International Journal of

Cross Cultural Management

A Critique of Hofstede's Fifth National Culture Dimension

Tony Fang

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://ccm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/3/3/347

Published by:
Ⓢ SAGE Publications

http://www.sagepublications.com

Additional services and information for *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://ccm.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://ccm.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations (this article cites 37 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
http://ccm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/3/3/347#BIBL

A Critique of Hofstede's Fifth National Culture Dimension

Tony Fang

Stockholm University School of Business, Sweden

ABSTRACT   Using indigenous knowledge of Chinese culture and philosophy, this article critiques Geert Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension, i.e. 'Confucian dynamism', also referred to as 'long-term orientation'. The basic premise on which the dimension is founded is scrutinized and the way in which this index has been constructed is assessed in detail. It is argued that there is a philosophical flaw inherent in this 'new' dimension. Given this fatal flaw and other methodological weaknesses, the usefulness of Hofstede's fifth dimension is doubted. The article concludes by calling for new visions and perspectives in our cross cultural research.

KEY WORDS • Chinese values • Confucian dynamism • cross cultural • Hofstede's fifth dimension • long-term orientation • Yin Yang

Geert Hofstede's (1980) *Culture's Consequences*, one of the most cited sources in the *Social Science Citation Index*, is the most influential work to date in the study of cross cultural management. The hallmark of this work is Hofstede's four dimensions of national cultural variability, i.e. power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity, derived from his unique and extensive empirical investigations at IBM subsidiaries in 53 countries.[1] Hofstede defines culture as the collective mental programming of the mind which distinguishes one group or category of people from another. Hofstede (1983b: 78) maintains that his cultural dimen-sions broadly characterize national culture in terms of its 'average pattern of beliefs and values'.

In 1991, Hofstede published *Cultures and Organizations*, a revised and popularized version of *Culture's Consequences*. He explained the impetus behind the new book as follows (1991: ix):

> Reformulating the message of *Culture's Consequences* after 10 years has made it possible to include the results of more recent research by others and by myself . . . Since 1980 many people have published important studies on cultural differences. The second half of the book is almost entirely based on new material.

Table 1   Long-term orientation (Confucian dynamism) as a fifth dimension

Long-term orientation	Short-term orientation
1. Persistence (perseverance)	1. Personal steadiness and stability
2. Ordering relationships by status and observing this order	2. Protecting your face
3. Thrift	3. Respect for tradition
4. Having a sense of shame	4. Reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts

Source: Based on Hofstede (1991: 165–6; 2001: 354–5)

A vital feature of this book is the inclusion of 'Confucian dynamism' (also known as 'long-term orientation' – LTO) as a fifth dimension of national culture variance. A whole chapter (i.e. Chapter 7, pp. 159–74) is devoted to theorizing and describing this new dimension (see especially the section 'Confucian dynamism as a fifth dimension', Hofstede, 1991: 164–6). According to Hofstede (1991), the fifth dimension deals with 'time orientation' and consists of two contrasting poles: 'long-term orientation' versus 'short-term orientation' (see Table 1).

Hofstede expounds this new dimension in many writings, for example:

> We have called this dimension 'Confucian Dynamism' to show that it deals with a choice from Confucius' ideas and that its *positive pole* reflects a dynamic, future-oriented mentality, whereas its *negative pole* reflects a more static, tradition-oriented mentality. (Hofstede and Bond, 1988: 16, emphasis added)

> [N]early all values, on both poles, seem to be taken straight from the *teachings of Confucius* . . . the values on the one pole are more oriented towards the future (especially perseverance and thrift); they are more dynamic. The values on the opposite pole are more oriented towards the past and present; they are more static. (Hofstede, 1991: 166, emphasis added)

According to Hofstede (1991), long-term orientation refers to a positive, dynamic, and future oriented culture linked with four 'positive' Confucian values: 'persistence (perseverance)'; 'ordering relationships by status

and observing this order'; 'thrift'; and 'having a sense of shame'. Short-term orientation, however, represents a negative, static and traditional and past-oriented culture associated with four 'negative' Confucian values: 'personal steadiness and stability'; 'protecting your face'; 'respect for tradition'; and 'reciprocation of greetings, favors and gifts'. Chinese societies (China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore), Japan, Korea, Thailand, etc., are ranked as more future- and long-term oriented cultures, whereas Pakistan, Nigeria, the Philippines, Canada, Zimbabwe, the UK, the USA, New Zealand, Australia and Germany are more past and short-term oriented cultures (see Table 2). Furthermore, Hofstede uses the index of Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) to explain the economic growth of nations. Carroll and Gannon (1997: 73) sum up: 'they [Hofstede and his associates] distinguished between the so-called *good* and *bad* aspects of Confucianism, and it was only the good aspects of Confucianism making up the Confucian ethic that were related to economic growth in Asian nations' (emphasis added).

During the process of preparing this article, Hofstede (2001) published the new edition of *Culture's Consequences*. However, the fundamental premise that underpins the fifth dimension remains the same as it was when originally introduced 10 years ago (see Hofstede, 1991). Comparing Hofstede (2001) with Hofstede (1980), Smith (2002: 119, 130) comments:

Table 2   Long-term orientation (LTO) index and factor scores from 23 countries and regions

Score rank	Country or region	Factor scores	LTO score
1	China*	—	118
2	Hong Kong	.91	96
3	Taiwan	.74	87
4	Japan	.59	80
5	South Korea	.49	75
6	Brazil	.30	65
7	India	.21	61
8	Thailand	.11	56
9	Singapore	−.04	48
10	Netherlands	−.13	44
11	Bangladesh	−.20	40
12	Sweden	−.34	33
13	Poland	−.36	32
14	Germany FR	−.38	31
15	Australia	−.38	31
16	New Zealand	−.39	30
17	USA	−.42	29
18	Great Britain	−.50	25
19	Zimbabwe	−.50	25
20	Canada	−.53	23
21	Philippines	−.61	19
22	Nigeria	−.67	16
23	Pakistan	−1.00	00

* China was not included in the original empirical study of 22 countries conducted by The Chinese Culture Connection (1987). China was later included in Hofstede (1991).
Sources: Factor scores from The Chinese Culture Connection (1987: 153); LTO scores from Hofstede (1991: 166).

This book is of course a new edition, not a new study. . . . The inclusion of a fifth dimension of cultural variance in this edition constitutes the most substantial departure from the perspective advanced in the first edition. However, it comes as no surprise to readers of Hofstede's (1991) reprise of his earlier perspective, and is an expanded version of the relevant chapter in that book.

In Søndergaard's (2001) recent review of Hofstede (2001), Hofstede's dimensional model of cultural variation is not discussed at all. However, a close scrutiny of the contents and structure of Hofstede (2001) compared to Hofstede (1991) reveals that Hofstede has indeed made several adjustments. For example, he no longer uses the terms 'Confucian dynamism' and 'long-term orientation' interchangeably to refer to the fifth dimension as he did earlier (Hofstede, 1991) but rather terms it solely 'long-term orientation' (see the section 'Long-term orientation as a fifth dimension', Hofstede, 2001: 353–5, as opposed to the section 'Confucian dynamism as a fifth dimension', Hofstede, 1991: 164–6). Furthermore, instead of clearly describing the fifth dimension as being made up of two opposing poles of Chinese (Confucian) values as he did earlier (Hofstede, 1991), Hofstede

now provides a list of the 'key implications' and 'essence' concerning long-term vs. short-term orientation when it comes to differences in family, social relations and work, in ways of thinking, and in societal norms between short- and long-term-orientation societies (see Exhibit 7.6 and Exhibit 7.7, Hofstede, 2001: 366–7). Such treatment makes the fifth dimension even more difficult to understand. The list offers mere speculations and 'after-event' corroboration and assertion rather than well-thought-out points embedded in the original database and conceptualization. This methodological flaw is also pointed out in other scholars' critiques of Hofstede's first four dimensions (e.g. Tayeb, 1994, 2000), which Hofstede himself admits (Hofstede et al., 1990: 287 in Tayeb, 2000). Given the purpose and focus of this article and the fact that the very basis of the notion of long-term orientation (LTO) originates from Hofstede (1991), I choose to refer mostly to Hofstede (1991) as the main source of reference where LTO is concerned. Also given this reason, the terms 'Confucian dynamism' and 'long-term orientation' are used interchangeably in this article, the same way as they are termed and treated in Hofstede (1991).

