

## Some Theoretical Concepts of Culture

Ulrike Notarp

Currently, cultural and cross-cultural studies are very popular in the Social Sciences and International Management.

We distinguish four approaches to cross-cultural research: 1) **a positivist or dimensionalist view**, 2) **an interpretive or particularist view**, 3) **a post-modern view**, and 4) **a critical view** on culture and cultural differences, each having a particular scientific focus and interest (Romani, Primecz, Bell (2014)<sup>1</sup>).

In this seminar we follow the **'dimensionalist' approach**, which sees culture as a systematic whole. The main purpose of cultural studies is the recognition, description and (at least for some authors) the explanation of **cultural patterns** and **structures** in general. Empirical research does not only have the purpose of examining cultural specifics but is focused on the **identification of general basic structures**.

The members of a social community organize their thinking, feeling and (communicative) acting according to the **values** and norms the community considers to be essential. Research of whatever cultural issue – for example work-ethics or management-style in companies – always has the aim of **capturing the general value-background**, which is shared by, and obligatory to, the members of a community, and of describing it within the frame of cultural dimensions (cf. Gerhards, Hölscher 2006, Krawietz 2012, Vinken, Soeters, Ester 2004, House, Hanges, Javidan 2004).

In cross-cultural studies, most researchers assume that **culture** is a phenomenon that automatically appears as soon as human beings join into a social group or community. Cultural imprinting of the young members of a social group goes along with their socialization. **Basic values and attitudes** are internalized by individuals during their early childhood. Mostly they are unconsciously learned from the elder generation and unconsciously passed on to the next generation. A change of values and attitudes, internalized during the imprinting phase of socialization, is highly improbable in later life (Hofstede 2005, Inglehart, Welzel 2007).

The reoccurring question is one of **cultural change**. Although cultural change and development are directly observable in many societies, it seems to be impossible because – according to the thesis of socialization - children learn and reproduce the values of their parents.

Actually dimensionalists differ in their answers to the problem of *cultural change*. **Geert Hofstede** (2005, p. 13), for example, denies the possibility of cultural

---

1

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311943053\\_There\\_is\\_Nothing\\_so\\_Practical\\_as\\_Four\\_Good\\_Theories](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311943053_There_is_Nothing_so_Practical_as_Four_Good_Theories)

change and cultural development - at least concerning basic cultural values, which he assumes to be very stable and unchangeable.

**Ronald Inglehart** proposes cultural change even within basic cultural values. He explains cultural change by connecting it to the special conditions of life that every single generation is confronted with and has to adapt to (Inglehart 1989, 1990, Inglehart, Welzel 2007). His *socialization hypothesis* suggests that cultural change happens through, and goes along with, the gradual process of generational replacement. Younger generations modify the value-formation they get from their parents by adapting it to present conditions. Thereby causing change and development of the current value-set (cf. Inglehart, 1990, p. 68, Inglehart, Halman, Welzel 2004, p. 8, Inglehart, Welzel 2007, p. 98).

Furthermore, *modernization theorists*, like Inglehart, suggest that there is a systematic relationship between economic, cultural and political developments. Changes in the economy, culture and politics of a country always go together. They depend on each other, determine each other and never appear independently. This assumption is confirmed by the **World Values Surveys**<sup>2</sup> which were conducted in more than 80 countries (Inglehart, Halman, Welzel 2004, p. 6-20, Inglehart, Welzel 2007 p. 15-47).

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.worldvaluessurvey.org](http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org)

# The Concept of Cultural Dimensions by Geert Hofstede

summarized by Ulrike Notarp  
on the basis of

**Hofstede, Geert & Hofstede, Gerd J. (2005). Cultures and Organizations. Software of the mind. Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival.** New York. Mc Graw-Hill.

Geert Hofstede developed his concept of Cultural Dimensions in the 1970s on a broad empirical basis. He first published the results of his research, in 1980, in his book "Culture's Consequences". In his research, he was interested in the **cultural differences** between nations, as well as, within organizations. He tried to identify cultural differences by **comparing one culture to another**. With his concept of five cultural dimensions, he was able, not only to make cultural differences visible but also, to make them understandable.

