle, altruistic and generous behavior of individuals. The author identified a large number of values derived from the specific features of this dimension. Societies with a strong Humane orientation cultivate instrumental values such as love (being affectionate, tender), helpfulness (working for the welfare of others), politeness (being courteous, well-mannered) and obedience (dutiful, respectful), and terminal values such as inner harmony and equality). At the other extreme, cultures with a weak Humane orientation accentuate ambition (hard-working, aspiring), independence (self-reliant), and courage (standing up for your beliefs), aiming at a comfortable life (Table 15). Unfortunately, Hofstede's analysis did not identify any significant correlation of this dimension with any of his cultural dimensions, expressing his doubts regarding the significance of this GLOBE dimension (Hofstede et al., 2012).

The results of the content analysis highlighted the focus of Humane Orientation on the specific aspects of Feminism as an element of the MAS: loving, helpful, polite and equality are common

values to the GLOBE dimension and Hofstede's Femininity, while ambitious represent the basis of Masculinity and is associated and with a weak Humane orientation. Consequently, Performance orientation (PO) and Humane orientation (HO) seem to be closely related constructs reminding, at least conceptually, of the opposite views on Hofstede's MAS dimension, PO expressing an emphasized feature of Masculinity, while HO accentuates some Feminine characteristics.

Fundamental cultural dimensions proposed by Fons Trompenaars

Fons Trompenaars is also a renowned researcher, and numerous studies refer to the system he proposed (together with Hampden-Turner). Geert Hofstede reproaches him the fact that his dimensions are not based on empirical research, but are extracted from the American sociological studies of the middle of 20th century (Hofstede et al., 2012). However, it must be acknowledged that Hofstede's model is also often criticized. One of the shortcomings that is worth mentioning is the fact highlighted by the GLOBE project, namely that Hofstede's dimensions do not include a clear distinction between values and practices, which is "repaired" in the model proposed by GLOBE (Javidan and House, 2001). Although there are some shortcomings, there are also points of connection with other dimensional systems, as well as some original aspects that make Trompenaars' model conceptually and analytically attractive.

Trompenaars' vision is based on how members of different cultures approach specific problems (seen by the author as dilemmas) that come from three sources: relationships with others, attitudes to time and attitudes to the environment. The first five dimensions relate to the first source.

Universalism versus particularism is a dimension that distinguishes cultures which cultivate the conviction that every right and good thing is universally applicable, from those in which applicability is dependent on circumstances and relationship systems. The author's analysis of the characteristics of this dimension showed that Universalism is associated with instrumental value cleanliness (neatness, tidiness), while Particularism is founded on the values of love (affectionate, tender) and politeness (courteous, well-mannered), focusing on human relationships to the detriment of formal rules (Table 16).

As for Hofstede's Individualism vs. collectivism the author focused on Particularism (manifested in the fact that in collectivist societies the clients from the internal group are treated better, and the standards of values are different for internal and external groups) and Universalism (in individualist societies all clients are treated at the same level; values are the same for all) (Hofstede et al., 2012). However, the author did not identify any common

values for the two dimensions.

The dimension of Individualism versus communitarianism is very close (at least conceptually) to Hofstede's homonymous dimension and distinguishes cultures in which people self-define as individuals and individual interests are prioritized from those in which people self-define as members of a group and the interests of the group are primary. Trompenaars' Individualism emphasizes independence (self-reliance) and terminal values of freedom and a sense of accomplishment (Table 17). At the same time, Communitarianism emphasizes helping and obedience, together with the aim of family security (caring for loved ones).

Hofstede mentions the statistical analyses made in the last decade of the 20th century by Smith and Dugan, which extracted only two independent dimensions from the Trompenaars' model: the first one related to Individualism vs. collectivism and the second one correlated, first of all, with Power distance, and also with Individualism vs. collectivism (Hofstede et al., 2012). The content analysis confirms these results, Individualism versus communitarianism representing one of Trompenaars' dimensions that shares values with Hofstede's homonym at both extremes: independence and a sense of accomplishment for Individualism, and helpfulness and family security for Communitarianism. Regarding both "collectivist" dimensions of the GLOBE study, they share with Trompenaars' dimension the values mentioned above (except for a sense of accomplishment) with the addition of freedom.

Another dimension is called Neutral versus emotional (affective) because it places societies between two extremes: those in which interactions between individuals have an objective and emotionless nature, and those in which the expression of emotions is acceptable (and even encouraged). The author's results (Table 18) demonstrate the existence of an explicit relationship between neutral societies and self-control (restraint, self-discipline), as well as between affection and the value of honesty (being sincere, truthful). A connection with the value love (affectionate) did not result from the characteristics of the affective side despite the suggestive name of the dimension.