The Fifth Dimension and the Research Community

Hofstede's first four dimensions have generated enormous numbers of replications, citations and discussions (Smith, 1996; Søndergaard, 1994; Triandis, 1982); they have also attracted criticism (Lowe, 2001; McSweeney, 2002a, b; Roberts and Boyacigiller, 1984; Tayeb, 1988, 1994, 2000, 2001; Yeh and Lawrence, 1995) and in some cases further refinements (Schwartz, 1992). In contrast, the fifth dimension does not seem to have been received enthusiastically by the cross cultural research community since it was launched in 1991. Few studies (e.g. Ralston et al., 1992, 1993; Read, 1993) have adopted the fifth dimension as a research instrument. These

works, however, share the feature of starting by unquestioningly accepting the notion of Confucian dynamism as a major theoretical platform. Such an approach to cross cultural research is believed to be problematic. In the words of Jackson and Aycan (2001: 7):

> Instead, cross cultural research starts with a deep questioning of whether or not the key concepts and measurement tools are relevant and appropriate in different cultural contexts. If not, researchers must develop comparable constructs and tools to capture both the 'emic' as well as the 'pan-cultural/etic' aspects of the management phenomenon.

Researchers in cross cultural communication who refer extensively to Hofstede avoid engaging in discussions about the fifth dimension (e.g. Gudykunst et al., 1996); a comprehensive survey of reviews, citations and replications of Hofstede does not even include the fifth dimension (Søndergaard, 1994). In Triandis's (1993) review of Hofstede's (1991) *Cultures and Organizations*, the fifth dimension is not mentioned at all. Punnett (1999: 60) writes in her overview of cross cultural research: 'The Hofstede (1980) model proposed four dimensions of culture (a fifth dimension was added based on research in the Far East – Chinese Culture Connection, 1987 – but is not discussed here).' Problems are reported by researchers who attempt to operationalize the fifth dimension in analysis. Newman and Nollen (1996: 776) write: 'long-term orientation is the most difficult because it is the newest of the dimensions and the least familiar to Western researchers.' Redpath and Nielsen (1997: 329) comment: 'this dimension is probably the least relevant to our analysis. It was the most difficult to apply, because distinctions between the two ends of the spectrum are unclear and often seem contradictory.' Kalé (1996: 22) remarks: 'Since this book [Hofstede, 1980] was published, Hofstede has added a fifth dimension, however, conceptual and empirical support for this dimension is not very exhaustive (Hofstede 1991).' Yeh

and Lawrence (1995) find that Hofstede's two cultural dimensions, individualism and Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation), appear to be highly interrelated; therefore the robustness of his conceptualization of these two dimensions in the same research scheme is questioned.

These critical comments are valuable because there has been a dearth of debate about Hofstede's fifth dimension in the literature. Suggestions that Hofstede's theories may not hold water are usually dismissed as wishful, pretentious, naïve and shortsighted. But the lack of debate has resulted in stagnation and confusion from which the field of cross cultural management has evidently suffered. Various textbooks and writings have introduced and interpreted Hofstede's fifth dimension in a way that is different from what even Hofstede (1991) himself implied. For example, contrary to what Confucian dynamism suggests (i.e. British and Americans are short-term-oriented, whereas Chinese and Japanese are future-oriented), Rollinson et al. (1998) explain that the fifth dimension means that the British and Americans are long-term future-oriented, whereas Chinese and Japanese are short-term past-oriented. Earley (1997: 87) also interprets Confucian dynamism as referring

> to a time and causal orientation. People from one extreme of Confucian dynamism focus on linearity of time and place an emphasis on the future, such as the British and Americans. Other people emphasize a connection to the past and place an emphasis on reciprocal causation of events, such as the Chinese and Japanese.

Uncertainty pervades the research community as to how many national culture dimensions make up Hofstede's theory. In one of his most recent texts, Hofstede (2002: 1356) talks about 'four or five dimensions'.

The research community's lack of enthusiasm for Hofstede's fifth dimension and the feeling of strangeness, uncertainty and confusion are not surprising. As will be discussed in

detail in this article, they reflect deep-seated flaws in the concept itself. Most existing critiques of Hofstede's fifth dimension, however, do not touch the foundation of the concept by analyzing the core constructs, i.e. the eight Chinese values that underlie the dimension. This is where the present article differs; its purpose is to assess the concept of Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) by using indigenous knowledge of Chinese culture and philosophy. The focus of the article is to scrutinize the basic premise on which the fifth dimension is founded and the way in which this index has been constructed. To achieve this purpose, we need to answer these questions: what is Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) and how was it produced?; how robust is the concept for cross cultural management? The article is not intended to be prescriptive; as a whole it should be read as a preliminary discussion of this rich and complex subject to help stimulate debate. As to the methodology, the article takes an emic approach, i.e. using an insider's knowledge of a specific culture (Chinese in this case) to examine the robustness and reliability of the fifth dimension. Analyzing an allegedly universal national culture dimension through the prism of Chinese culture may court accusations of blending etics with emics. However, an in-depth look at Hofstede's fifth dimension requires the Chinese perspective, because the concept itself is built on Chinese values.

Genesis of the Fifth Dimension

Although Hofstede and Bond (1984) initially suggested that Hofstede's original four dimensions might not be the only universal dimensions of cultural variation, the notion that Confucian (work) dynamism could be a meaningful national culture dimension was first suggested by the Chinese Value Survey (CVS) from the Chinese Culture Connection (1987). The motivation behind the CVS was

Table 3   The 40 Chinese values in the Chinese Value Survey

1.	*Xiao (Fucong fumu, zunjin fumu zunchong zuxian, shanyang fumu)*	Filial piety (Obedience to parents, respect for parents, honoring of ancestors, financial support of parents)
2.	*Qinlao*	Industry (Working hard)
3.	*Rongren*	Tolerance of others
4.	*Suihe*	Harmony with others
5.	*Qianxu*	Humbleness
6.	*Zhongyu shangci*	Loyalty to superiors
7.	*Liyi*	Observation of rites and social rituals
8.	*Li shang wang lai*	Reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts
9.	*Renai (Xu, renqing)*	Kindness (Forgiveness, compassion)
10.	*Xueshi (Jiaoyu)*	Knowledge (Education)
11.	*Tuanjie*	Solidarity with others
12.	*Zhongyong zhidao*	Moderation, following the middle way
13.	*Xiuyang*	Self-cultivation
14.	*Zun bei you xu*	Ordering relationships by status and observing this order
15.	*Zhengyigan*	Sense of righteousness
16.	*En wei bing shi*	Benevolent authority
17.	*Bu zhong jingzheng*	Non-competitiveness
18.	*Wenzhong*	Personal steadiness and stability
19.	*Lianjie*	Resistance to corruption
20.	*Ai guo*	Patriotism
21.	*Chengken*	Sincerity
22.	*Qinggao*	Keeping oneself disinterested and pure
23.	*Jian*	Thrift
24.	*Naili (Yili)*	Persistence (Perseverance)
25.	*Naixin*	Patience
26	*Baoen yu baochou*	Repayment of both the good or the evil that another person has caused you
27.	*Wenhua youyuegan*	A sense of cultural superiority
28.	*Shiying huanjing*	Adaptability
29.	*Xiaoxin (Shen)*	Prudence (Carefulness)
30.	*Xinyong*	Trustworthiness
31.	*Zhi chi*	Having a sense of shame
32.	*You limao*	Courtesy
33.	*An fen shou ji*	Contentedness with one's position in life
34.	*Baoshou*	Being conservative
35.	*Yao mianzi*	Protecting your 'face'
36.	*Zhiji zhijiao*	A close, intimate friend
37.	*Zhenjie*	Chastity in women
38.	*Guayu*	Having few desires
39.	*Zunjing chuantong*	Respect for tradition
40.	*Caifu*	Wealth

Note: The original Chinese characters have been replaced with the Chinese *pinyin* spelling for the convenience of western readers.
Source: Based on The Chinese Culture Connection (1987: 147–8).*

Table 4   Value loading > .55 on the factor analysis of standardized CVS country means

CVS I (Integration)	*CVS II (Confucian work dynamism)*
Tolerance of others (.86)	Ordering relationships (.64)
Harmony with others (.86)	Thrift (.63)
Solidarity with others (.61)	Persistence (.76)
Non-competitiveness (.85)	Having a sense of shame (.61)
Trustworthiness (.69)	Reciprocation (−.58)
Contentedness (.65)	Personal steadiness (−.76)
Being conservative (.56)	Protecting your 'face' (−.72)
A close, intimate friend (.75)	Respect for tradition (−.62)
Filial piety (−.74)	
Patriotism (−.62)	
Chastity in women (−.70)	
CV III (Human-heartedness)	*CV IV (Moral discipline)*
Kindness (.72)	Moderation (.65)
Patience (.88)	Keeping oneself disinterested and pure (.56)
Courtesy (.76)	Having few desires (.67)
Sense of righteousness (−.57)	Adaptability (−.71)
Patriotism (−.62)	Prudence (−.58)

Source: The Chinese Culture Connection (1987: 150)

the Chinese Culture Connection's (1987: 144) concern with the cultural neutrality of Hofstede's four dimensions: 'they may themselves be culture bound'. Therefore, in order to generate 'sufficiently robust' and 'culture-free' dimensions, Eastern-biased research instruments ought to be introduced. Given the 'pervasive and long-standing' influence of the Chinese culture on surrounding cultures in East Asia, a Chinese value survey would serve the aim of counter-balancing the western biases. Michael H. Bond and seven overseas Chinese scholars prepared a list of 'fundamental and basic values for Chinese people' in which 40 traditional Chinese values are included (see Table 3).

Fifty male and 50 female college students in each of the 22 countries (see Table 1; Mainland China was not included) were asked to indicate on a 9-point scale how important each of the values was to them

personally. Through factor analysis based on the students' ratings, the 40 Chinese values were further boiled down to four value groupings or dimensions: integration (CVS I), Confucian work dynamism (CVS II), human-heartedness (CVS III), and moral discipline (CVS IV), as shown in Table 4.

The 22 countries in the Chinese Value Survey were then placed along each of the four Chinese dimensions. The factor scores on Confucian work dynamism can be found in Table 1. Since 20 of the 22 countries in the CVS overlapped with those in Hofstede's (1983a) study, the country scores on each of the four Chinese dimensions could be correlation-tested with scores on Hofstede's four dimensions in the IBM studies. Hofstede's power distance (PD) and individualism (IDV) were found to correlate significantly with integration (CVS I) and moral discipline (CVS IV), respectively, and Hofstede's

masculinity (MAS) correlated significantly with human-heartedness (CVS III). However, uncertainty avoidance (UAI) does not correlate with any of the CVS dimensions. Moreover, Confucian work dynamism (CVS II) does not correlate with any of the Hofstede dimensions, but does correlate significantly with the countries' average gross national growth (GNG) across the 20-year span of 1965–84. The Chinese Culture Connection (1987: 155, 158) wrote:

> This latter result is extremely important in the light of recent speculation on the Post-Confucian Hypothesis, the conjecture that fundamental aspects of Confucian social philosophy are responsible for the stunning economic development of Oriental cultures with a Chinese heritage.

Confucian dynamism, a concept unknown to the West, eventually emerged as an 'Oriental' contribution to Hofstede's dimensions of national culture. In their joint article 'The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth', Hofstede and Bond (1988: 16) wrote:

> In fact, both the values on the right and those on the left are in line with the teachings of Confucius as we described them earlier. However, the values on the left select those teachings of Confucius that are more oriented toward the future (especially perseverance and thrift), whereas those on the right select Confucian values oriented toward the past and the present. We have called this dimension 'Confucian Dynamism'.

In *Cultures and Organizations*, Hofstede defines Confucian dynamism as his fifth dimension and also interchangeably refers to it as 'long-term versus short-term orientation'. The scores from China are then (Hofstede, 1991) added to the previous list of 22 countries, with the number of sample countries reaching 23 (see Table 1). It may seem unfair to ascribe Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) to Geert Hofstede alone. As we have found in the foregoing discussions, the prototype of Confucian dynamism and LTO was initially constructed by the Chinese

Culture Connection (1987) led by Michael H. Bond (the weaknesses in their design will be discussed later). However, Hofstede (1991) makes a great leap forward in his interpretation of the concept by transforming it into a national culture dimension of 'long-term versus short-term orientation', which does not feature the original work of the Chinese Culture Connection (1987).[2]

A Confusing Dimension

Hofstede's fifth dimension, as noted earlier, has not been well received. One reason may be that the Confucian values underlying the concept look so Chinese that they appear disconcertingly strange to many western readers. Hofstede frequently notes that the fifth dimension is an Oriental contribution to his dimensional theory of culture that is not registered in the western mind (see, e.g. Hofstede, 1991, 1993; Franke et al., 1991) and writes (in Hofstede and Bond, 1988: 17–18):

> If this dimension is somewhat puzzling to the Western readers, they should not be surprised. The dimension is composed precisely of those elements that our Western instruments had not registered; a Westerner would not normally find them important.

However, the fifth dimension seems to be confusing to the Chinese mind too. Dimensions of national culture, like low- and high-context (Hall, 1976), individualism–collectivism (Triandis, 1995; Hofstede, 1980, 1991), power distance (large versus small), uncertainty avoidance (strong versus weak), and masculinity–femininity (Hofstede, 1980, 1991) all possess a structural fit[3] by offering two *contrasting* or *opposing* alternatives. Hofstede's fifth dimension, however, does not follow this vein. For the Chinese, the values at the two ends of long-term orientation are not contrasting or opposing values, but rather closely interrelated with one another. For example, the Chinese are certainly long-term and future-oriented in certain settings

and situations. But there has been considerable research showing that Chinese culture is past-oriented. Kluckholn and Strodtbeck (1961: 14) observe that 'China was a society which gave first-order value preference to the Past *time* orientation. Ancestor worship and a strong family tradition were both expressions of this preference.' The past time orientation is also found to be a core Chinese value by Chinese scholars on the mainland and overseas (Chan, 1998; Fan, 2000; Ouyang, 1995; Yau, 1988, 1994). An inside look at the Chinese business psyche reveals that short-term orientation, such as opportunity-driven behaviors and heavy reliance on cash transactions to expedite business deals, has been a salient Chinese trait throughout history (Chen, 2001, 2002). Running after short-term commercial interests without long-term vision in business ethics is an overriding problem of Mainland Chinese business enterprises (Zhang, 2001).

Take 'face' as another example. This is among the most important elements in Chinese social psychology. Although a universal phenomenon, face is particularly salient in the Chinese culture (e.g. Hu, 1944; Lin, 1939; Redding and Ng, 1982). In fact, the concept of face is Chinese in origin (see *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 1975: 716). According to Hofstede's country scores on Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation, see Tables 1 and 2), compared with China, western countries like the USA, Great Britain and Canada are more short-term oriented, being placed toward the lower end of the LTO scale, suggesting that these national cultures are more face-oriented. Anyone with intimate cross cultural life and work experience will find this confusing and will wonder how westerners, such as North Americans and the English, could be more face-caring ('protecting your face', a key value in 'short-term orientation') than the Chinese from China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore.

A Philosophical Flaw

From the Oriental and Chinese point of view, Hofstede's fifth dimension, which divides some Confucian values into the 'positive' pole and some into the 'negative' pole, suffers from a grave philosophical flaw. Perhaps the best-known symbol of East Asia is Yin Yang (Cooper, 1990), the Chinese philosophical principle of dualism and paradox in the manifest world (Figure 1). Yin (female elements: the moon, water, weak, dark, soft, passive, etc.) and Yang (male elements: the sun, fire, strong, bright, hard, active, etc.) represent qualities inherent in all the phenomena in the universe. It is a deeply rooted Chinese belief that Yin and Yang exist in everything; everything embraces Yin and Yang. Confucian values are no exception – each Confucian value has its bright and dark sides and involves constructive and destructive qualities.

Let us first look at the four allegedly 'negative' and 'short-term' Chinese values in Hofstede's fifth dimension (see also Table 1). In Chinese, these values are: *wenzhong* ('personal steadiness and stability'); *yao mianzi* ('protecting your face'); *zunjing chuantong* ('respect for tradition'); and *li shang wang lai* ('reciprocation of greetings, favors and gifts'). From a linguistic point of view, these Chinese phrases sound more positive than negative, or at least neutral. Whether these values are positive or negative cannot be judged at face value; it all depends on the specific contexts and situations in which they are discussed. However, if the prefixes *tai* (too much), *guofen* (excessive), and *bu* (not, none) are added to these values, they then tend to, if not always, become negative.

Wenzhong – Personal Steadiness and Stability

Wenzhong (personal steadiness and stability) means *prudence* and implies the need for good planning. When a person is *wenzhong* in decision-making, the decision is perceived as

Figure 1   The Yin Yang principle

solid, well-grounded and valuable. In Chinese, *wenzhong* carries with it certain moral connotations of deeply cultivated personal integrity.

Wenzhong is interrelated with the values on the positive pole of long-term orientation: a person who is persistent, respects ordered relationships and thrift, and has a sense of shame must be a person who is *wenzhong* in character. For example, thrift cannot be expected of a person who is not *wenzhong*.

The opposite of *wenzhong* – *bu wenzhong* – is very negative in the Confucian culture. People of *bu wenzhong* type are not reliable and trustworthy. However, those who are *tai wenzhong* or *guofen wenzhong* may not be able to make a career either; they lack dynamics, passion, and an entrepreneurial spirit, which are important qualities for surviving in today's changeable business environment.

Yao mianzi – Protecting your Face

Hofstede (1991: 169) seems to interpret face as a negative value when he claims that '*protecting one's face* if exaggerated would detract from pursuing the business at hand'. But must a strong face-consciousness always be negative? No. Ting-Toomey's (1988) study of the facework literature shows that face can be both positive and negative. Goffman (1955: 213) defines face as a 'positive social value' and calls it an effective 'self-regulating' mechanism for mobilizing members in any society.

In Chinese society, face as a self-regulating moral mechanism finds its most telling exposure. Face, in Chinese, is conceptualized in terms of two words: *lian* (*lien*) and *mianzi* (Hu, 1944). Both convey more or less moral connotations and are linked to family and group. The need for face (*yao lian*, or *yao mianzi*) is intrinsic to various aspects of personal and interpersonal relationship development in the Chinese culture (Gao, 1996). Face is an essential element of Chinese politeness; 'to be polite is to be face-caring' (Gu, 1990: 241).

Can the Confucian value *protecting one's face* inspire people to pursue business and make a career? Yes. In Chinese culture, face is not only a person's private affair but also, more important, concerns the person's whole family, social networks, and community at large. Schütte and Ciarlante (1998: 45) observe that 'Chinese . . . are particularly mindful not to lose face for their family but instead strive to gain face for the family through the accumulation of wealth, prestige, status, power and so on.' Many Chinese are hardworking and ambitious; a deep psy-

chological explanation is face because they simply do not wish to let China, Chinese people, or Chinese culture down. This is illustrated in a story (in Huang et al., 1997: 224), 'My Daughter Played the National Anthem of China on the Piano', by Zhang Xiaoming, about how her 7-year-old daughter adapted successfully to her new life in Japan:

> The daughter[,] who was a first grade pupil, came to Japan without knowing any Japanese. The parents worried that she could not adapt to changes in the Japanese school system. The girl made great achievements after only six months. The girl often said to her parents: 'If I cannot do a good job, they [her Japanese classmates] will think that Chinese people are unable to achieve. I must gain a respectful "face" for our Chinese people'.

Face has also been found to be an important reason behind the economic growth of East Asia. As Hofheinz and Calder (1982: 25) put it:

> 'Face' is an old Chinese expression – to 'lose face,' or to be shown to be not what society thinks you are, is a fate literally worse than imprisonment. . . . In many ways, Japan's massive efforts at rapid growth were spurred by the feeling that Japan had to catch up with its industrialized neighbors to 'save face,' an important element in ensuring national security.

Looking back on Chinese history, I would say that had the Chinese people not had a deep face-consciousness or keen sense of shame, China, a country traditionally with no effective legal and institutional frameworks, would have become a disunited nation a long time ago.

In Confucian culture, there is no greater sin than *bu yao mianzi* ('do not protect face'). This person simply does not have a sense of shame. If a person is *tai yao mianzi* or *guofen yao mianzi*, he or she is difficult to communicate with. Face could, for example, give rise to the following communication problems: a Chinese 'no' may not mean a real no, and a Chinese 'yes' may not be a real yes, either

(Gu, 1990; Tung and Worm, 1997); critical messages have to be relayed through a third party (Wierzbicka, 1996); and *yilun* (gossip, making remarks behind one's back, see Gao, et al., 1996). Gao (1996: 95) explains that the two expressions *bu yao lian* and *bu yao mianzi* both sound very negative in Confucian culture, the former being more negatively connoted with one's personal integrity and moral character.

Chinese thought has been shaped not only by Confucian values but also many other philosophies including Sun Tzu's strategic and 'deceptive' thinking. In a business context, the Chinese play and integrate two diametrically different roles: 'Confucian gentleman' and 'Sun Tzu-like strategist' (Fang, 1999). Chinese businesspeople value *face* when doing business as gentlemen, but '*thick face and black heart*' (meaning 'faceless', Chu, 1992) when doing business as strategists.

In Chinese philosophical parlance, *yao mianzi* (protecting your face) and *zhi chi* (having a sense of shame) are not distinct concepts but rather share a common Confucian moral base: face-caring or face-need. It is inappropriate to operationalize 'having a sense of shame' and 'protecting your face' as two separate and opposing values as shown in Hofstede's fifth dimension.

Zunjing chuantong – Respect for Tradition

Zunjing chuantong (respect for tradition) is perceived as a negative Chinese value in Hofstede's fifth dimension. In general terms, however, a tradition does not have to be poor or negative; it could refer to fine traditions and involve all the 'positive' values listed in long-term orientation, i.e. persistence (perseverance), ordering relationships by status and observing this order, thrift, and having a sense of shame. China is the world's oldest civilization, with a 5000-year history. A reason why the Chinese culture is so enduring is because the Chinese people are proud of their traditions and profoundly respect

them. Instead of using the term 'Confucianism', Professor Wei-Ming Tu (1984, 1990), a world authority on Confucianism, prefers to call Confucianism 'Confucian tradition', 'Confucian philosophy' or 'Confucian thought'.

Redding's (1990: 209) following analysis of Chinese culture allows us to see the causal relationship between the Chinese respect for tradition (a negative value in Hofstede's fifth dimension), willing compliance ('observing this order', a positive value in the fifth dimension) and perseverance (also a positive value in the fifth dimension):

> One of the outcomes of this vertical cooperativeness is willing compliance. This tendency is also reinforced by early conditioning of people during childhood and education, and the respect for authority figure, deeply ingrained in the Confucian tradition, tends to be maintained through life. . . . An extension of this willingness to comply is willingness to engage diligently in routine and possibly dull tasks, something one might term perseverance.

The phrases *tai zunjing chuantong* or *guofen zunjing chuantong* suggest a person who is caught in the same trap as those who are *tai wenzhong* or *guofen wenzhong*, which is thus negative. In the Confucian culture, the phrase *bu zunjing chuantong* commonly refers to behaviors that do not respect traditional Chinese etiquette and custom, which sounds negative.

Li shang wang lai – Reciprocation of Greetings, Favors and Gifts

Li shang wang lai is also a negative value in Hofstede's fifth dimension. Translating the Chinese concept *li* as 'greetings, favors and gifts' is basically correct. However, such an interpretation does not deliver the philosophical underpinnings that this Chinese value carries with it. More accurate translations would be: 'If you honor me a foot, I will honor you ten feet in return' and 'Courtesy demands reciprocity' (Fang, 2001), or 'Deal with a person as he deals with you' and 'pay a man back in his own coin' (see *A Modern Chinese–English Dictionary*, 1994: 543).

Li shang wang lai, like all other Chinese values, is a Chinese way of life; it is impossible to generalize whether it is good or bad, positive or negative, long-term oriented or short-term oriented. It could be very positive, and long-term oriented. An example that comes to mind is that of the difference between what is practiced in China and in the West in going out to eat with colleagues and acquaintances. In the West, 'going Dutch' is common. When the bill comes, people pass it around, check it, and then each pays for what he or she ordered. In China, however, a bill is seldom settled in a restaurant in this way – someone will always pay for the whole party. Situations where people argue back and forth and elbow one another to get to the bill first are not uncommon. The person who finally picks up the bill will not be forgotten by the others. They will practice *li shang wang lai* to repay this hospitality by inviting this person to dinner the next time when another person will settle the bill for everyone. In this way, the Chinese mutually cultivate and develop interpersonal relationships, showing concern for one another and pushing their relationships into the future. A person who does not observe *li shang wang lai* will simply not survive in Chinese society. However, excessive *li shang wang lai* vulgarizes one's social networks and can lead to corruption.

We have now discussed what are called the 'short-term oriented', 'past-oriented' and 'negative' Confucian values in the fifth dimension. We find that each of these four Chinese values embraces both Yin and Yang; they are not necessarily past- and short-term oriented, or negative; they can be future- and long-term oriented, or positive, as well. The same principle applies to the 'positive' Chinese values in Hofstede's long-term orientation. We have earlier discussed *zhi chi* ('having a sense of shame'), which shares the same philosophical base as *yao mianzi* ('pro-

tecting your face'). Now, let us focus on *jian* ('thrift'), *zun bei you xu* ('ordering relationships by status and observing this order'), and *naili (yili)* ('persistence, perseverance').

Jian – Thrift

Thrift (*jian*) is a major characteristic of the Chinese. Hofstede and Bond (1988: 18) explain this value as follows: 'The value of "thrift" leads to savings, which means availability of capital for reinvestment, an obvious asset to economic growth' Hofstede (1991: 168). Hofstede also mentions that there is a striking contrast between the East and the West in terms of *private savings* as a share of the gross national product; and 'spending', the opposite to thrift, seems to be a value in the USA both at individual and government level. Clearly, Hofstede interprets the Chinese saving behavior as long-term oriented and the American spending behavior as short-term oriented, the former being positive and the latter negative to economic growth. Interestingly, in China, for example, many people tend to think the opposite: westerners are far-sighted: they have the guts to spend money, since spending also means, at least in part, investing in the future. Saving behavior does not automatically mean that the person who makes the saving makes a future-oriented investment.

Zun bei you xu – Ordering Relationships by Status and Observing this Order

The value of *zun bei you xu* ('ordering relationships by status and observing this order') is based on the five cardinal relationships (*wulun*) of Confucianism: relationships between ruler and subject, father and son, husband and wife, elder brother and younger brother, and older friend and younger friend. It can be positive in terms of its emphasis on every person's commitment to doing their duty in society, thereby contributing to the establishment of social stability and harmony. Nevertheless, the same value can also

be destructive to innovation and creativity. Cheng (1990) discusses the problem of 'the lack of personality' among East Asians, which is attributed to the Confucian notion of hierarchy, role obligation and codes of behavior. Gao et al. (1996) observe that in Chinese culture not everyone is entitled to speak; a spoken voice is equated with status, and young people can hardly get a chance to talk. Therefore, we would say that *zun bei you xu*, despite its positive effect, could stifle creativity.

Naili (Yili) – Persistence (Perseverance)

Naili (*yili*) 'persistence (perseverance)' appears to be an obvious virtue. In any society, nothing can be achieved without persistence/perseverance. Nevertheless, the Chinese notion of persistence (perseverance) has deeper implications: it is a great Chinese virtue obtained at a great price. All those similar Chinese values contained in the CVS (see Table 3), i.e. *naili* (*yili*) ('persistence, perseverance'), *naixin* ('patience'), *rongren* ('tolerance of others') point essentially to a Chinese word: *ren* (to bear, to endure, to tolerate; endurance, tolerance, patience; cruel, ruthless). Very often we can arrive at the genuine meaning of a cultural value from its indigenous vocabulary. This is true of *ren*. See Figure 2: the Chinese character for *ren* is composed of two other Chinese characters: *ren* ('the edge of a knife') at the top and *xin* ('heart') at the bottom. Here, what I intend to emphasize is a philosophical message that every Confucian value has its bright and dark, positive and negative, or creative and destructive sides, for the same reason that everything has its Yin and Yang.

A Weak Design

Redundancy

The design of the fifth dimension has a number of weaknesses. It all started from the list of 40 Chinese values that the Chinese

Figure 2 The Chinese character 'Ren' ('perseverance', 'patience', 'tolerance')

Culture Connection (1987) drafted (see Table 3). There is rich redundancy among the 40 Chinese values, many of which either mean the same thing or are highly inter-related with each other. For example:

- Values 31 and 35 mean essentially the same thing: face-caring; face is philosophically based on the Confucian notion of shame. The Chinese concept of face is also found to be highly associated with other values such as 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23–27, 29, 32–34, 37–39, 40; your face is automatically at stake if you do not respect and practice these values.
- Values 3, 24 and 25 are highly interrelated and refer to the same Chinese concept: *ren* ('knife' + 'heart', see also Figure 2).
- Values 4 and 17 are used almost interchangeably by the Chinese.
- Values 5 and 34 are close to one another in Chinese. Value 5 is also connected to values 18 and 29.
- Values 7, 8 and 32 refer to the same Confucian concept: *li* (rituals, propriety, ceremony, decorum, protocol, courtesy, etiquette).

- Values 18 and 29 cannot be separated; in Chinese, *wen* (steady, steadiness), *zhong* (heavy, weight), and *shen* (careful, cautious) sound essentially the same.
- Values 8 and 26 share the same philosophical meaning: repay or reciprocate to the other party what one has received from them.

Apart from *li shang wang lai*, the meaning of which is not accurately translated (see our earlier discussion), the English version of value 16 is another case of inaccurate translation. In the original Chinese, value 16, *en wei bing shi*, denotes a charismatic authority who rules by being both *en* (kind, benevolent) and *wei* (awe-inspiring, dignified). Value 16 should be properly translated, for example, as 'applying the carrot and stick judiciously' (see also *A Modern Chinese–English Dictionary*, 1994: 222).

What Chinese Values?

Why 40 Chinese values? Why not 30, 50, or even more? A close look at the list of 40 'fundamental and basic values for Chinese people' reveals that a number of core Chinese values are not included, such as Guanxi, Yin Yang, and Wu Wei.[4] In a recent

study, 31 Chinese values are added to the original list of 40, making a total of 71 that are grouped into eight categories. Even this extensive list is said not to be exhaustive, and some values are not included (Fan, 2000).

Value is defined as that which is explicitly or implicitly desirable to and consciously or unconsciously held by an individual or group and which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action (Adler, 1991). This definition suggests that value can be discerned from the attitude and behavior of individuals and groups. Let us look at value 11: *tuanjie* (solidarity with others). There is a consensus that the Chinese culture is so family-oriented that trust is high only within the borders of family and kinship networks and is low in society at large (Fukuyama, 1995; Hsu, 1963; Kao, 1993; Lin, 1939). Teamwork is unknown to the Chinese; Chinese society is compared to 'a tray of loose sands' (Lin, 1939: 177). 'Non-cooperation' is one of the cultural determinants of Chinese values (Redding, 1990: 43). Chinese people's inability to cooperate and their predilection for bickering among themselves are deep-rooted harmful traits (Bo, 1992). Solidarity seems to be a value that is lacking in Chinese culture, so how could *tuanjie* be classified as one of the 'fundamental and basic values for Chinese people' (The Chinese Culture Connection, 1987: 145)?

The 40 values on which Hofstede's fifth dimension is empirically based rest too strongly on Confucianism. As a matter of fact, Chinese beliefs and values come from a combination of three schools of philosophical thought, i.e. Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism (Redding, 1990). Other philosophies than Confucianism have made an imprint on the shaping of Chinese values, norms and behavior and should be included in any serious study of Chinese culture.

Student Samples

Hofstede's first four dimensions are empirically based on his studies of IBM employees in 53 countries. The fifth dimension is not constructed on the same empirical ground; rather, it is based on the college student samples collected in 23 countries. The Chinese Culture Connection (1987: 146) describes its research strategy as follows:

> The *most convenient* cultural informants were university students, as collaborators in this study were all faculty members at universities. The procedure was to collect responses from at least 50 males and 50 females from any class level, but from as wide a range of undergraduate majors as possible. [emphasis added]

College students may be the 'most convenient' cultural informants and may even be one of the most frequently sought-after samples in our cross cultural research data bank. But the question remains: are college students the most reliable representatives of the average cultural values held by people in their culture at large? The answer is, unfortunately, no. Given their behavioral traits, it is not very difficult to understand why the student respondents ranked the following values as less important: chastity in women, patriotism, sense of righteousness, reciprocation, personal steadiness, protecting your 'face', reciprocation of greetings, favors and gifts, respect for tradition, adaptability, prudence, (see the negative values in Table 4). These values look, quite simply, too conservative to the student population. Hofstede clearly knows this weakness when he explains why face turns out to be insignificant in East Asia according to his study (1991: 169): 'Even if there is, in fact, a lot of face-saving going on in East Asia, the scores show that at the conscious level, the student respondents wanted to de-emphasize it.'

What is the meaning of identifying dimensions of national culture? What is our interest: to measure the 'average pattern of beliefs and values' in a culture (Hofstede, 1983b: 78) or to measure the student respondents' 'de-emphasis' of these beliefs and values 'at the conscious level' (Hofstede, 1991: 169)? Given the self-explanatory con-

cept of *national culture* dimensions, innocent readers would be lured to believe there is not much face-saving in East Asia. But the reality is just the opposite. Consider advertising in China and East Asia: who could afford to launch a 'face de-emphasizing' ad in Chinese and East Asian markets just because the student respondents from these cultures wanted to play down face? In short, a sample with mixed occupational, age and gender profiles is required in order to obtain a more reliable picture of national values in a society.

Distorted Methodology

The strength of Hofstede's earlier study (1980) is that it ingeniously employs somewhat comparable samples (though in no way 'almost perfectly matched' as claimed) from across a large number of countries, using the same set of instruments for data generation, and thus arrives at results that could provide a good anchor for future research. Adding a fifth dimension to the original four, without following the earlier methodology, however, has resulted in an unwarranted inferential jump and a model that is not based on logic. The right thing to do would have been to add the new instruments (that purport to measure Confucian dynamism) to the earlier ones and employ the same techniques of factor analysis used earlier to validate the results. Given the distorted research methodology, the fifth dimension cannot lay claim to being a result of robust research.[5]

Because of the defects built into Hofstede's fifth dimension as discussed, the viability of this dimension is doubted. We also doubt the viability of Hofstede's hypothesis of the 'Confucian connection' that explains the Chinese/East Asian economic performance by referring to Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) (Bond and Hofstede, 1989; Hofstede, 1991; Hofstede and Bond, 1988). *Confucianism* may not be the right and/or only philosophy to refer to when explaining the Chinese/East Asian economic performance; some larger frameworks seem to be at work.

Confucius himself says: 'The superior man understands righteousness; the inferior man understands profit' (*Analects*, in Chan, 1963: 28). Therefore, it can be unfair to hypothesize 'the cash value of Confucian values' (Bond and Hofstede, 1989). Tu (1984: 88) maintains that moral development rather than economic interest is intrinsic to Confucian traditions, and that 'there is no causal relationship' between the 'Confucian ethic' and the 'East Asian entrepreneurial spirit'. Yeh and Lawrence (1995) also draw our attention to the influence of non-cultural factors such as political environment and market-oriented policies. The Asian economic crisis rolling through most regions of East Asia since 1997 provides striking evidence against Hofstede's 'Confucian connection' thesis.

Conclusions and Future Research

In this article, we have discussed a number of drawbacks in Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension. First, Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) divides interrelated values into two opposing poles. Values labeled as 'short-term oriented' or 'negative' may not necessarily be so, and values labeled as 'long-term oriented' or 'positive' may not necessarily be so either. We call this a philosophical flaw because the Chinese Yin Yang principle is violated by the concept. Second, there is much redundancy among the 40 Chinese values in the Chinese Value Survey (CVS), the ultimate base of Hofstede's fifth dimension. A number of values either mean essentially the same thing or are highly interrelated. This leads to the fact that the two 'opposite' ends of Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) are actually not opposed to each other. Third, there exists a problem of including non-values and excluding values in the list of Chinese values proposed by the Chinese Culture Connection (1987). These values focus too much on

Confucianism; the Taoist and Buddhist values are not considered in the design of the constructs leading to Hofstede's fifth dimension. Fourth, inaccurate English translation has been found in some values in the CVS, which may have, in part, resulted in misinterpretations in the cross cultural surveys and eventual meaningless findings. Fifth, Hofstede's fifth dimension is based on the opinions of a student population whose cultural values can barely represent the average cultural values held by the people in their cultures at large. Finally, compared with the first four dimensions, the fifth does not result from the same techniques of factor analysis as used earlier to validate the results; it does not have the same sampling background (students vs. IBM employees). Given the flaws inherent in its conceptualization, Hofstede's fifth dimension's viability is questioned, and its relevance for our cross cultural management research and practice has been found and will remain very limited.

Yin Yang Revisited

A question naturally comes to mind: what would be a possible Oriental contribution if the Confucian dynamism (long-term orientation) does not work? Herriot, a French writer and politician, defines culture as 'what remains when one has forgotten everything' (Faure, 1999: 188). If I were asked what would remain on the *Chinese* mind when all else is forgotten, my answer would be Yin Yang. Yin Yang represents a paradoxical, integrated, holistic, harmonious, and changing worldview and lifestyle. Chen (2001) notes that *zhongguo*, the mandarin word for 'China' which literally translates as 'Middle Kingdom' and is commonly interpreted as suggesting that the Chinese view themselves as a superior people at the center of the universe, refers, as a matter of fact, to the philosophical principle of being 'in the middle' – of maintaining a balanced and integrated life.

In this article, the spirit of Yin Yang has sparked us to touch the base of one of Hofstede's national culture dimensions. The Yin Yang principle has far-reaching implications for our cross cultural theory building in general. For decades the field of cross cultural research has been predominated by a functionalist paradigm of national culture, which analyzes culture in terms of *bipolarized* cultural dimensions. Geert Hofstede's (1980) *Culture's Consequences* represents the peak of such scholarship. National cultures are classified essentially as clustering around two poles of these dimensions. Cultures are individualistic or collectivistic, low-context or high-context, long-term oriented or short-term oriented, P-time (polychronic) or M-time (monochronic), and so on. Conventional cross cultural wisdom abounds with such 'either/or' lists. The strength of this paradigm lies in its clarity and parsimony in isolating culture-general variables/dimensions and contrasting one culture against another in terms of these variables/dimensions, thereby facilitating cross cultural comparisons. However, as many scholars (see, e.g. Fang, 2002; Lowe, 2001; McSweeney, 2002a, b; Tayeb, 2001; Williamson, 2002) have pointed out, the paradigm does not cope well with the intricacy, diversity, richness and dynamism of culture; the field calls for fresh air and new visions.

The Yin Yang philosophy suggests that human beings, organizations, and cultures, like all other universal phenomena, intrinsically crave variation and harmony for their sheer existence and healthy development. We are 'both/and' instead of 'either/or'. We are both Yin and Yang, feminine and masculine, long-term and short-term, individualistic and collectivistic, . . . depending on situations, context and time. Saying this, I do not mean to imply that the concept of culture is useless. Culture is too important, subtle, sensual, delicate, colorful and fluid to be left only to the functionalist paradigm. We need larger 'both/and' frameworks. We need, for example, to develop models to explain why,

to what extent, and in what circumstances a group of people behave as *both* individualists *and* collectivists; why subcultures and regional cultures within and across a national culture can differ diametrically from the national culture; why and how contingencies, i.e. particularistic and unexpected events, can ignite a cultural change process and contribute to eventual and continuous transformation of a culture into its opposite. The Yin Yang philosophy empowers us with an important perspective to develop a dynamic and holistic approach to cross cultural research. In line with the philosophical spirit of Yin Yang, recent interest in paradox, pluralism, postmodernism, and change in organization and management studies (e.g. Clegg, 2002; Clegg et al., 2002; Glynn et al., 2000; Kilduff and Dougherty, 2000; Kilduff and Mehra, 1997; Leana and Barry, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Poole and Van de Ven, 1989; Quinn and Cameron, 1988) offers important insights from which we cross cultural management researchers can learn and borrow.

Geert Hofstede is a great scholar of our times; he has been inspiring us to catch up and move on.[6] Culture is full of life, energy, complexity, diversity and paradox. Our cross cultural theories should capture such dynamism.

Notes

The first draft of this article was presented at The Academy of Management Annual Meeting, San Diego, 9–12 August 1998. I would like to thank the two IJCCM anonymous reviewers and the IJCCM Editor Terence Jackson for pushing me to clarify and sharpen my arguments. Thanks also go to many researchers with whom I have had inspiring discussions on the subject that the article tackles.

1   In Hofstede's initial study (1980), 40 countries were included; in his later study (1983a), 13 more countries were added. For the sake of simplicity, the term 'countries' in this article refers to 'countries and regions'.

2   Hofstede (1993: 90) writes: 'It [Confucian dynamism] was composed, both on the positive and on the negative side, from items that had not been included in the IBM studies but were present in the Chinese Value Survey because they were rooted in the teachings of Confucius. I labeled this dimension: *Long-term* versus *Short-term Orientation*.'

3   Here 'fit' is meant in a functionalist paradigm.

4   Guanxi ('relationship', 'personal contacts', 'connections'), Yin Yang, and Wu Wei ('doing nothing', 'to act without acting') as indigenous Chinese values are discussed extensively in the Chinese culture and management literature (e.g. Ambler, 1994; Chan, 1963; Chen, 2001, 2002; Cooper, 1990; Davies et al., 1995; Fan, 2002; Fang, 1999; Lin, 1996; Luo, 2000; Pye, 1982; Redding, 1990; Xin and Pearce, 1996; Yang, 1994; Yeung and Tung, 1996). Wu Wei is also believed to be 'at the center of the Taoist paradigm' (Redding, 1990: 50).

5   Based on personal communication with J.P. Singh.

6   Geert Hofstede (2001: 466) holds that his work 'does not present a finished theory' and encourages us to continue our 'exploration' to 'serve the understanding of cultural differences and the improvement of intercultural communication and cooperation, which the world will increasingly and forever need'.

References

A Modern Chinese–English Dictionary (1994) Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Adler, N.J. (1991) *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, 2nd edn. Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.

Ambler, T. (1994) 'Marketing's Third Paradigm: Guanxi', *Business Strategy Review* 5(4): 69–80.

Bo, Y. (1992) *The Ugly Chinaman and the Crisis of Chinese Culture*. St Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Bond, M.H. and Hofstede, G. (1989) 'The Cash Value of Confucian Values', *Human Systems Management* 8: 195–200.

Carroll, S. and Gannon, M.J. (1997) *Ethical Dimensions of International Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chan, A.M. (1998) 'Construction of a Chineseness Value Scale and a Chineseness Ethnicity Scale', paper presented at the Association for Consumer Research Asia-

Pacific Conference (June), Hong Kong.

Chan, W.-T. (1963) *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chen, M.J. (2001) *Inside Chinese Business: A Guide for Managers Worldwide*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Chen, M.J. (2002) 'Transcending Paradox: The "Middle Way" Perspective', *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 19: 179–99.

Cheng, S.K.K. (1990) 'Understanding the Culture and Behavior of East Asians: A Confucian Perspective', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 24(4): 510–15.

The Chinese Culture Connection (1987) 'Chinese Values and the Search for Culture-free Dimensions of Culture', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 18(2): 143–64.

Chu, C.N. (1992) *Thick Face Black Heart: The Path to Thriving, Winning & Succeeding*. Beaverton: AMC Publishing.

Clegg, S.R. (ed.) (2002) *Management and Organization Paradoxes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Clegg, S.R., da Cunha, J.V. and e Cunha, M.P. (2002) 'Management Paradoxes: A Relational View', *Human Relations* 55(5): 483–503.

Cooper, J.C. (1990) *Taoism: The Way of the Mystic*, revised edn. Wellingborough: The Aquarian Press.

Davies, H., Leung, K.P., Luk, T.K. and Wong, Y.H. (1995) 'The Benefits of "Guanxi": The Value of Relationships in Developing the Chinese Market', *Industrial Marketing Management* 24: 207–14.

Earley, P.C. (1997) *Face, Harmony, and Social Structure: An Analysis of Organizational Behavior across Cultures*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fan, Y. (2000) 'A Classification of Chinese Culture', *Cross Cultural Management* 7(2): 3–10.

Fan, Y. (2002) 'Questioning Guanxi: Definition, Classification and Implications', *International Business Review* 11(5): 543–61.

Fang, T. (1999) *Chinese Business Negotiating Style*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fang, T. (2001) 'Culture as a Driving Force for Interfirm Adaptation: A Chinese Case', *Industrial Marketing Management* 30(1): 51–63.

Fang, T. (2002) 'The Moon and the Sun of Culture: A Yin Yang Approach to Cross-cultural Management', paper presented as a keynote speech at the 2nd Doing Business Across Borders (DBAB) Conference, Newcastle Business School, Australia, 27–28 November,

http://www.newcastle.edu.au/journal/dbab/keynote.html, accessed April 2003.

Faure, G.O. (1999) 'The Cultural Dimension of Negotiation: The Chinese Case', *Group Decision and Negotiation* 8: 187–215.

Franke, R.H., Hofstede, G. and Bond, M.H. (1991) 'Cultural Roots of Economic Performance: A Research Note', *Strategic Management Journal* 12(Special Issue, Summer): 165–73.

Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Gao, G. (1996) 'Self and Other: A Chinese Perspective on Interpersonal Relationships', In W.B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey and T. Nishida (eds) *Communication in Personal Relationships across Cultures*, pp. 81–101. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gao, G., Ting-Toomey, S. and Gudykunst, W.B. (1996) 'Chinese Communication Processes', in M.H. Bond (ed.) *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology*, pp. 280–93. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Glynn, M.A., Barr, P.S. and Dacin, M.T. (2000) 'Pluralism and the Problem of Variety', *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 726–34.

Goffman, E. (1955) 'On Face-work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction', *Psychiatry* 18(3): 213–31.

Gu, Y.G. (1990) 'Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese', *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2): 237–57.

Gudykunst, W.B., Ting-Toomey, S. and Nishida, T. (eds) (1996) *Communication in Personal Relationships across Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Hofheinz, R. Jr and Calder, K.E. (1982) *The EastAsia Edge*. New York: Basic Books.

Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1983a) 'Dimensions of National Cultures in Fifty Countries and Three Regions', in J.B. Deregowski, S. Dziurawiec and R.C. Annis (eds) *Expiscations in Cross-cultural Psychology*, pp. 335–55. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hofstede, G. (1983b) 'The Cultural Relativity of Organizational Practices and Theories', *Journal of International Business Studies* 14(2): 75–89.

Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1993) 'Cultural Constraints in Management Theories', *Academy of Management Executive* 7(1): 81–94.

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

Hofstede, G. (2002) 'Dimensions Do Not Exist: A Reply to Brendan McSweeney', *Human Relations* 55(11): 1355–61.

Hofstede, G. and Bond, M.H. (1984) 'Hofstede's Culture Dimensions: An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Survey', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 15(4): 417–33.

Hofstede, G. and Bond, M.H. (1988) 'The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth', *Organizational Dynamics* 16(4): 5–21.

Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B. and Ohavy, D. (1990) 'Measuring Organizational Cultures: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study across Twenty Cases', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35 (June): 286–316.

Hsu, F.L.-K. (1963) *Clan, Caste, and Club.* Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Hu, H.C. (1944) 'The Chinese Concepts of "Face"', *American Anthropologist* 46(1): 45–64.

Huang, Q.Y., Leonard, J. and Chen, T. (1997) *Business Decision Making in China.* New York: International Business Press.

Jackson, T. and Aycan, Z. (2001) 'International Journal of Cross Cultural Management – Towards the Future', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 1(1): 5–9.

Kalé, S. (1996) 'How National Culture, Organizational Culture and Personality Impact Buyer–Seller Interactions.', in P. Ghauri and J.-C. Usunier (eds) *International Business Negotiations*, pp. 21–37. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kao, J. (1993) 'The Worldwide Web of Chinese Business', *Harvard Business Review* 93(March–April): 24–36.

Kilduff, M. and Dougherty, D. (2000) 'Change and Development in a Pluralistic World: The View from the Classics', *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 777–82.

Kilduff, M. and Mehra, A. (1997) 'Postmodernism and Organizational Research', *Academy of Management Review* 22(2): 453–81.

Kluckholn, F.R. and Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961) *Variations in Value Orientations.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Co.

Leana, C.R. and Barry, B. (2000) 'Stability and Change as Simultaneous Experiences in Organizational Life', *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 753–59.

Lewis, M.W. (2000) 'Exploring Paradox: Toward a More Comprehensive Guide', *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 760–76.

Lin, Y.T. (1939) *My Country and My People.* London: William Heinemann.

Lin, Y.T. (1996) *The Importance of Living* (First published in 1937). New York: William Morrow and Company.

Lowe, S. (2001) 'In the Kingdom of the Blind, the One-eyed Man is King', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 1(3): 313–32.

Luo, Y. (2000) *Guanxi and Business.* Singapore: World Scientific.

McSweeney, B. (2002a) 'Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith – A Failure of Analysis', *Human Relations* 55(1): 89–118.

McSweeney, B. (2002b) 'The Essentials of Scholarship: A Reply to Geert Hofstede', *Human Relations* 55(11): 1363–72.

Newman, K.L. and Nollen, S.D. (1996) 'Cultural and Congruence: The Fit between Management Practices and National Culture', *Journal of International Business Studies* 27(4): 753–79.

Ouyang, W.M. (1995) *Confucian Culture and Chinese Economy.* China: Northwestern Finance and Accounting University Press (in Chinese).

Poole, M.S. and Van de Ven, A.H. (1989) 'Using Paradox to Build Management and Organization Theories', *Academy of Management Review* 14(4): 562–78.

Punnett, B.J. (1999) 'Culture, Cross-national', in R.L. Tung (ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Business Management (IEBM) Handbook of International Business*, pp. 51–67. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Pye, L.W. (1982) *Chinese Commercial Negotiating Style.* Cambridge: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Quinn, R.E. and Cameron, K.S. (eds) (1988) *Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing.

Ralston, D.A, Gustafson, D.J., Elsass, P.M., Cheung, F.M. and Terpstra, R.H. (1992) 'Eastern Values: A Comparison of Managers in the United States, Hong Kong, and the People's Republic of China', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77(5): 664–71.

Ralston, D.A., Gustafson, D.J., Cheung, F.M.

and Terpstra, R.H. (1993) 'Differences in Managerial Values: A Study of United States, Hong Kong and PRC Managers', *Journal of International Business Studies* 24: 249–75.

Read, R. (1993) 'Politics and Policies of National Economic Growth', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Redding, S.G. (1990) *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Redding, S.G. and Ng, M. (1982) 'The Role of "Face" in the Organizational Perceptions of Chinese Managers', *Organization Studies* 3(3): 201–19.

Redpath, L. and Nielsen, M.O. (1997) 'A Comparison of Native Culture, Non-native Culture and New Management Ideology', *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 14(3): 327–39.

Roberts, K. and Boyacigiller, N. (1984) 'Cross-national Organizational Research: The Grasp of the Blind Man', in B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (eds) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 6, pp. 423–75. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Rollinson, D., Broadfield, A. and Edwards, D.J. (1998) *Organisational Behaviour and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Harlow: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Schütte, H. and Ciarlante, D. (1998) *Consumer Behavior in Asia*. New York: New York University Press.

Schwartz, S.H. (1992) 'Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theory and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries', in M. Zanna (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 25, pp. 1–65. New York: Academic Press.

Smith, P.B. (1996) 'National Cultures and the Values of Organizational Employees: Time for Another Look', in P. Joynt and M. Warner (eds) *Managing across Cultures: Issues and Perspectives*. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Smith, P.B. (2002) 'Culture's Consequences: Something Old and Something New', *Human Relations* 55(1): 119–35.

Søndergaard, M. (1994) 'Research Note: Hofstede's Consequences: A Study of Reviews, Citations and Replications', *Organization Studies* 15(3): 447–56.

Søndergaard, M. (2001) Book Review. 'Geert Hofstede, *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 1(2): 243–6.

Tayeb, M.H. (1988) *Organizations and National*

Culture: A Comparative Analysis. London: Sage.

Tayeb, M.H. (1994) 'Organizations and National Culture: Methodology Considered', *Organization Studies* 15: 429–46.

Tayeb, M.H. (2000) 'Hofstede', in M. Warner (ed.) *International Encyclopaedia of Business and Management*, 2nd edn, pp. 2574–9. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Tayeb, M.H. (2001) 'Conducting Research across Cultures: Overcoming Drawbacks and Obstacles', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 1(1): 91–108.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles (1975) (First published in 1933). Glasgow: Oxford University Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988) 'Intercultural Conflict Styles: A Face-negotiation Theory', in Y.Y. Kim and W.B. Gudykunst (eds), *Theories in Intercultural Communication*, pp. 213–35. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Triandis, H.C. (1982) Book Review. 'Hofstede's *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*', *Human Organization* 41(1): 86–90.

Triandis, H.C. (1993) Book Review. 'Hofstede's *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38(1): 132–4.

Triandis, H.C. (1995) *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tu, W.-M. (1984) *Confucian Ethics Today: The Singapore Challenge*. Singapore: Federal Publications.

Tu, W.-M. (1990) 'The Confucian Tradition in Chinese History', in P.S. Ropp (ed.) *Heritage of China: Contemporary Perspectives on Chinese Civilization*, pp. 112–37. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Tung, R.L. and Worm, V. (1997) 'East meets West: Northern European Expatriates in China', *Business and the Contemporary World* 9(1): 137–48.

Wierzbicka, A. (1996) 'Contrastive Sociolinguistics and the Theory of "Cultural Scripts": Chinese vs English', in M. Hellinger and U. Ammon (eds) *Contrastive Sociolinguistics*, pp. 313–44. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Williamson, D. (2002) 'Forward from a Critique of Hofstede's Model of National Culture', *Human Relations* 55(11): 1373–95.

Xin, K.R. and Pearce, J.L. (1996) 'Guanxi: Connections as Substitutes for Formal Institutional Support', *Academy of Management Journal* 39(6): 1641–58.

Yang, M.M.H. (1994) *Gifts, Favors, and Banquets: The Art of Social Relationships in China*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Yau, O.H.M. (1988) 'Chinese Cultural Values: Their Dimensions and Marketing Implications', *European Journal of Marketing* 22(5): 44–57.

Yau, O.H.M. (1994) *Consumer Behaviour in China: Customer Satisfaction and Cultural Values.* London: Routledge.

Yeh, R.-S. and Lawrence, J.J. (1995) 'Individualism and Confucian Dynamism: A Note on Hofstede's Cultural Root to Economic Growth', *Journal of International Business Studies* 26(3): 655–69.

Yeung, I.Y.M. and Tung, R.L. (1996) 'Achieving Business Success in Confucian Societies: The Importance of *Guanxi* (Connections)', *Organizational Dynamics* 25(2): 54–65.

Zhang, W.Y. (2001) *Property Rights, Government and Reputation.* Beijing: San Lian Shu Dian (in Chinese).

TONY FANG is Assistant Professor in the Stockholm University School of Business, Sweden.
[email: tony.fang@fek.su.se]

Résumé

Une critique de la cinquième dimension des cultures nationales de Hofstede (Tony Fang)

Sur la base de connaissances endogènes sur la culture et la philosophie chinoises, cette article apporte une critique de la cinquième dimension des cultures nationales de Hofstede, "le dynamisme confucianiste", aussi appelée "orientation à long terme". Les fondements sur lesquels s'appuient la définition de cette dimension ainsi que la méthodologie utilisée pour contruire son index sont analysés en détail. Un biais philosophique inhérent à cette "nouvelle" dimension apparaît, qui, associé à d'autres faiblesses méthodologiques, remet en question l'utilité de cette cinquième dimension de Hofstede. Les conclusions de l'article appellent à de nouvelles visions et perspectives pour développer des recherches comparatives.

摘要

關於HOFSTEDE的第五種國家文化價值觀的批評論述

Tony Fang

在對了解本土中國文化和哲學體系的基礎上，本文作者批評的論述了Geert Hofstede第五個國家文化觀 "孔子學說的力本論"，也被稱為 "長遠定位論"。作者對這項理論的產生根據以及這一文化層面的構成進行了分析驗證。本文作者認為這種所謂新文化價值層面存在着哲學誤區。基於這種誤區以及其它方法論上的缺點，Hofstede的第五種價值觀是否有用值得懷疑。本文作者在討論中，呼籲在跨文化理論研究中，應該有新的觀念及研究方向。