In the 1970s Hofstede had the opportunity to evaluate the data of a survey among IBM employees from more than 50 nations, who had been asked about their wishes and preferences at their workplace. Through this, they were indirectly asked about their values and basic attitudes. According to Hofstede - the IBM employees were similar to each other in all social aspects concerning their work, their tasks and professional position. They differed only in their nationality. Therefore, national cultural differences appeared clearly in the data. A statistical analysis of the data revealed that people from different countries face similar social problems. Most respondents mentioned problems in the following areas (Hofstede 2005, p. 23):

1. **Social inequality**, including the relationship with authority (**Hierarchy**)
2. The **relationship between the individual and the group (Identity)**
3. Concepts of **masculinity and femininity**: the social and emotional implications of having been born a boy or a girl (**Gender**)
4. Ways of **dealing with uncertainty and ambiguity**, which turned out to be related to the control of aggression and the expression of emotions (**Uncertainty Avoidance**)

Although the basic social problems seemed to be the same for IBM respondents from the different countries, their ways of solving them was sometimes very different and culturally specific. In other words, people all over the world seem to face more or less the same social problems. Nevertheless, the solutions they offer to cope with them are sometimes very different.

Hofstede described **the four basic problem areas** found in the IBM data within the framework of the **cultural dimensions: 1) Hierarchy 2) Identity 3) Gender 4) Uncertainty Avoidance**. On the basis of later research, Hofstede added a fifth dimension - **5) Virtue** - the so called *Confucian dimension* - which contains values concerning our understanding of time.

In the early 1980s, Ronald Inglehart, coordinator of the World-Value-Survey (WVS), in an initial analysis of WVS, announced two main dimensions which he called **well-being versus survival** and **secular-rational versus traditional authority**. Michael Minkov, also examining the data from the WVS, extracted a

dimension he called **Indulgence versus Restraint (IVR)** that strongly correlates with the Inglehart dimensions. **Indulgence versus Restraint (IVR)** has been added as a sixth dimension to the Hofstede concept.

## **Culture as Mental Programming**

Every person carries within **patterns of thinking, feeling and potential acting** that were **learned** throughout their lifetime. Much of these **mental patterns** were acquired in early childhood because at that time a person is most susceptible to learning and assimilating.

Using the analogy of the way computers are programmed, we will call such mental patterns of thinking, feeling and acting, **mental programs** or **software of the mind**. The **sources** of one's mental programs lie within the social environment in which one grew up and collected one's life experiences. The programming starts within the family; it continues within the neighborhood, at school, in youth groups, at the workplace, and in the community. Mental programs vary as much as the social environment in which they were acquired. A customary term for such mental software is **culture**.

**Culture** is always a **collective phenomenon** because it is at least partly **shared with people who live or lived within the same social environment**. Culture consists of the unwritten rules of the social game. It is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one social group from the members of other groups. Culture is **learned not innate**. It derives from one's social environment rather than from one's genes.

Culture should be distinguished from human nature on one side and from an individual's personality on the other.

**Human nature** is what all human beings have in common: it represents the universal level in one's mental software and is inherited within one's genes. Using the computer analogy, it is the "operating system" that determines one's physical and basic psychological functioning.

Human nature is the human ability **to feel** fear, anger, love, joy, sadness, shame - the need to associate with others and to play and exercise. Human nature also means the ability **to observe** - to draw a distinction between me and the world around me - to establish an identity. And 'human' automatically means the ability **to communicate**. However, the way humans express basic emotions, how they observe their surroundings and how they communicate, is deeply affected and modified by culture.

The **personality** of an individual is his or her unique personal set of mental programs that needn't be shared with any other human being. It is based on traits that are partly inherited within the individual's genes and partly learned. *Learned* means modified by the collective programming (culture) as well as by unique personal experiences.

## Manifestations of Culture at Different Levels of Depth

**Symbols** are words, gestures, pictures, or objects that carry a particular meaning. Every culture or social community develops its own set of symbols by providing words, gestures, or pictures with a special meaning, only understood by the members of that given community. Words and jargon belong to this category, in the same way as dress, hair-styles, flags, and status symbols do. New symbols are easily developed and old ones disappear - every generation generates its own symbols, furthermore symbols from one cultural group are regularly copied by others, and this also applies across cultures. The relatively quick change of cultural symbols is the reason why Hofstede put them into the outermost (superficial) layer of culture (see Figure 1.2).