This dimension has common points with Hofstede's Indulgence vs. restraint: the author identified the instrumental value of self-control for both the Neutral and Restraint. On the other hand, both systems of cultural dimensions focus on the expression of emotions: Hofstede's dimension encourages the expression of positive emotions (cheerfulness) while Trompenaars' dimension refers to the expression of emotions in general, without inhibition (honesty).

The dimension called Specific versus diffuse refers

to the modality of approaching business: formal and contractual interactions are opposed to the interconnection between personal and business relationships. The characteristics of this dimension demonstrate that specific cultures highlight equality (equal opportunity), while diffuse societies discourage it (Table 19). Although other values of the Rokeach system could not be extracted with certainty, equality associates this dimension with Power distance from Hofstede's study (by some means in line with the results of Smith and Dugan's above-mentioned analysis) and with Humane orientation proposed by GLOBE (the author does not mention MAS and Gender egalitarianism, because in their case it is a specific kind of equality, though the author admits a possible connection with these constructs too).

In Hofstede's research the author identified high-context communication (characteristic of Collectivism) and low-context communication (peculiar to Individualism), also present in the Specific versus diffuse dimension. However, at the level of values the author has not identified common points in this respect.

Within the next dimension, Achievement versus ascription, societies are ranked according to the degree to which the individual is valued on the basis of his / her own achievements, or the status is attributed to him / her through birth, relationships or education. According to the author's results, this dimension is based only on terminal values: Achievement is associated with the value of a sense of accomplishment, and Ascription highlights social recognition (respect, admiration), regardless of achievements (Table 20). This dimension has common points with Hofstede's Long-term orientation, where a sense of accomplishment (short-term) is also opposed to social recognition (long-term).

The dimension of Attitudes to time is fundamentally different from the dimensions mentioned above, since it is unrelated to interpersonal relationships. In Trompenaars' vision, it has two expressions: Past / Present / Future orientation and the dichotomy Sequential versus synchronous time. If the first element does not require any explanation, Sequential versus synchronous time distinguishes between the perception of time as a vector, a line in which events occur consecutively, and the thought that time moves in a circle in which the past intertwines with the present and the future.

Regarding the first element, the author identified a connection between Past orientation and the value of obedience (being dutiful, respectful); cultures with Present orientation cultivate the value of pleasure (an enjoyable leisurely life), and those oriented towards the future highlight ambition (hard-working, aspiring) and imagination (daring, creative) instrumental values (Table 21). These

results have nothing in common with Long-term orientation from the Hofstede study, where obedience and ambition are situated at the same pole. Simultaneously, the value of pleasure is also identified in the weak Future orientation of the GLOBE project, which confirms the conceptual proximity of the two studies regarding the approach of time in an intercultural context. This is especially important because pleasure is one of the values that have not been identified in Hofstede's model.

The content analysis of the other expression of Attitudes to time showed that sequential societies emphasize logic (consistent, rational) and cleanliness (tidiness), respectively the synchronous ones will pay less attention to these values (Table 22).

The Attitude to the environment is another distinct dimension since it does not refer to interpersonal relationships nor to the concept of time. This dimension distinguishes between the belief that values and motivations come from within the person (Internal control), and the view that the world (environment) is much more powerful than individuals (External control). Internal control is associated with independence (self-reliance) and courage (standing up for your beliefs), and the characteristics of External control demonstrate the concentration on others (the value of helpfulness – working for the welfare of others) and the emphasis on terminal values of a world at peace (free of war and conflict) and inner harmony (Table 23). Among the characteristics of Hofstede's Masculinity vs. femininity the author observed the dichotomy "the environment must be defended" – "economic growth must continue" that provides a connection with Attitudes to the environment, wherein Trompenaars distinguishes between compromise and peace in relation with the environment, and domination over the environment. The content analysis partially confirms this connection, the values of helpful and a world at peace being common for both dimensions.

The GLOBE project provides several dimensions, which seem to have common points with the Attitudes to the environment. Humane orientation has four values in common with Trompenaars' dimension: independence, courage, helpfulness and inner harmony. The same values, except for independence, were also identified for the dimension of Assertiveness, while Institutional collectivism includes values of independence and helpfulness, which correlate Internal control with Individualism, and External control with Institutional collectivism. This situation could represent a consequence of an imperfect construction of the dimension and of its placement in an improper conceptual context and / or of the fact that several GLOBE dimensions are not very

precise and their characteristics overlap (respectively, specific values are repeated).

It should be mentioned that several of Trompenaars' dimensions seem to be based on cultural factors identified by the anthropologist Edward T. Hall several decades before Trompenaars' study. These factors include High-context versus Low-context culture and Monochronic versus Polychronic culture (in this case Trompenaars refers to Hall's study). If Hofstede admits the existence of high and low context, these being an implicit feature of the dimension Individualism vs. collectivism, Trompenaars attributes several characteristics of Hall's factors to some dimensions. The similarities between Trompenaars' and Hall's approaches require a separate examination.

CONCLUSIONS

The content analysis identified cultural values embedded in the dimensions proposed by some of the most well-known approaches in the field of intercultural studies.

The study elaborated by GLOBE is conceptually closer to Hofstede's approach than to Trompenaars'. The homonymous dimensions (Power distance and Uncertainty avoidance) have common values at both extremes, though GLOBE model is less specific in the description of the characteristics of the dimensions. GLOBE's collectivist dimensions also demonstrate a conceptual connection with Hofstede's IDV. Assertiveness has the most common values with Hofstede's MAS, which confirms the results of Hofstede's view that this dimension had achieved the assertiveness aspect of the MAS (Hofstede et al., 2012). Gender egalitarianism seems to highlight only a specific aspect of MAS reflected in the value of equality. The dimension of Future orientation was found to have a common value with LTO, though the other extreme is oriented on a different aspect of the perception of time, associated with Trompenaars' Present orientation. Performance orientation (PO) and Humane orientation (HO) seem to be closely related constructs reminding, at least conceptually, of the opposite views on Hofstede's MAS dimension, PO expressing an emphasized feature of Masculinity, while HO accentuates some Feminine characteristics.

The approach proposed by Trompenaars has important common features with both Hofstede's and GLOBE's models, which, however, highlight the differences between the last two. Despite the fact that Particularism and Universalism are mentioned by Hofstede as characteristics of the extremes of IDV, the author did not identify any common values for the two dimensions. Individualism versus communitarianism is the

closest dimension to Hofstede's, though, at the same time, it has more common values with each of the GLOBE's collectivist dimensions. The dimension of Neutral versus emotional (affective) has similar characteristics with a Hofstede's Indulgence vs. restraint dimension, while Specific versus Diffuse has a common value with Hofstede's Power distance and GLOBE's Humane orientation. Achievement versus ascription is surprisingly connected to Hofstede's Long-term orientation, where a sense of accomplishment (short-term) is also opposed to social recognition (long-term). The dimension of Attitudes to time have nothing in common with Long-term orientation from Hofstede's study; simultaneously, Present orientation is connected to weak Future orientation of the GLOBE project, which confirms the conceptual proximity of the two studies regarding the approach of time. The dimension of Attitudes to the environment has common values with Hofstede's MAS and several GLOBE dimensions (including Humane orientation and Assertiveness, which are also connected to MAS), which affirm a conceptual closeness of these dimensions.

Among the studies analyzed, Geert Hofstede's model appeared to be the most elaborate and outlined, and the most cultural values were also identified for the dimensions within this model. Respectively, if we could speak of a certain "degree of coverage" of the Rokeach value system by the cultural dimensions, this would be the highest in the case of Hofstede's approach.

According to the results of the analysis, the six cultural dimensions proposed by Geert and his collaborators cover 15 out of 18 instrumental values and 13 of the terminal values of the applied standardized list. This is followed by Trompenaars' model, which managed to capture 12 out of 18 instrumental values and eight out of 18 terminal values through seven dimensions. The GLOBE project's model has the lowest "coverage" because the nine dimensions proposed by its members incorporate 11 out of 18 instrumental values and eight out of 18 terminal values (Table 24).

In addition, Hofstede managed to capture several values omitted by Trompenaars and GLOBE, such as instrumental values of being capable, cheerful and responsible (capability, cheerfulness and responsibility), and terminal values of an exciting life, happiness, national security, self-respect, true friendship and wisdom. Both Hofstede's and Trompenaars' dimensions included the values of a world at peace, honest and imagination, which were not identified in the analysis of GLOBE dimensions. The values of a comfortable life and broadminded were captured by Hofstede and GLOBE, but could not be extracted from Trompenaars' study. On the other hand, Hofstede omits three values that appear in the other two

studies: inner harmony, pleasure and courage. These values are of a great interest because they are the only ones that are not considered in Hofstede's system, though they are included in the other models. It is important that inner harmony and courage represent different extremes of the same dimensions: Assertiveness and Humane orientation from the GLOBE project's model and Attitudes to the environment of Trompenaars' model. Inner harmony is associated with weak Assertiveness, strong Humane orientation and External control, while courage – with strong Assertiveness, weak Humane orientation and Internal control. The terminal value of pleasure was identified in the time-related dimensions of the studies of GLOBE and Trompenaars: in the model elaborated by GLOBE this corresponds to weak Future orientation, and in Trompenaars' system it is associated with Present orientation. Therefore, these cultural dimensions require extra attention because they include (at least conceptually) aspects that were not incorporated in Hofstede's dimensions.

None of the analyzed studies has explicitly presented in its dimensions the instrumental values of forgiveness and intelligence as well as the terminal values of a world of beauty, mature love and salvation. Respectively, these values present a great interest and require more attention in the context of intercultural research, as they were not captured in the conceptual systems represented by the most appreciated studies in the field.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The lack of access to the latest version of Trompenaars' book and to GLOBE's book "Culture, Leadership and Organizations" represents the main limitation of this research, which could possibly influence the number of values identified for these studies (the actual values could not be influenced, since the basic aspects of the approaches are stable). In future research it would be opportune to access the latest versions of the studies and to increase the number of analyzed approaches.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E. & Lindzey, G. (1960). Study of Values. A scale for Measuring the Dominant Interests in Personality. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [2] Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2012). *Culturișororganizații*. București: Humanitas.

- [3] Ionescu, G. & Toma, A. (2001). *Cultura organizațională și managementul tranziției ei*. București: Editura Economică.
- [4] Javidan, M., & House, R. J. (2001). Cultural acumen for the global manager. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(4), 289-305.
- [5] Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Oxford, England: Row, Peterson.
- [6] Magnusson, P., Wilson, R. T., Zdravkovic, S., Zhou, J. X., & Westjohn, S. A. (2008). Breaking through the cultural clutter: A comparative assessment of multiple cultural and institutional frameworks. *International Marketing Review*, 25(2), 183-201.
- [7] McSweeney, B. (2015). Hall, Hofstede, Huntington, Trompenaars, GLOBE: Common Foundations, Common Flaws. B. Y. Sanchez, & C. F. Bruhwiler, *Transculturalism and Business in the BRIC States: a handbook* (стр. 13-58). New York, USA: Routledge.
- [8] Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New-York: Thw Free Press.
- [9] Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the Waves of Culture. Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business* (изд. Second). London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- [10] Warner-Soderholm, G. (2012). Was the grass trampled when the two elephants fought? Measuring societal cultures: project GLOBE vs. Hofstede. *Journal of International Doctoral Research*, 1(1), 74-96.

APPENDICES

Table 1

Characteristic values for Power distance

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Low Power distance	High Power distance
Instrumental values	Capability	Obedience
		Helpfulness
Terminal values	Equality	Family security
		Wisdom

Table 2

Characteristic values for Individualism vs. collectivism

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Individualism	Collectivism
Instrumental values	Honesty	Helpfulness
	Independence	
	Cheerfulness	
Terminal values	A sense of accomplishment	A world at peace
	True friendship	Family security
	Self-respect	

Table 3

Characteristic values for Masculinity vs. femininity

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Masculinity	Femininity
Instrumental values	Ambition	Responsibility
	Capability	Helpfulness
		Love
		Politeness
Terminal values	Social recognition	A comfortable life
	An exciting life	Equality
	A sense of accomplishment	A world at peace

Table 4

Characteristic values for Uncertainty avoidance

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Low Uncertainty avoidance	High Uncertainty avoidance
Instrumental values	Self-control	Cleanliness
	Being imaginative	
	Broadmindedness	
Terminal values	A sense of accomplishment	National security
	A comfortable life	Family security

Table 5

Characteristic values for Long-term orientation vs. short-term orientation

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Short-term orientation	Long-term orientation
Instrumental values	Independence	Self-control
	Capability	Ambition
	Helpfulness	Obedience
	Logic	
Terminal values	Freedom	Social recognition
	A sense of accomplishment	True friendship

Table 6
Characteristic values for Indulgence vs. restraint

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Indulgence	Restrain
Instrumental values	Cheerfulness	Self-control
		Cleanliness
Terminal values	True friendship	National security
	Freedom	
	Happiness	

Table 7
Characteristic values for Power distance

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	High Power distance	Low Power distance
Instrumental values	Obedience	
Terminal values	Social recognition	Equality

Table 8
Characteristic values for Uncertainty avoidance

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	High Uncertainty avoidance	Low Uncertainty avoidance
Instrumental values	Cleanliness	Broadmindedness
	Logic	

Table 9
Characteristic values for Institutional collectivism

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Institutional individualism	Institutional Collectivism
Instrumental values	Independence	Helpfulness
Terminal values	Freedom	

Table 10
Characteristic values for In-group collectivism

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	High In-group collectivism	Low In-group collectivism
Instrumental values	Helpfulness	
Terminal values	Family security	

Table 11
Characteristic values for Assertiveness

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	High Assertiveness	Low Assertiveness
Instrumental values	Courage	Love
	Ambition	Helpfulness
Terminal values	A sense of accomplishment	Inner harmony

Table 12
Characteristic values for Gender differentiation (egalitarianism)

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	High Gender differentiation	Low Gender differentiation
Terminal values	- Equality	Equality

Table 13

Characteristic values for Future orientation

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Strong Future orientation	Weak Future orientation
Instrumental values	Self-control	
Terminal values		Pleasure

Table 14

Characteristic values for Performance orientation

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Strong Performance orientation	Weak Performance orientation
Instrumental values	Ambition	Love

Table 15

Characteristic values for Humane orientation

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Strong Humane orientation	Weak Humane orientation
Instrumental values	Love	Ambition
	Helpfulness	Independent
	Politeness	Courage
	Obedience	
Terminal values	Inner harmony	A comfortable life
	Equality	

Table 16

Characteristic values for Universalism versus particularism

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Universalism	Particularism
Instrumental values	Cleanliness	Love
		Politeness

Table 17

Characteristic values for Individualism versus communitarianism

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Individualism	Collectivism
Instrumental values	Independence	Helpfulness
		Obedience
		Family security
Terminal values	Freedom	
	A sense of accomplishment	

Table 18

Characteristic values for Neutral versus emotional (affective)

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Neutral	Affection
Instrumental values	Self-controlled	Honesty

Table 19

Characteristic values for Specific versus diffuse

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Specific	Diffuse
Terminal values	Equality	- Equality

Table 20

Characteristic values for Achievement versus ascription

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Achievement	Ascription
Terminal values	A sense of accomplishment	Social recognition

Table 21

Characteristic values for Past / Present / Future orientation

Set of values	Characteristic values		
	Past	Present	Future
Instrumental values	Obedience		Being imaginative/Creativity
			Ambition
Terminal values		Pleasure	

Table 22

Characteristic values for Sequential versus synchronous time

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Sequential	Synchronous
Instrumental values	Logic	
	Cleanliness	

Table 23

Characteristic values for Attitudes to the environment

Set of values	Characteristic values	
	Internal control	External control
Instrumental values	Independence	Helpfulness
	Courage	
Terminal values		A world at peace
		Inner harmony

Table 24

Value system proposed by Milton Rokeach in the studies of Hofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE project

Terminal values	Instrumental values
A comfortable life (a prosperous life)	Ambition (hard-work, aspiration)
An exciting life (a stimulating active life)	Broadmindedness (open-mindedness)
A sense of accomplishment (a lasting contribution)	Capability (being competent, effective)
A world at peace (free of war and conflict)	Cheerfulness (lighthearted, joyful)
A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)	Cleanliness (being neat, tidy)
Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)	Courage (standing up for your beliefs)
Family security (taking care of loved ones)	Forgiveness (willing to pardon others)
Freedom (independence, free choice)	Helpfulness (working for the welfare of others)
Happiness (contentedness)	Honesty (being sincere, truthful)
Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)	Being imaginative (daring, creative)
Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	Independence (self-reliant, self sufficient)
National security (protection from attack)	Intellectual ability (intelligent, reflective)
Pleasure (an enjoyable leisurely life)	Logic (consistent, rational)
Salvation (saved, eternal life)	Love (affectionate, tender)
Self-respect (self esteem)	Obedience (dutiful, respectful)
Social recognition (respect, admiration)	Politeness (courteous, well-mannered)
True friendship (close companionship)	Responsibility (dependable, reliable)
Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)	Self – control (restrained, self discipline)

Note. Elaborated by the author on the basis of Rokeach (1973)

Values that are identified in the studies of:

- Hofstede
- Trompenaars
- GLOBE
- Hofstede and Trompenaars
- Trompenaars and GLOBE
- Hofstede and GLOBE
- Hofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE