Summary
This little paper highlights development of cultural research and the key studies which have formed the MUSIC Intercultural Model. It names and details the sources which are mentioned during your intercultural training.

No one model can adequately explain the human condition. The MUSIC Intercultural Model seeks only to explain the key value differences in communication which can hinder the establishment and maintenance of successful business relationships between people of different cultures. The model does not value motivation, personal drivers or intelligence, but it does give valuable insight into what can be considered 'normal' and therefore acceptable communication and behavioural styles for different individuals.

No one area of the model should be viewed in isolation, and overlaps can and should be apparent. But just as height and gender in humans have a correlation, it would be false to assume that they are part of the same construct.

An appreciation of one's own cultural profile can only help to the individual to comprehend how (s)he views the world and is viewed by others, this is known as cultural awareness.

Cultural effectiveness gives the individual the power to be in control of how they are perceived by people of different cultures. Culturally effective people are curious as to how their own culture is seen, happy to self-criticise and also interested in learning more of other cultures. Having a model as a framework for this understanding is perhaps a useful start in this life-long process.

What is culture?
Anthropologists Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) analysed 164 types of cultural definitions before producing this comprehensive and now generally accepted definition:

> „Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment in artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; cultures systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as conditioning elements of future action."

Culture is therefore: (Adler 1991)

a Something that is shared by all or almost all members of some social group.

b. Something that the older members of the group try to pass on to the younger members

c. Something that shapes behaviour or structures one's perception of the world

The nineteenth Century - Revolution
The nineteenth century saw the publication of radical theorem such as *Darwin's Origin of the Species* (1859) and *Descent of Man* (1871), Lubbock's *Origin of Civilisation* (1870) and Bachofen's *Mutterrecht (Mother's Rights)* (1861). The new intellectual thinking was soon attributed to new sciences (Kroeber, 1918) of Psychology and Social Psychology, the separation being Psychology concentrates on biographic (mental organic phenomena) whereas Social Psychology concentrates on Culture history (superorganic phenomena).

The barriers between Social Psychology and Psychology became clearer after the addition of theory by George Mead (The creative I), Austrian Alfred Adler (Individual Psychology and inferiority complex) and Gordon Allport (intention; tolerance).

The Twentieth Century - The first fifty years of development
By 1936 Anthropology was an accepted science, the first chairs in the USA were established at the turn of the century (Harvard, Columbia, California). The separation between Social Psychology and Psychology became clearer and the term Anthropology became aligned to the study of culture.

As Kroeber observed in his address to the 1950 meeting of the American Anthropological Society that science had been useful for 'healing the sick and building bridges' but not for understanding what makes us tick.

From the mid 1920s a 'preoccupation with patterns as the structuring property of culture' (Kroeber, 1950 p148) emerged, supported largely by Boas, who arrived at Anthropology through mathematics and physics

Freud's *Totem and Taboo* helped to compartmentalise the role of psyche/personality and society/culture. The emerging role of the anthropologist was to facilitate understanding of culture and cultural history in an area where the role of the personality could 'clog understanding' of cultural context. So what had previously been perceived as 'the investigation of oddments by the eccentric' slowly became an accepted science of equitable study of intersocietal and intercultural understanding and acculturation, a term first used by McGee in the 1890s.

The fifties and sixties - The study of management behaviour

In 1954 Abraham Maslow published *Motivation and Personality* and unleashed his vision of 'self actualised man' to the management world. His now famous 'hierarchy of needs' leading to self-actualisation transcends cultural differences and separates human personality from culture by stating (p.351)

> "Research has established an important point in discovering that individuals can be healthier, even much healthier, than the culture in which they grow and live. This is possible primarily because of the ability of the healthy man to be detached from his surroundings, which is the same as saying that he lives by his inner laws rather than by outer pressures."

The definition of culture by Kroeber and Kluckhohn used at the beginning of this paper has been used as the basis of most cultural studies since its publication in 1952 the initial words are key "Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit of and for behaviour". The pattern element properly takes priority.

The dictionary definition (Oxford, 1992) of pattern as a "Mould for casting" or "a regular arrangement" is an appropriate concept for our behaviour, as stated by Goodman (1967 p.39)

> " A culture pattern is, then, both mould and modality. It is a mould in functioning as a guide for behaviour. It is a modality in that it is a central tendency (in the statistical sense) of behaviour."

Kroeber and Kluckhohn deal with implicit and explicit patterns, this theme was later explored by Edward T Hall (1959) in "The Silent Language", where he states (p92)

> "Entire systems of behaviour made up of hundreds of thousands of details are passed from generation to generation, and nobody can give the rules for what is happening. Only when the rules are broken do we realise that they exist… The principal agent is a model used for imitation."

.

The 70s and 1980s: Recognising the patterns, measuring the trends

By this time it was clear that the study of culture was a science in itself; and that its study would be complex and controversial. One writer produced what was to become the standard text of any student studying international business – the Dutchman Geert Hofstede and his book 'Culture's Consequences' (1980).

At this time Geert Hofstede was working for IBM in Belgium, responsible for international management development. In 1968 and again in 1972, using staff in 40 different countries, he carried out the first large-scale measurement of individuals' attitudes to certain cultural dimensions. His work was based on the theoretical (literature based) assumptions of three sets of predecessors,

- Parsons and Shils
- Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck
- Inkeles and Levison

Parsons and Shils, in their General Theory of Action (1952) developed the following pattern variables, which they argued could be used to explain all human action.

1. Affectivity versus affective neutrality (compulsion versus restraint)
2. Self-orientation versus collective orientation
3. Universalism versus particularism (general standards versus particular standards)
4. Ascription versus achievement (judging others by who they are or what they do)
5. Specifity versus diffuseness (type of relationships established)

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) studied various ethnic groups in the USA and ascribed these descriptions to explain their actions.

1. Evaluation of human nature
2. Mastery of surrounding natural environment
3. Orientation in time
4. Orientation towards activity
5. Relationships among people

In their literature review of 1969, Inkeles and Levinson identify three 'standard analytic issues' which can be used to explain culture:

1. Relation to authority
2. Conception of self; including the individual's concepts of masculinity and femininity
3. Primary dilemmas or conflicts and ways of dealing with them, including aggression expression versus inhibition.

Hofstede argues in Culture's Consequences (1980) that his surveys 'discovered' four dimensions of culture, in reality his questionnaire was designed to promote responses relating to the above three theories. Hofstede's original four categories are

1. Power distance - inequality and hierarchy
2. Uncertainty Avoidance - anxiety tolerance
3. Individualism / Collectivism - extent of responsibilities to society
4. Masculinity / Femininity - the individual's concepts of these issues

One of the main breakthroughs of Hofstede's work was the diagrammatic illustration of cultural differences. Each culture was given a position on a bi-polar cultural scale. This enabled easy comparison of cultures and the assessment of similarities and/or differences and thereby allowing potential problem areas in intercultural communication to be identified.

Geert Hofstede's work has become the standard for business schools and intercultural researchers, but the question of 'forced fit' of results and appropriateness of categories must be explored. Indeed in Hofstede's 1991 work Cultures and Organisations - intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival, he admits a 'western bias' (p160) to his work and refers to a new dimension discovered by Michael Bond called 'Confuscian Dynamism'. This dimension was established from the results of a values survey issued to one hundred students (50 male, 50 female) in each of 22 countries. In practical terms, this relates to a long-term versus short-term orientation in life.

The long term descriptors include
- persistance
- ordering relationships by status and observing this order
- thrift
- having a sense of shame

Short-term descriptors are:
- personal steadiness and stability
- protecting your 'face'
- respect for tradition
- reciprocation of greetings, favours and gifts

Although some of these areas border on the dimensions of uncertainty avoidance (personal steadiness) and power distance (ordering relationships by status), the other factors do not 'fit' with the Hofstede model. However they are close to the work of anthropologist husband and wife team Edward Hall and Mildred Reed-Hall, who (1983) also tried to "Provide readers with a framework by revealing underlying patterns of behaviour…showing critical relationships between different parts of culture:"

Whereas Hofstede validated his dimensions through questionnaires, the Halls used in-depth interviews and combined the responses with cultural models to establish possible dimensions.

Their published results show the following dimensions:

1. Monochronic/ polychronic - approach to time
2. High and low context - the amount of background knowledge present in normal conversation, direct and indirect speech.
3. Space - attitudes to personal space and territory

The Halls' work is based on the improvement of communication "it is better to release the right responses than to think you have sent the correct messages.", whereas Hofstede's work seeks to categorise values. It is a weakness of Hofstede's not to include attitudes to time and communication style (a stretched high/ low context) as values.

Edgar Schein takes up this cause in 1985 with the publication of Organisational Culture and Leadership. In this book he goes back to the root dimensions identified by Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck and Parsons & Schils, and expands on these dimensions by drawing on the work of both Hofstede and the Halls. Schein argues that "One of the reasons that organisational theory has not progressed further… is that most of the typologies which are published tend to be unidimensional" (p111) and argues for the need to understand the whole of the cultural paradigm. He argues for the use of many dimensions;

> "At the least we should take all of the assumption areas described… We can then attempt to answer systematically that there is no culture…or culture conflict between several groups. But unless we push to this level of analysis we should not make any statement about culture at all."

The following year (Brislin, 1986) the idea of 'taking all of the assumption areas' was taken to the extreme in Intercultural Interactions - a practical guide with the identification and explanation of 18 "Cultural Themes", listed below:

1. Anxiety and Related Emotional States
2. Emotional experience and disconfirmed expectancies
3. Belonging
4. Ambiguity
5. Prejudice and Ethnocentrism
6. Work
7. Time and Space
8. Language
9. Roles
10. Importance of group versus individual
11. Ritual and superstition
12. Hierarchies
13. Values
14. Categorisation
15. Differentiation
16. Ingroup: outgroup distinction
17. Learning styles
18. Attribution

Many of these catogories can be directly linked to the root models and to Hofstede's and Halls' work. Some of these categories relate more to personality than to culture (learning styles, work) and are an indication of the still present blurring between psychology and anthropology deemed dangerous by Kroeber in 1950.

At this stage it became clear that different levels of interpretation were required dependent of the needs of the cultural student.

The establishment of needs groups from tourists to expatriates to managers of international businesses opened up the market for niche publications.

This story follows the development of research and books aimed at managers of international business.

The 1990s - Commercial Exploitation; Culture as a business tool

Just as the word Globalisation gained acceptance in the business world, the world inter-cultural lost its hyphen and became a well used prefix to words such as understanding, effectiveness, communication, conflict, efficiency, tolerance, dynamic, training and audit.

A wealth of management focused books ensued, most taking Hofstede's four dimension model as a base and applying this to practical situations. Nancy Adler (1991) applies the model to

- cultural differences affect on the organisation
- cultural synergy and
- communication.

1991 also saw the publication of Borden's Cultural Orientation - an approach to understanding intercultural communication. This book also uses Hofstede's four dimension model and also includes Parsons and Shils' Particularism vs. Universalism. The breakthrough in this book is the connection between intercultural theory and communication effectiveness; the practical application of theoretical knowledge. To build this effectiveness Borden concentrates on human communication codes, dimensions and constraints; then builds in the additional filter of cultural differences. Hofstede's four dimensions are positioned as "helping us to understand the intercultural communication process." This book straddles psychology and anthropology with its focus on human communication and the individual's response, justifying this by stating "When you become involved in an intercultural communication event, you find out how little you know about yourself and your culture. It may be a frightening experience, but there is no better way to understand yourself."(p221)

A former student of Geert Hofstede, Fons Trompenaars and management consultant Charles Hampden-Turner breached the divide between academic tome and commercial management book with the publication of Riding the Waves of Culture[i]. This upbeat book heavily relies on Hofstede's research in the four dimensions, but draws on the constructs of Parsons & Shils and Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck to complete his seven dimension model, as shown below.

The dimensions are defined briefly below.

Universalist / Particularist

Definable and fixed viewpoint versus circumstance driven solution

Individualism/ Communitarianism
The belief in individual influence versus the loyalty to society

Neutral/ Affective
The role of emotion in the workplace, neutral being without emotional involvement, affective combining emotional involvement with working style and decision making.

Specific/ Diffuse
The separation of the private persona from the workplace (specific) or the access to the 'whole person' in the working environment (diffuse).

Sequential / Synchronic
Attitudes to time and abilities to multi-task (synchronic) or prioritising single tasks (sequential).

Achievement/ Ascripted
You are the product of your circumstances (ascripted) versus you are who you make yourself to be (achievement).

Nature controlling/ nature controlled
Whether the individual is more or less powerful than nature.

This seven point model covers new ground as the previously theoretical constructs were tested through questionnaire based research. Over 30,000 respondents completed a short survey, constructed to establish the participant's personal profile against these seven categories. The collaboration with Hampden-Turner provided practical case studies and examples of the seven behavioural types, and also strategies for dealing with differences. In a possible spat of rivalry, Trompenaars responds to a criticism by Hofstede of the amount of dimensions introduced by stating (p254);

> "Although, as Hofstede claims, responses to some of Trompenaars' questions may correlate for many countries and therefore these dimensions might be combined, the separate dimensions are required for many specific cases such as Gulf countries (ignored by Hofstede) because for these counties they do correlate…. And let's remember that in the same way that gender correlates to height, just because two dimensions correlate is not the same as saying that they are measuring the same construct."

The model was further developed (Trompenaars, 2000) and revised. The category 'Neutral/ Affective' was dropped and the 'Nature controlling/ Nature controlled' category has been renamed Inner Direction (conscience and convictions are located inside) and Outer Direction (examples and influences are located outside).

Some writers have been less concerned with the accuracy or number of dimensions to describe culture. New Zealand Management Communications Professor Margaret McLaren (1998) cleverly combines the work of Hofstede and Hall and considers the impact of non-verbal communication. She also makes the link between 'face saving' and high-context cultures, and while refering to O'Sullivan (1994) "although face and politeness are important in culture, the way to be polite will differ markedly according to the culture".

The need for a practical and pragmatic cultural model

For the first eighty years of the twentieth century the mission was to establish a credible platform for the new and distinctly defined science of cultural study. Through the empirical testing of theoretical constructs, notably by Hofstede, widely accepted cultural dimensions and cultural positioning within these dimensions has been established.

There appear to be two main danger areas which have emerged

1. the blurring between cultural observation and business psychology
2. applying one model to all situations

The danger of the first area being the lack of separation and focus of the cultural influences on the situation and the temptation to explain differences in understanding through personality issues rather that cultural context.

The second model is perhaps more dangerous, for example the repercussions of a cultural audit between an American and Arabian country using Hofstede's model would find many similarities, as the aspects of time and context (where there are substantial differences) would not be explored.

Industrial globalisation brings with it the need to successfully attain cultural assimilation within the minimum time period. For many companies, competitive advantage will be achieved by forming strategic alliances with cultures very different from their own, and future customers will be found in newly emerging markets which are often 'foreign' in every sense of the word. It is clear that a 'one size fits all' approach to business can only have limited acceptance in a global marketplace, and that being effective in business also means forming strong relationships with suppliers, coworkers and customers from a diverse range of cultures.

So What is MUSIC?

The MUSIC Intercultural Model was designed by THE BRIDGE international Management Consulting Ltd in 1996 to help businesses become more aware and effective when dealing with people from different cultures. The name for the model is an acronym and is based on five cultural dimensions, which through research and practical experience of international projects, have shown to represent the

major value differences with conflict potential in global business.

The model compliments research from Hall, Trompenaars and Hofstede in addition to the validation and refinement carried out by THE BRIDGE in its ongoing work with international teams.

The five categories are:
1. Matrix of Relationships
2. Uncertainty Tolerance
3. Sequencing of Time
4. I and We
5. Communication Context

Matrix Of Relationships

The core question behind this concept is "How well do I have to know you before I feel comfortable doing business with you". The key word here is comfort. Our comfort level is internally defined and therefore culturally influenced. In some cultures this comfort level is achieved by knowing that the person is well qualified and works for a known and respected company. This could be described as a Task Orientation. In other cultures these factors are also important but are not enough to give one the comfort level needed in order to enter into a business relationship. In these cultures a much stronger relationship is needed before making important decisions. This could be described as People orientation. Neither approach is better than the other, but the appropriate approach is necessary if business success is to be achieved.

Trompenaars (2000) uses the categorisation of Specific versus Diffuse cultures.

This is simply defined as "The separation of the private persona from the workplace (specific) or the access to the 'whole person' in the working environment (diffuse)".

One measure of this is to consider if in a culture a company is more Specific (task focused) or Diffuse (relationship focused) is to consider which of the following statements is a more appropriate description of 'normal' business behaviour.

a) A company is a system designed to perform tasks in a certain way. People are hired to perform the tasks with the help of machines and other equipment. They are paid for the tasks they perform.

b) A company is a group of people working together. They have social relations with other people and with the organisation. The successful functioning is dependent on these relations.

Within A type (task focused) corporate cultures there is no need to establish strong personal relationships in order to fulfil my task successfully. In B type (relationship focused) corporate cultures the fulfilment of the task is dependent on the ability

of the individual to establish and sustain strong personal relationships.

Not surprisingly the communication styles vary strongly between the two cultural extremes. In task focused cultures the individual has the responsibility to voice their opinion clearly. In relationship focused cultures a strong filter is apparent between what is thought and what it is appropriate to say. This is often evident in discussions between hierarchical levels and is explained by Hofstede (1980, 1994) as Power Distance.

Power Distance is the 'extent to which less powerful members of institutions and organisations within a country accept and expect that power is distributed unequally'.

Close working relationships between subordinates and their managers are seen in all cultures. The expected role of subordinate and boss are however defined differently in cultures with small or large power distance.

In cultures with small power distance, subordinated happily challenge the opinion of their manager, there is a limited dependence from the subordinate to the boss and subordinates will happily both approach and contradict the opinion of the boss. These cultures tend to be more task focused. The more formal relationships in these cultures and the strongly defined roles and responsibilities encourage a culture of challenge.

Cultures with large power distance often have autocratic of paternalistic leadership styles. These are often relationship focused cultures. In these cultures the subordinate has a strong personal relationship with their manager, who often plays the role of 'Patron' to the more junior members of the organisation. In large power distance cultures, an inequality of power is not only expected but also preferred. A tacit acceptance of this is prevalent in the organisation.

Uncertainty Tolerance
This also relates to an invisible comfort level which every human being needs. The subjective decision of when enough is enough is answered by people of different Uncertainty Tolerance levels differently.

Hofstede (1980) refers to Uncertainty Avoidance (the same dimension as Uncertainty Tolerance but described from the opposite end of the scale) as "the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations. This feeling is expressed through nervous stress and in a need for predictability; a need for written and unwritten rules."

The idea here is that, as human beings, we are constantly confronted with uncertainties. All cultures have developed ways of relieving the anxiety of dealing with uncertainty, and an appreciation that different cultures have different tolerance levels for uncertain situations and secondly different ways of dealing with uncertainty raises awareness of potential conflict situations where one party may be feeling uncomfortable about a situation for which another party from a different culture is completely comfortable.

Trompenaars (2000) uses the categorisation of universalism/ particularism describes universalism as emphasising rules that apply to a universe of people, which particularism emphasizes exceptions and particular cases. Universalism searches for sameness and similarity and tries to impose on all members of a class or universe the laws of their commonality, whereas particularism searches for differences, for unique and exceptional forms of distinction that render phenomena incomparable and of matchless quality.

The relationship from uncertainty tolerance to universalism/ particularism is paradoxical. Cultures with a low tolerance for uncertainty (France, Germany) are also particularist. This means that freedom is attained within a strict code of rules, and that 'testing' barriers and borders is an acceptable behaviour, meaning that a low tolerance for uncertainty and a need for conformity are not the same thing. Cultures that have universalist tendencies (USA, UK) where the enforcement of universal behaviours and universal acceptance is the norm also have high tolerance for uncertainty. The paradox here is that the globalising company with a high uncertainty tolerance culture may also be more rigid in enforcing global standards, policies and procedures common in a universalist culture. A company in a similar position from a particularist/ low uncertainty tolerance culture may approach globalisation with the mindset of integration of local cultural needs more readily.

Uncertainty tolerance relates therefore to some extent, to the strength of self-belief in the inherent strength of our own system, with cultures of lower uncertainty tolerance more ready to call into question their own assumptions and beliefs.

As noted by Hofstede (1994) 'In the area of philosophy and science grand theories are more likely to be conceived within strong uncertaintly avoidance (low uncertainty tolerance) cultures than in the opposite. In Europe, Germany and France have more great philosophers than the UK or Sweden (like Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche and Sartre).' The great positivist schools of thought have also emerged from Germany and Austria (the Frankfurt and Vienna school of positivism respectively), and even the American schools of positivist thought were heavily contributed to by refugee German philosophers in the 1930s and 1940s.

Sequencing of Time
Micheal Bond's upgrade of Hofstede's work (1994) to include Confucian Dynamism brings in the concept of different approaches to time and its associated value. The construct is bi-polar. One end of the scale is described as 'Long Term Orientation' which shows a strong future orientation and the category descriptors of perseverance and

thrift. The other end of the scale is 'Short Term Orientation' which is orientated towards the past and present, including the descriptors of respect for tradition and personal steadiness and stability. Both ends of the scale (and everywhere in-between) relate to the teaching of Confucius, and within Asia vast differences in orientation are seen. Hofstede also notes that these differences may surprise the western reader, but that as they are based on values shown to be not inherently conscious throughout much of the western world this, on reflection, should not be surprising. The scale represents value differences within a set of cultures that from the outside can appear more similar than different. An appreciation of the differences between these cultures can help the observer to appreciate possible sources of discrepancy and conflict within the Asian environment.

From a wider perspective, Trompenaars (2000) observes these differences and focuses on the Sequential or Synchronic abilities of a culture.

Chronos, Greek god of clock time, symbolises a sequential approach to life. Do one thing at a time and do this to the best of your abililty. Kairos, Greek god of time and opportunity represents a synchronic approach of doing many things at once and letting things happen in their own natural rhythm.

These two approaches are also defined in Hall's (1983) work that establishes a mono-chronic view of time versus a poly-chronic view of time. Monochronism is aligned to sequential thinking. Monochronic people measure time precisely and value it highly. In monochromic societies it is a sin to 'waste' time and a virtue to 'save' time. Time is therefore a valuable and almost tangible commodity.

In polychronic societies time is not a tangible material. It is as invisible and as plentiful as the air that we breathe, and to be told that one is 'wasting' time is as relevant as to be told you are 'wasting' air by breathing too much oxygen. In Africa there is the concept of 'African time' meaning that things will happen when they will happen. In South Africa there is a common saying among non-whites that 'You have the watch, but I have the time.' Showing that the monochronic party can try to put pressure on to polychronic people, but unless a value is shared the pressure will not be accepted or perhaps even recognised.

Hall (1983) also identifies a link between how we view time and how we view space. Polychronic people often have smaller space bubbles their monochronic counterparts. All human beings have a natural distance at which they will comfortable engage in conversation. This distance varies according to the relationship between the sender and the receiver, and will be closer with an intimate partner that with a stranger or disliked work colleague. In addition to this, these distances vary from culture to culture. In general, monochronic cultures have a larger space bubble (natural personal space) than polychonic cultures.

I and We
This area has been described (Kim and Triandis, 1994) as the fundamental and most important area of cultural difference.

The core concepts when considering how individualistic or collectivist orientated a culture is include:

> The definition of 'self' and the need for peer recognition

The extent of inherent support from the individual to society and the amount of support which an individual should expect from society.

Hofstede (1994) defines individualistic cultures as cultures where 'the ties between individuals are loose, everyone is expected to look after themselves and the individual members of their family. Collectivism is defined as societies where 'people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty'. In Hofstede's studies it was shown that individualistic cultures had work goals which included freedom, work-life balance and challenge (personal accomplishment) In collectivist cultures these items were lowly ranked and the preference was for good training, excellent working conditions and being able to use one's abilities at work.

Trompenaars' work overlaps strongly with Hofstede's in this area. His categories of Achievement/ Ascripted, Individualism, communitarianism, Nature controlling/ nature controlled (inner versus outer direction) are all symptoms of individualistic versus collectivist values.

Achievement/ Ascription (You are the product of your circumstances (ascripted) versus you are who you make yourself to be (achievement)) demonstrates the responsibility of the individual for their own 'success' in life. Individualism/communitarianism test this core concept with the loyalty toward society or the individual. Individualistic people feel guilty (disappointment of self) whereas people in communitarianism cultures feel a sense of shame (disappointment of others).

For Trompenaars Individualism 'seeks to locate the origins of value in the creative, feeling, inquiring and discovering person who seeks fulfilment and is solely respons'ible for choices made and convictions formed.' The communitariast however seeks to 'locate origins of value within the society, which nurtures, educates and takes responsibility for the spirit engendered among its members.'

The third Trompenaars category described under I and We is inner versus outer direction (Trompenaars, 2000) Inner directed cultures believe that 'deep down we know what is right' whereas outer directed cultures place value in learning 'the way of things'.

Communication Context

Hall's (1959) anthroprological research identified that some cultures (high context) expel much effort in gathering minor amounts of information. The result of this is that when a conversation between two members of this culture takes place about a subject of shared interest, much background knowledge will already be present. Therefore the conversation itself will act as more of a connector for previously gathered scraps of knowledge than the whole story itself. This kind of communication is called high context, as the context (or background) is needed in order to understand the whole situation.

High context cultures are also often cultures in which indirect speech and implied meanings are commonly used.

Low context cultures use more direct speech and clear communication. In these cultures less 'scrap gathering' of information takes place and therefore a conversation between two people with a shared interest must include more background information and detail in order for the meaning to be clear. Low context societies place value on clarity of message, whereas in high context cultures many messages are half-said or implied, but rarely clearly stated.

Hofstede uses the un-PC terms of Masculinity and Femininity, the concepts of which in communication terms fall within the High/ Low context category. Masculine cultures are assertive and conflicts in the workplace should be confronted and fought with energy. These constructs are valued in low context cultures. Feminine cultures value modesty and conflict situations should be avoided through tact and diplomacy and careful negotiation, these values are highly regarded in high context cultures.

Trompenaars (2000) has researched one other area that helps us to understand that not all high context or low context cultures are the same. This is the area of neutral/ affective styles.

The level of affect a culture has relates to the level of permissive emotion in a situation. A conversation between two people of an affective culture can be a lively and emotional exchange. In a neutral culture, even if the subject is highly emotional for the individuals concerned, a measure of restraint and rational debate is still required.

High context cultures have strong filters between what is seen and what is said. These filters are intensified if the culture is also a neutral one (such as Japan), as a strongly emotional request will still be voiced in an impartial voice.

In a low context culture there is less need for filtering and as clear communication is highly valued, one should clearly state what one is thinking. If this low context culture is also an affective one (such as Israel), the full measure of emotions can also be expressed.

Key studies that helped MUSIC's development

Adler, N (1991) *International Dimensions of organisational behaviour.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing

Borden, G (1991) *Cultural Orientation - an approach to understanding intercultural communication.* London: Prentice Hall

Boulding, K. (1956) *General Systems Theory: The Skeleton of Science* in Management Science, 2 pp 202-205

Brislin, R. et al (1986) *Intercultural Interactions - a practical guide.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Elashmawi, F & Harris, P (1993) *Multicultural Management - New Skills for Global Success.* Houston: Gulf Publishing

Goodman, Mary (1967) *The individual and Culture.* Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press

Hall, Edward T (1959) *The Silent language.* New York: Doubleday & Co

Hall, E. & Reed-Hall, M. (1983) *Hidden Differences - Studies in Intercultural Communication.* Hamburg: Grüner & Jahr

Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences.* Beverly Hills CA: Sage

Hofstede, G (1994) Cultures and Organisations - intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival. London: Harper Collins Business

Inkeles, A. & Levinson, D. (1969*) National Character: The study of modal personality and sociocultural systems* in G. Lindzey & Aronson E. (Eds.) The handbook of social psychology, vol. 4 Reading MA: Adison-Wesley

Kim, U & Triandis, H. (1994) *Individualism and Collectivism.* London: Sage

Kluckhohn F. & Stroedbeck, F. *Variations in value orientations* (1961) Westport, CT: Greenwood Press

Kroeber (1918) The Possibility of a Social Psychology in The Nature of Culture (1952) Chicago: Chicago University Press. pp52-56.

Kroeber, A.L. & Kluckhohn, F.(1952) Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions. Peabody Museum Papers, Vol 47, no. 1, page 181. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press

Maslow, Abraham H (1954) *Motivation and Personality.* New York: Harper & Row

McLaren, M (1998) Interpreting Cultural Differences - *The challenge of intercultural communication.* Dereham, Norfolk: Peter Francis Publishing

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

Schein, E. (1985) *Organisational Culture and Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Simons, G. Vazquez, C and Harris, P (1993*) Transcultural Leadership - Empowering the diverse workforce.* Houston: Gulf Publishing

Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C. (1993) *Riding the waves of culture.* London: Nicholas Brealy

Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C. (2000) *Building Cross-Cultural Competence*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons

i

Jon Jeeves
THE BRIDGE ©
Jon is a director of THE BRIDGE and has five years of PhD studies in intercultural issues. He is a consultant to global companies on international collaboration and cross-cultural leadership.

bridgeconsultantds.info
info@bridgeconsultants.info