**Heroes** are people, alive or dead, real or imaginary, who possess characteristics that are highly prized in a culture and thus serve as models for behavior. Barbie, Batman, or Snoopy in the United States, Asterix in France, or Ollie B. Bommel (Mr. Bumble) in the Netherlands have all served as cultural heroes. In the digital age of the internet and television, outward appearances became more important than they were before in the choice of heroes.

**Rituals** are collective activities, technically superfluous to reaching desired ends, but considered as socially essential. Rituals are carried out for their own sake. Examples are *ways of greeting* and *paying respect to others*, as well as *social and religious ceremonies*. Business and political meetings, organized for seemingly rational reasons, often serve mainly ritual purposes, such as reinforcing group cohesion or allowing the leaders to assert themselves. Rituals include **discourse**, the way language is used in text and talk, in daily interaction, and in communicating beliefs.

Symbols, heroes, and rituals have been subsumed under the term **practices** (Figure 1.2). As such they are visible to an outside observer. Their cultural meaning, however, is invisible and lies precisely and only in the way these practices are interpreted by the insiders.

The **core of culture** is formed by **values**. Values are acquired early in our lives. Values are broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others. Values are feelings with an arrow to it: a plus and a minus side. They deal with;

Evil versus good

Dirty versus clean

Dangerous versus safe

Forbidden versus permitted

Ugly versus beautiful

Unnatural versus natural

Abnormal versus normal

Moral versus immoral

Contrary to most animals, humans, at birth, are incompletely equipped for life. Fortunately our human physiology provides us with a receptive period of some ten to twelve years, a period in which we can quickly, and **largely unconsciously**, absorb the necessary information from our environment. This includes symbols (such as language), heroes (such as our parents), and rituals (such as toilet training), and most importantly it includes **our basic values**. At the end of this period, we gradually switch to a different, conscious way of learning, focusing primarily on new practices.

### **Culture Reproduces Itself**

There is a powerful stabilizing force in the cycle that biologists call *homeostasis*. **Parents tend to reproduce the education that they received, when they were children, whether they want to or not.** The most salient learning in our tender years is all about the body and about relationships between people. Because they were acquired so early in our lives, **many values remain unconscious** to those who hold them. Therefore, they cannot be discussed, nor can they be directly observed by outsiders. They can only be inferred from the way people act under various circumstances.

### **Culture Change: Changing Practices, Stable Values**

There is no evidence that the values of present-day generations from different countries are converging.

Culture change can be fast for the outer layers of the onion diagram, labeled practices. Practices are the visible part of culture. New practices can be learned throughout our lifetime.

Culture change is slow for the onion's core, the cultural values. As already argued, these were learned when we were children, from parents who acquired them when they were children. This makes for considerable stability in the basic values of a society, in spite of sweeping changes in practices.

The social game itself, the unwritten rules for success, failure, belonging, and other key attributes of our lives remain similar. **We need to fit in, to behave in ways that are acceptable to the groups we belong to.**

## **Cultural Dimensions**

A cultural dimension represents a pool of values and norms, strategies and possibilities people use in order to solve the basic problems of society. From this pool of values, norms and possibilities a social community chooses those values that are from its point of view the most appropriate to solve basic social problems. According to Hofstede **the special sample of values, norms, attitudes and normal ways of behavior** make a society's *culture*.

Cultural dimensions are **scientific constructs** that allow us to adequately describe how social groups or societies solve their basic social problems. Cultural dimensions allow us to describe **the formation and order of values and norms** a society considers to be essential.

*Culture* is the underlying background that rules *our thinking, feeling and (communicative) acting* according to the conditions under which our community exists. One culture can be characterized by comparing its special set of values, norms etc. to the special set of another culture (Hofstede 2005, p. 2-4).

## Five Basic Problems of Society

Cultures are **adaptations of a people to the conditions of life**. When these conditions change, as they have over the last centuries, cultures are put under pressure.

If you were to compare a large number of cultures around the world, you would see that although each is different, **they all encounter the same five basic problems of social life. Each culture has developed its own answers to each problem.**

### 1. Identity

The basic problem involved here is identity, the **relationship between the individual and the group**. It can be seen as a spectrum ranging from individual identity, or **Individualism**, to group identity, or **Collectivism**. The cultures of most wealthy countries in the world are relatively individualistic, and those of the poorer countries are relatively collectivistic. Collectivism can be seen as an adaptation to poverty and limited resources, and individualism, to wealth and ample resources.

**Individualism** pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after themselves and their immediate family.

**Collectivism** as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onward are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout their lives continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.

### 2. Hierarchy

The second basic issue is hierarchy, the **degree of inequality between people** that is assumed by them to be a natural state of affairs. This attribute has been called *Power Distance*.

**Power Distance** can be defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of a society expect and accept power to be distributed unequally.

In **small power distance** countries, there is limited dependence of subordinates on bosses, and there is a preference for consultation. The emotional distance between them is relatively small: subordinates will feel they can approach and contradict their bosses.

In **large power distance** countries, there is considerable dependence of subordinates on bosses. The emotional distance between them is large: subordinates are unlikely to approach and contradict their bosses directly.

### 3. Gender

The basic problem here centers on **gender roles** and the **control of aggression**. It has been found throughout the world, that an **unequal role distribution** between men and women corresponds to a tougher society, in which there is more emphasis on achievement and fighting rather than on caring and compromise. If **men and women are more equal**, the result is more

“feminine” qualities within society as a whole. This is the reason why we call an equal role distribution between genders *Feminine* and an unequal distribution, *Masculine*.

A society is called **masculine** when emotional gender roles are clearly distinct: men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success, whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.

A society is called **feminine** when emotional gender roles overlap: both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.

#### 4. Truth

The basic problem described in this dimension is **how people cope with unpredictability and the ambiguity**. It has to do with **anxiety**, as a basic human feeling, or in other words with **fear of the unknown**. The dimension describing this aspect includes the extremes of **Uncertainty Avoidance** on the one hand, and **Uncertainty Tolerance** on the other. As anxiety and the search for truth are closely related, this continuum is labeled as a *one-truth orientation*, as opposed to a *many-truths orientation*.

**Uncertainty avoidance** can be defined as the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations. This feeling is, among other things, expressed through stress and in the need for predictability: a need for written and unwritten rules.

In **Uncertainty tolerant** countries, anxiety levels are relatively low. Aggression and emotions are not supposed to be shown. Stress cannot be released through activity; it has to be internalized. Not only familiar but also unfamiliar risks are accepted. There is a lower need for predictability and, thereby, for rules in general.

#### 5. Virtue

The basic problem described in this dimension is a community's **orientation in time**, which basically means the **choice between future and present virtues and values** and between future and present obligations and rewards. This aspect of culture is called *Long-Term Orientation*, as opposed to *Short-Term Orientation*.

**Long-Term Orientation (LTO)** stands for the fostering of virtues orientated towards future rewards – in particular, perseverance and thrift. In **Long-Term orientated cultures** hard work and persistence are important virtues. Virtue consists of trying to acquire skills and education, working hard, not spending more than necessary, being patient, and persevering. Conspicuous consumption is taboo, as is losing one's temper.

**Short-Term Orientation** stands for the fostering of virtues related to the past and present – in particular, respect for tradition, preserving of “face”, and fulfilling social obligations.



## **The Sixth Dimension**

### **6. Indulgence versus Restraint**

This sixth dimension is mainly related to national levels of subjective happiness and life control.

**Indulgent societies** allow relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires leading to enjoying life and having fun.

**Restrained societies** suppress gratification of needs and regulate it by means of strict social norms.

*Indulgence stands for a tendency to allow relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun.*

*Restraint reflects a conviction that such gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by strict social norms.*

(Hofstede, Hofstede, Minkov 2010, p. 281)

Hofstede about Culture

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wdh40kgyYOY>

Identity

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zQj1VPNPHII&list=PLQvFZ16QYK\\_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ&index=2](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zQj1VPNPHII&list=PLQvFZ16QYK_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ&index=2)

Power Distance

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DqAJclwfyCw>

Gender

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pyr-XKQG2CM&list=PLQvFZ16QYK\\_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ&index=3](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pyr-XKQG2CM&list=PLQvFZ16QYK_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ&index=3)

Truth

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZF6LyGne7Q&index=4&list=PLQvFZ16QYK\\_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZF6LyGne7Q&index=4&list=PLQvFZ16QYK_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ)

Virtue

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H8ygYIGsIQ4&index=5&list=PLQvFZ16QYK\\_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H8ygYIGsIQ4&index=5&list=PLQvFZ16QYK_ovcyej9kTjCrsg0mnS3oaJ)

Indulgence/Restraint

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V0YgGdzmFtA>

## Review of Hofstede´s Concept of Culture

by Ulrike Notarp

Hofstede´s concept of five resp. six cultural dimensions was criticized many times. There are two main directions of criticism: First, the way of data collection and the way of deducing cultural dimensions from the data, second, the cultural dimensions themselves.

- The IBM-study was conducted from 1967 to 1973 resp. from 1981 to 1985. *Therefore, the concept of cultural dimensions is based on nowadays obsolete data* (Reimer 2005, p. 46f). The underlying question is whether the concept of cultural dimensions is appropriate to adequately describe cultures until today, or whether it is only a scientific construct a Hofstede came up with on the basis of one empirical research. Can we suggest that Hofstede´s concept of cultural dimensions really possesses an observable equivalent within social reality? Hofstede´s research caused like no other in this field replication studies. Anne Neumann (2008) counted about 61 replication studies until 2008, which mostly confirm the cultural dimensions found by Hofstede. It seems, that the basic values underlying social life can be adequately described and ordered in the frame of these five dimensions. That supports the further suggestion that the dimensions really reflect the main problem areas every society is confronted with.
- *The different dimensions are not precisely defined* (Reimer 2005, p. 46f). Some of them overlap each other and, therefore, it is sometimes difficult to subordinate a value to only one of the dimensions. Different studies point out a correlation between the dimensions of *Identity* and *Hierarchy*, which refer mostly to the same cultural values and therefore could be subsumed. Some studies hint on a correlation between the dimensions of *Identity* and *Uncertainty Avoidance* as well as between *Hierarchy* and *Uncertainty Avoidance* (Neumann 2008, 53-57).
- *Five or six dimensions are not enough to represent the total complexity of culture* (Reimer 2005, p. 47). Culture is a too complex phenomenon that cannot be adequately described with the help of five dimensions only. Some critics point out that the number and content of Hofstede´s cultural dimensions is arbitrary. Using other items in the questionnaire, they would probably appear quite different. In general, the cultural dimensions can afford only a superficial comparison of cultures. From my point of view, the number of dimensions subsuming cultural values should not be unlimited, because the more dimensions we distinguish the less significant they become. In the end one could have for every cultural value a separate dimension and would probably picture the culture completely. But, we would remain on the level of single words and the level of abstraction would very low, actually too low to compare cultures on that basis.
- *Concerning the genesis of the dimensions* was asked, whether it is possible to draw a conclusion from the behavior and preferences of people (represented in the IBM questionnaire) to their basic values. The question is, whether it is legitimate to conclude from differences in

behavior to differences in the underlying value system and furthermore, whether it is legitimate to interpret those underlying values in the frame of cultural dimensions.

If we assume, that our thinking, feeling, acting, and communicating is ruled by basic values of our culture, theoretically it seems legitimate to draw this conclusion from our behavior (our decision-making) to its leading values.

- *Criticized was the generalizing effect of classifying cultures by the help of dimensions* (Kutschker/Schmid 2004, p. 747). In order to compare them, cultures are put into a scheme of cultural dimensions, accepting by the way that this might produce stereotype pronouncements like "The Germans ..., the English ..., and the Polish ..." and accepting that the specifics of a culture might be overlooked and not be taken into account. On the other hand, we have to remind that - on the level of cultural dimensions - we are not concerned with the peculiarities of a culture, as peculiarities in general cannot afford an intercultural comparison. The construction of cultural dimensions has just the purpose to abstract from the special and single and make visible the general and common. Cultural dimensions have the purpose to sample and order basic values and adjustments in order to uncover specific value patterns.
- *There is no common, abstract theory on which the concept of cultural dimensions is based* (Reimer 2005, p. 45). Critics blame Hofstede's concept for its lack of a general theory, on the basis of which the *cultural dimensions* could have been deduced. In spite of that - they complain - the cultural dimensions were developed only inductively by interpreting empirical data. Even if this criticism is only partly right - Hofstede refers to some American sociologists like *Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, Alex Inkeles, and Daniel Levinson*, from whom he took the idea of ordering cultural values according to existential problem areas of society - it is appropriate in principle (Hofstede 2005, p. 22). On the other hand, Hofstede is not the only one, who deduces cultural dimensions by only interpreting empirical data and without a common theoretical background. In fact there is no other *Concept of Cultural Dimensions* that is based on an abstract theory! The advantage of Hofstede's concept is, that it relatively precisely strikes - if by chance or not - the main problem areas of society and of social systems in general. His concept fits nearly perfectly into the *Evolutionary Systems Theory* (Riedl 1984, 1990, 2000).

## **Other Dimensional Concepts of Culture**

The table shows cultural dimensions of other concepts. For more information see the concepts of Trompenaars (Trompenaars, Hampden-Turner 1997), Schwartz (1994), Hall (1990), Project GLOBE (House, Hanges, Javidan 2004) and Thomas (Thomas, Kinast, Schroll-Machl 2003) themselves or the works of Kutschker/Schmid (2004), Reimer (2005).

<b>Hofstede</b>	<b>Trompenaars</b>	<b>Schwartz</b>	<b>Kluckhohn/ Strodtbeck</b>	<b>Hall</b>	<b>GLOBE</b>	<b>Thomas</b>
<b>Individualism / Kollektivism</b>	Individualism/ Communitarism	Autonomy	Relational	High/low context	Collectivism I	Individualism / Kollektivism
	Universalism/ Particularism	Conservatism			Collectivism II	Objective/ Personal Relations
					Confrontation with/ Avoidance of Conflicts	
					Direct/Indirect communication Weak/Strong Context	
<b>Hierarchy Power Distance</b>	Status Achievement/ Ascription	Hierarchy		Power Distance	External/ Internal Authority	
<b>Uncertainty Avoidance</b>	Universalism/ Particularism				Uncertainty Avoidance	Orientation on Structures / Devaluation of Structures
<b>Maskulinität/ Femininity</b>		Mastery			Assertiveness Gender Egalitarianism	
<b>Long-/ Short- Term Orientation</b>	Human-Time- Relationship		Time	Mono- chronic/ Poly- chronic Time	Future Orientation	Simultaneous/ consecutive activities
			Activity		Performance Orientation	
	Human- Nature- Relationship	Harmony	Man- Nature			
	Neutral/ Affective			Space		
	Specific/ Diffuse	Egalitarian Commitment	Human Nature	Fast/Slo w Messag e		

(see also Reimer 2005, p. 38)

## Literature

- Arts, Wil, Hagedaars, Jacques, Halman, Loek (2003). The Cultural Diversity of European Unity: an introduction. In Wil Arts, Jacques Hagedaars & Loek Halman (Hrsg.), *The Cultural Diversity of European Unity. Findings, Explanations and Reflections from the European Values Study (S. 1-12)*. Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill.
- Hofstede, Geert & Hofstede, Gerd Jan, Minkov, Michael (2010). *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the mind. Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. New York. Mc Graw-Hill.
- Hofstede, Geert & Hofstede, Gerd J. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the mind. Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. New York. Mc Graw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture´s consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, Geert and Associates (1998). *Masculinity and Femininity. The Taboo Dimension of National Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, California. Sage Publications.
- House, Robert J., Hanges, Paul J., Javidan Mansour (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations. The Globe Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks CA. Sage.
- Inglehart, Ronald (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton. University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald, Halman, Loek, Welzel, Christian (2004). Introduction. In R. Inglehart, M. Basáñez, J. Díez-Medrano (Hrsg.), *Human beliefs and values. A cross-cultural sourcebook based on the 1999-2002 values surveys, S. 1-20*. Mexico. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Inglehart, Ronald, Oyserman, Daphna (2004). Individualism, autonomy, self-expression. The human development syndrome. In Henk Vinken, Joseph Soeters & Peter Ester (Hrsg.), *Comparing Cultures. Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective. S. 74-96*. Leiden in the Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill.
- Inglehart, Ronald, Welzel Christian (2007). (1. Aufl. 2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy. The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge. University Press.
- Triandis, Harry C. (2004). Dimensions of culture beyond Hofstede. In Henk Vinken, Joseph Soeters & Peter Ester (Hrsg.), *Comparing Cultures. Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective. S. 28-42*. Leiden in the Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill.
- Trompenaars, F. and C. Hampden-Turner (1997). *Riding the waves of culture : understanding cultural diversity in business*. London, Nicholas Brearley.
- Vinken, Henk, Soeters, Josef, Ester, Peter (2004). Cultures and Dimensions. Classic perspectives and new opportunities in 'dimensionalist' cross-cultural studies. In H. Vinken et al. (Hrsg.), *Comparing Cultures. Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective. S. 5-27*. Leiden in the Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill.