

Field : Sociology, Cultural Studies

Type : Review Article

Received: 02.03.2018 - *Accepted*: 16.05.2018

The Evolution of Culture Concept in the Social History

Dr. Erdem ERCIYES

The MINUJUSTH-United Nations, Port au Prince, HAITI

Email: erdemerciyes@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research aims to clarify impact of social and historical developments on culture concept. Reality of culture is shaped by economic, social, political, cultural and historical developments. In addition, due to researcher's experience on cultural studies, the researcher and the research subject are linked and personal values of researcher influence the inquiry. Therefore, results are subjective and there is a need for dialogue between researcher and research subject in order to strike a balance. To these effects, the research philosophical perspective leans heavily on "phenomenology" with critical theory. This research contributes to the understanding of both cultural and social history. Organizational culture and national culture are separated concepts, but when they reflect on work practice, these concepts intersect and interact. Further researches may focus on contradiction of national and organizational culture dimension.

Keywords: Critical theory, culture, national culture, organizational culture, social history



Kültür Kavramının Sosyal Tarihteki Evrimi

Öz

Bu araştırma, sosyal ve tarihsel gelişmelerin kültür kavramı üzerindeki etkisini açıklığa kavuşturmayı amaçlamaktadır. Kültürün gerçekliği ekonomik, sosyal, politik, kültürel ve tarihsel gelişmelerle şekillenmektedir. Buna ek olarak, araştırmacının kültürel araştırmalar üzerindeki deneyimleri nedeniyle, araştırmacı ve araştırma konusu birbirine bağlıdır ve araştırmacının kişisel değerleri araştırmayı etkilemektedir. Bundan dolayı sonuçlar öznel ve bir denge kurmak için araştırmacı ve araştırma konusu arasında diyaloga ihtiyaç olmaktadır. Tüm bu nedenlerle, araştırmacının felsefi perspektifi eleştirel teoriyle birlikte fenomenolojiye dayanmaktadır. Bu araştırma kültürel ve sosyal tarih anlayışlarına katkıda bulunmaktadır. Örgüt kültürü ve ulusal kültür ayrılmış kavramlardır, ancak çalışma pratiği üzerine düşündükleri zaman, bu kavramlar kesişir ve etkileşir. Daha ileri araştırmalar, ulusal ve örgütsel kültür boyutunun çelişmesi üzerine odaklanabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eleştirel teori, kültür, milli kültür, örgütsel kültür, sosyal tarih



1. Introduction

Theory has played a fundamental role in the history of social science development. Many theories have changed the direction of social science and have given a new way to it based on their hypotheses and perspectives. Furthermore, theory provides a better understanding to reality and knowledge of phenomenon in social history. Therefore, this research aimed to provide a reliable linkage of culture concept from historical perspective. Culture concept will be evaluated from a broad perspective to a specific focus. For critical theory, subjective humans develop theory in a historical and cultural context. Critical theory uses dialogic and dialectical methodology through developing dialectical dialogue between the researcher and research object. Dialectical dialogue should transform misunderstandings and ignorance into more informed consciousness (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Here, structures may be changed and actions are needed to effect change (Howell, 2013). To these effects, the researcher utilizes critical theory as a paradigm of inquiry in the research. The reality in critical theory referred to as historical realism desires to understand reality through historical analysis. This research will demonstrate the chronological development of culture and its intersubjective relation.

The term culture has been a key concept in anthropology since the 19th Century. Particularly in the US, anthropology was seen as a holistic discipline in social science, under two major divisions of physical anthropology and cultural anthropology (Fox, 1985). Physical anthropology is concerned with changes in the human form. In the 19th Century, these changes were seen from an evolutionary perspective¹ and were utilized to support the belief of white European superiority over other races. Nowadays, it is not utilized as a tool for scientific racism, but instead only focuses on human physical diversity in the world (Edgar and Sedwick, 1999). On the other hand, cultural anthropology accepts man as a social being (Kuper, 1985) and investigates culturally original thoughts and behaviours in a society (Rapport and Overing, 2000).

2. Cultural Anthropology

Tylor (1871:1), as one of the pioneers of cultural anthropology, departed from physical anthropology with his definition of culture:

“Culture or civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by as a member of society. The condition of culture among the various societies of mankind, in so far as it is capable of being investigated on general principles, is a subject apt for the study of laws of human thought and action.”

Tylor believed that there is no difference between the mind of a savage and that of civilized men, because human minds were the same everywhere. To this effect, culture concept was similar for all human beings (Ibid). Boas (1896) did not accept Tylor’s assumption about cultural similarity (Stocking, 1966) and developed the concept of cultural relativism (Hendry, 2008). His cultural relativism approach was based on, *“understanding the individual as living in his culture; and the culture as lived by individuals”* (Boas, 1959: 54). Because, according to him, every culture has its own relative system that was formed by the integration of its own

¹ The main representatives of this perspective were Morton (1839), Gobineau (1854), Darwin (1859), Vogt (1864), and Haeckel (1876).



symbols, ideals, and values (Stocking, 1966; Kuper, 1985; Eriksen and Nielsen, 2001). Unlike Boas, Mead (1970) saw culture from an evolutionary perspective and defined three types:

- a. *Postfigurative*: in which children learn primarily from their forebears,
- b. *Cofigurative*: in which both children and adults learn from their peers,
- c. *Prefigurative*: in which adults also learn from their children (Ibid: 31).

According to her, cultural evolution concept could be explained with the term, “generational interaction”, which shows the reflection of living time. In this context, human culture experienced an irreversible evolutionary change through generational interaction that was based on the past, present, and future orientations (Bois, 1971). While defining culture, like Mead, Geertz (1973) focused on the impact of history on social life:

Culture is “... an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about, and attitudes toward life” (Ibid: 89).

Even though Harris (1979) was known as a cultural anthropologist, he tried to create a scientific culture theory, named *cultural materialism*, which could be accepted not only by anthropologists but also by everyone else. He defined culture as, “the learned repertory of thoughts and actions exhibited by the members of social group” (Ibid: 47). His cultural materialism theory “...is a commitment to search for the probabilistic causes of human behavior in the infrastructure (the mode of production and the mode of reproduction)” (Ibid: 278). By the term cultural materialism, he tried to understand the similarities and differences in human thought and behaviour. Hence, he made a distinction between the terms “*emics* and *etics*”. In short, the term “emics” represents the local, or the native’s, perspective, while “etics” represents an observer or researcher’s perspective. These two terms complement each other while interpreting culture (Ibid). Additionally, he brought a major critique to sociology for trying to understand cultural dynamics of a society without synthesising emic and etic perspectives.

3. Relation of Sociology to Cultural Issues

The human, as a social being, was the central subject of sociology. Comtè (1856) was first to utilize the term *sociology* in today’s context. He divided human thought into three stages: religious or theological², metaphysical or abstract³, and scientific or positive⁴ (Honderich, 2005). Furthermore, he adapted principles of natural science to the social world. Sociology

² “The theological perspective develops dialectically through fetishism, polytheism, and monotheism, as events are understood as animated by their own will, that of several deities, or the decree of one Supreme Being.” <https://web.duke.edu/secmod/biographies/Comte.pdf> Accessed 04 August 2016

³ “As civilization progresses, the metaphysical stage begins as a criticism of these conceptions in the name of a new order. Supernatural entities are gradually transformed into abstract forces; just as political rights are codified into systems of law” (Ibid).

⁴ “The search for absolute knowledge is abandoned in favour of a modest but precise inquiry into the Relative laws of nature. The absolutist and feudal social orders are replaced gradually by increasing social progress achieved through the application of scientific knowledge” (Ibid).



relates to cultural issues investigated by the concepts of symbolic interaction⁵, myth, ritual⁶ and ethno-methodology⁷ (Ouchi and Wilkins, 1985). Durkheim (1933) and Weber (1947), as well-known representatives of sociology, performed important research as regarded the relationship between culture and industrialization (Brannen, 2003). Durkheim (1912), in lieu of the term *culture*, utilized, “*collective representation*”⁸ (Hatch, 1973), and posited that it was the reflection of social cooperation on the organization of a society. Moreover, Durkheim (1933) investigated the dynamics of society and concluded that dissimilarities within it were not a threat to social cohesion. “Organic Solidarity”, which held people together through interdependence with many different and complementary roles, provided more freedom in industrial societies (Moberg, 2013). Individuals generate social power in societies and institutions which makes them live longer through organic solidarity. However, this form of power is not an obstacle to the progress of emic perspectives and differences. On the contrary, it helps the enrichment of local cultures, especially in the form of beliefs, symbols, rituals, sentiments and language, in societies.

Conversely, Weber did not utilize the concept of *organismic analogy*, or cohesion of the social system (Schroeder, 1992), but rather emphasized the impact of differences in the economic and social structure, and the internal power structure of a nation, on customs⁹ (Weber, 1978). According to him, customs, common language, religion, and political memories, were important elements of culture (Ibid), and, “*culture is the endowment of a finite segment of the meaningless infinity of events in the world with meaning and significance from the standpoint of human beings*” (Weber, 1949: 81). In addition, in his book, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Weber (1930) claimed that religion as a part of culture, especially Protestantism¹⁰, contributed to the progress of capitalism in the West. On the other hand, due to the greater role religion plays in the state structure of the United States, as compared to Europe, Protestantism, with its chief characteristic of showing no tolerance for dishonesty, has influenced American political history¹¹ and to this day continues to impact her

⁵ According to symbolic interaction, ‘human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that these things have for them’ (Blumer, 1969:2).

⁶ James Frazer and the Cambridge ritualists, such as Jane Harrison, F.M. Cornford, and A.B. Crook, are known as the main representatives of the myth and ritual school. They investigate the relationship between myth and ritual and mainly believe that “myth is derived from the ritual” (Meletinsky, 2000).

⁷ Ethnomethodology examines “the way in which society’s members create the ordered social world where they live” (Edgar and Sedwick, 1999: 134).

⁸ Durkheim (1912: 16) defined collective representation as, “the result of an immense co-operation, which stretches out not only into space but into time as well; to make them, a multitude of minds have associated, united and combined their ideas and sentiments; for them, long generations have accumulated their experience and their knowledge”.

⁹ Before defining the term, “custom”, Weber (1978:29) defined the word “usage”: “if an orientation toward social action occurs regularly, it will be called “usage”. A usage will be called “custom” if the practice is based upon long standing”.

¹⁰ Protestantism is a Christian belief system which is based on reformation in the religion. Weber (1930) took mainly Calvinism as a main reference in the Protestantism. Calvinism encourages becoming honest, hardworking and modest in human behaviours.

¹¹ After President Andrew Johnson’s impeachment in 1868 (violation of the Tenure of Office Act), impeachment mechanisms were carried out only for two presidents: Richard Nixon (after resignation, his case was closed) and Bill Clinton. Impeachment process is utilized to remove President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States from their posts due to accusation of high crimes, such as treason, bribery, etc. Even their cases seemed totally different from the outside; Nixon was the principal actor of the Watergate scandal (knowing in advance the plan of attempted burglary against his political rivals); and Clinton caused the Monica Lewinsky scandal (sexual affair with a White House intern, Monica Lewinsky). Both men were accused of perjury.



political culture (Kalberg, 2012). Cultural reflection in the form of religion affects expectations of leadership. Herein, trustworthiness as the fundamental trait of leader emerges. However, according to Weber, religion is not a sole entity that shapes our cultural or leadership expectations, but also an iron cage of mechanization and rationalism that surrounds our mental formation of expectations as well.

4. A Critique to Cultural Anthropology and Sociology

Bourdieu (1984) criticized cultural anthropologists' subjectivity and sociologists' objectivity¹², but did not reject these two approaches and tried to find a middle-ground between them, through the use of the terms, "habitus" and "field" (Grenfell, 2014). The habitus is a "structuring structure" which organizes practices, and perceptions of practices, and is also a "structured structure" because it organizes the perception of the social world (Bourdieu, 1984:166). Habitus acts in the social structure, which is called the "field": the combination of *habitus* and *field* form practice. Social actors and previous events take active roles in this combination process (Wacquant, 2008; Moore, 2012). Bourdieu's cultural understanding reflected on work environment as well: Agent, as a staff with the impact of habitus, such as, nationality, background, values and beliefs, interacts with the field as an organization. The interaction between habitus and field influences work practice.

Since modern culture concept emerged in the 19th Century (Fox, 1985), due to the impact of cultural anthropology and sociology, cultural research has had a tendency to understand and explain human behavioural patterns. However, after the huge and unexpected success of Japanese firms in the 1970s, scholars such as Marsh and Mannari (1971), Cole (1971), Dore (1973), Ouchi and Price (1978), Vogel (1979), Pascale & Athos (1981), Peterson (1988), began to investigate their secrets through conducting comparative analysis studies between them and their Western counterparts. This academic curiosity became a milestone in the cultural research arena: In order to provide a better understanding for the term *culture*, cultural studies were divided into two main categories in the literature, as organizational culture and national culture (Ouchi and Wilkins, 1985).

5. Organizational Culture

Ouchi and Price (1978) investigated both state and private Japanese organizations and realised that bureaucratic hierarchy was weaker in them than in Western organizations, while coordination and organization of people were the main responsibility of management. Moreover, Japanese organizational culture was based on a more humanistic approach, such as showing respect for common values and beliefs of their society (Ouchi, 1981). Ouchi and Price (1978) posited that individual goals of employees must meet organizational objectives, and in order to provide for this aim, they developed the "Type Z Organization" concept. Unlike classic Western type organizations, Type Z represented that of the culture of Japanese organizations in which common characteristics were stable and the following criteria existed: long-term employment, slow process of evaluation and promotion, moderately specialized careers, collective decision making processes, individual responsibility, implicit control, and

¹² Bourdieu categorized previous cultural studies into two groups: firstly, structural tradition which saw culture as a part of knowledge and communication, and secondly, the functionalist tradition saw culture as a part of social infrastructure (Grenfell, 2014).



holistic concern. According to Ouchi (1981), organizations are living organisms and have their own theories of culture. In order to reach success, Western organizations need not imitate their Japanese counterparts, but should rather adapt their institutions to Type Z.

While developing organizational culture concept, Pettigrew (1979) tried to combine the terms, cultural anthropology and sociology. He defined organizational culture as “the source of a family of concepts”, such as, symbols¹³, language¹⁴, ideology¹⁵, beliefs, rituals¹⁶ and myths¹⁷, and a social form of organizational analysis (Pettigrew, 2000). Smircich (1983) took Pettigrew’s organizational culture definition as a starting point and synthesized culture concept from anthropology, and organization concept from organizational theory. She founded five themes which provide links between culture and organization: cross cultural or comparative research, corporate culture, organizational cognition, organizational symbolism, and unconscious process (Ibid). Additionally, she supported Siehl and Martin’s (1981), and Tichy’s (1982), views which saw “culture as social or normative glue that held an organization together” (Smircich, 1983: 344). She inferred culture as a bridge in the organization but did not clearly define its role and impact on followers and leader from a cultural perspective.

Schein (2004) broke away the domination of cultural anthropology and sociology, on the definition of organizational culture, through utilizing leadership perspective. According to him, dynamic processes of culture and management are at the core of leadership. At first, a leader structured organizational culture, and then, structured culture, would determine who would be next leader. Even today, one of the most accepted definitions of organizational culture belongs to him.

“A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems” (Ibid: 12).

Parallel to the development of the global economy, organizations began to grow and develop more complex structures. In so doing, organizational culture emerged as an important figure in an organizational research. This was because scholars realized that without responding to organizational culture, it is rather difficult to adapt or change anything in organizations. Likewise, after Schein, understanding organizational culture was seen as an inseparable part of the leadership concept by many scholars. The importance of understanding and responding to organizational culture, in effective leadership, was also emphasized by Deal and Kennedy (1999). They illustrated five components of organizational culture¹⁸: a. Business environment, b. Values and beliefs, c. Heroic figures (role models), d. Ritual and ceremony, and, e.

¹³ “Symbols are objects, acts, relationships, or linguistic formations that stand ambiguously for a multiplicity of meanings, evoke emotions, and impel men to action” (Cohen, 1974: 23).

¹⁴ Language infers to vocal signs (Pettigrew, 1979).

¹⁵ “Ideology is a set of beliefs about social world and how it operates, containing statements about rightness of certain social arrangements and what action would be undertaken in the light of those statements” (Wilson, 1973: 91).

¹⁶ Ritual is “the symbolic use of bodily movement and gesture in a social situation to express and articulate meaning” (Bocock, 1974: 37).

¹⁷ Myth “contains narrative of events often with a sacred quality which explores in dramatic form issues of origin and transformation” (Pettigrew, 1979: 576).

¹⁸ Deal and Kennedy (1999) utilized the term, corporate culture, equivalent to organizational culture, in their book, *The New Corporate Culture*.



Cultural network (Ibid). However, their findings were criticized by many scholars for not pursuing academic rigour in including only very successful companies in the research process; in lieu of empirical data, utilizing anecdotes from top management, giving too much emphasis to corporate excellence for managerial effectiveness, and ignoring other factors, such as, organizational structure, regulations, technological development, and the impact of competitive markets (Carroll, 1983; Reynolds, 1986; Xenikou and Furnham, 2013).

Hofstede (2001: 391) defined organizational culture as, “*the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from others*”. The nature of organizational culture was holistic, socially created, but historically shaped, related to rituals and symbols, non-measurable, resistant to change, and when these attributes combined, they formed organizational culture (Hofstede et al., 2010). Moreover, in order to be utilized in organizational comparative studies, Hofstede (2001) developed six dimensions of organizational culture: a. Process-oriented versus results-oriented, b. Employee-oriented versus job-oriented, c. Parochial (Local) versus professionalism, d. Open systems versus closed systems, e. Loose control versus tight control, and, f. Normative (Internal) versus pragmatic (external). Waisfisz (2007) added two semi-autonomous dimensions to this model, as, degree of leadership style acceptance and degree of identification with an organization.

Until Hofstede’s famous book in 1980, “Culture’s Consequences”, investigating organizational culture was the norm for grasping holistic organizational perspectives in all types of organizations. However, Hofstede (2001) suggested that managers who were unaware of the national culture of their business arena may bring harm to their company's standing if they only take into consideration their company’s organizational culture. In order to prevent this undesired result, companies must utilize the training of cross-cultural institutes, or develop their own program by employing host-country personnel as instructors. What is more, after his wide-ranging research at the International Business Machines (IBM) Corporation, he categorized countries according to their cultural attributes. His national cultural cluster approach was generally accepted by scholars and Hofstede became one of the most referenced authors in cultural studies.

6. National Culture

Hofstede et al. (2010) criticized giving an identity meaning to national culture and organization culture and made a clear distinction between them by utilizing a combination of values and beliefs:

“National cultures are part of the mental software we acquired during the first ten years of our lives, in the family, in the living environment, and in school, and they contain most of our basic values. Organizational cultures are acquired when we enter a work organization as young adults, with our values firmly in place and they consist mainly of the organization’s practices- they are more superficial (Ibid: 346)”.

Hofstede (2001) utilized six dimensions to differentiate and categorize national culture: a. Power Distance (PD) was taken from the work Mulder (1976, 1977; Mulder et al., 1971) in which power distance theory was founded in a laboratory and field experiments with simple social structures. PD expresses the degree of inequality in power between subordinates and managers; b. Uncertainty Avoidance (UA) was derived from Cyert and March’s (1963) book, “A Behavioural Theory of the Firm”. UA indicates tolerance of a society for uncertainty and



ambiguity; c. Individualism versus Collectivism (IVC) emerged from Parsons and Shils' (1951) "Self-orientation versus Collectivity" orientation concept. In addition, Hofstede's individualism is related significantly with the need for affiliation in McClelland's content analysis of 1925's children's readers. IVC pins down either individualism or collectivism as effective in a society; d. Masculinity versus Femininity (MVF) was inspired from the work of Herzberg et al. (1957) which investigated the impact of sex differences in work goals of US companies. MVF indicates how society deals with the duality of sexes; e. Long versus Short-Term Orientation (LVSTO): Research by Bond and colleagues among students of 23 countries led Hofstede in 1991 to add a fifth dimension, referred to as LVSTO, which focuses on a society's time concern as past, present or future; and, f. Indulgence versus Restraint (IVR) was added in 2010, based on Michael Minkov's world values survey data analysis: "*Indulgence stands for a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun. Restraint represents a society that suppresses gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms*" (Hofstede et al., 2010: 92).

One of Hofstede's major criticisms came from McSweeney (2002). He infers that his conceptualization of national culture is based on flawed assumptions, such as organizational, occupational and national cultures, which are discrete and not interactive with each other: the micro, local and national, are uniform; the dimensions of national culture can be produced by questionnaire responses; different responses indicate differences in national values; and, national culture is not influenced by the location of the organization. Therefore, the findings of Hofstede are invalid. Furthermore, she infers that culture can be managed by the conditions of utilizing action theories which can deal with 'change, power, variety, multiple influences - including the non-national- and complexity and situational variability of the individual subject' (Ibid:113). Conversely, Legge (2005) objects to this inference, because of the complex nature of culture it cannot be managed but only understood. Both McSweeney and Legge have logical consistency in their arguments, but the researcher believes that culture can be managed by leaders who have cultural intelligence. Herein, there is no need for cultural packet programs or handbooks specific to each nation's traits, but there is the need for education and training to increase awareness of a leader's cultural intelligence.

Unlike Hofstede's frameworks which were based on posterior theorizing, Schwartz's (1992) cultural value dimensions were based on *a priori* theorizing (Schwartz, 2006; and, Hsu et. al, 2013). While he was developing value orientations, Schwartz mostly utilized the works of the following researchers: Durkheim, 1912/1954; Freud, 1930; Parsons, 1951; Kluckhohn, 1951; Morris, 1956; Maslow, 1965; Williams, 1968; Korman, 1974; Deci, 1975; Kohn & Schooler, 1983. These dimensions are as follows: a. Embeddedness vs. Autonomy, concerns the relations of the individual and the group in a society (Hsu et. al, 2013); b. Hierarchy vs. Egalitarianism, expresses people's responsibilities and behaviours related to their societal tasks and roles (Schwartz, 2006); and, c. Harmony vs. Mastery emphasizes the way people manage to fit in the natural and social world (Hsu et. al, 2013:9). Schwartz (1999) emphasized the relation of culture and leadership vis-à-vis the legitimacy of an unequal distribution of power, roles, and resources, thorough hierarchy's dimension. Moreover, he benefited from Maslow's motivational theory while developing the values of Achievement, Security and Benevolence. It has to be noted here that achievement values should not be confused with McClelland's (1961) achievement motivation. Achievement value deals with showing competence by prevailing cultural standards, hence social approval can be obtained



(Schwartz, 2012). As well, Schwartz defines power as social status or hierarchy which ensures control over individuals. This definition represents characteristics of Western hard power perspective which sees power as material. However, the Schwartz model covers Hofstede's cultural dimensions and provides an alternative cultural approach for researchers.

Trompenaars and Hamden-Turner (1999) took Parsons' four-value orientations (Parsons, 1951) and added two more of their own: a. Universalism/particularism: Universalism looks for uniformity and affinity but particularism searches for differences (Hamden-Turner and Trompenaars, 2004); b. Communitarianism/individualism: Communitarianism categorizes cultures thorough the relationships of individuals and group interests (Trompenaars and Hamden-Turner, 1999); c. Specificity/diffuseness engages entering specific areas of private life and diffuses in multiple social areas of lives; d. Achieved/ascribed is the degree of understanding the reflection of status conceptualizes on people; e. Inner direction/outer direction seeks to explore how people from different cultures respond to the natural environment and changes; and f. Sequential and Synchronous Time shows how different cultures comment on the meaning of the past, present and future (Ibid). According to this model, organizations and project teams must become more mature in managing cultural diversity. They described maturity as moving from recognizing to respecting to reconciling cultural differences. This cultural model does not have a deep theoretical perspective. It takes its main bulk of theory from Parsons (1951) and gives the impression that it is written for the business sector rather than academia by providing useful practical hints for managers who are dealing with multinationals.

Different from other cultural cluster researches, the GLOBE study examines the impact of culture on leadership and develops nine dimensions¹⁹. It directly borrows Hofstede's power distance and UA dimensions. Hereby, Hofstede's IVC dimension is divided into two parts, as Collectivism I (Institutional), and Collectivism II (In-Group). Furthermore, Hofstede's masculinity was divided into Assert and Gender Egalitarianism dimensions. Future Orientation (FO) dimension was taken from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) Past, Present and Future Orientation dimensions. Performance Orientation (PO) has its origin in McClelland's (1985a-b) theory. Finally, Human Orientation (HO) was derived from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's work (1961), Putnam's (1993) work on civil society, and McClelland's (1985a-b) motivation theory (House et al., 2004). The GLOBE Study, as one of the latest versions of culture models, updated flaws of other earlier culture models and provided a more holistic perspective through covering power, leadership and culture concepts and melting them in the same pot.

These four cultural cluster studies have the tendency to separate societies according to their cultural components. As seen in Table 2.1, there are close similarities between these models. After emergence of Hofstede's research in 1980, all other models were developed in its axis and provided etic Western perspective to the existing literature. Here, Fang (2012) holds an important place in the literature, because unlike other mentioned models, he combines etic and emic perspectives in national cultural studies through utilizing ancient Eastern philosophy of Yin Yang²⁰. According to Fang (2012: 25):

¹⁹ The definitions of these dimensions will be given in chapter on theory.

²⁰ Yin Yang philosophy infers that the universe is shaped by two opposite, but complementary, forces named Yin and Yang. Hereby, Yin embodies feminine attributes, such as, night and weakness. On the other hand, Yang represents masculine attributes, such as, day and strength (Fang: 2012: 31).



“...all cultures share the same potential in value orientations, but at the same time they are also different from each other because each culture is a unique dynamic portfolio of self-selected globally available value orientations as a consequence of that culture’s all-dimensional learning over time.”

Fang (2012) posited that culture was not a homogenous concept because it contained paradoxes²¹, diversity, change, opposite values, and beliefs in its nature. However, these contradictions with interaction between each other provided a holistic and complementary understanding in the national culture concept. Fang brought a critical approach to the existing national cultural studies through adapting Yin and Yang philosophy, but in lieu of providing an alternative theory, he presented some propositions²². Moreover, although he utilized an Eastern philosophy, his cultural approach did not provide pure Eastern perspectives, because even he differentiated Chinese dialectic and Western ones through referring to Peng and Nisbett (2000)²³. His cultural approach has many similarities with Hegelian dialectic²⁴ and Harris’s cultural materialism²⁵.

7. Conclusion

Through accelerative impact of globalization, presently, it is very common to see multinational organizations and foreign employers on the global economic markets. Either organizations invest and do business in other countries, or people go abroad for work. In either case, people will not leave their national cultural characteristic at home, but instead will take it with them wherever they go. Therefore, nowadays, understanding national culture becomes an important component of cultural research. In addition, organizational culture and national culture must complement each other to provide mutual understanding while dealing with multi-cultural workforce. However, it is rather difficult to differentiate which one is more dominant in its interactions or draws sharp lines in its interrelations, but we can conclude that they have an ongoing and reflexive relation through shaping and shaped by each other.

²¹ Paradox means, “contradictory yet interrelated elements that seem logical in isolation but absurd and irrational when appearing simultaneously (Lewin, 2000: 760).

²² +Vi and -Vi (i: 1, 2, 3 ...n) stand for different paradoxical value orientations.

Proposition 1: If there exists {‘+V1’, ‘+V2’, ‘+V3’...‘+Vn’} in a culture, {‘-V1’, ‘-V2’, ‘-V3’...‘-Vn’} can coexist in the same culture depending on the situation, context, and time (Fang: 2012:36).

Proposition 2: To guide action in a given context at a given time, human beings choose the most relevant value(s) from the full spectrum of potential value orientations ranging from {‘+V1’, ‘+V2’, ‘+V3’...‘+Vn’}, to {‘-V1’, ‘-V2’, ‘-V3’...‘-Vn’} (Ibid: 38).

Proposition 3: In a culture, in a particular context at a particular time, some values {‘+V1’, ‘+V2’, ‘+V3’...‘+Vn’} can be promoted, while other values {‘-V1’, ‘-V2’, ‘-V3’...‘-Vn’} can be suppressed, thus resulting in a unique value configuration (Ibid: 39).

Proposition 4: Each culture is a unique dynamic portfolio of self-selected globally available value orientations ranging from {‘+V1’, ‘+V2’, ‘+V3’...‘+Vi’}, to {‘-V1’, ‘-V2’, ‘-V3’...‘-Vi’} as a consequence of the culture’s all-dimensional learning over time (Ibid: 41).

²³ Chinese dialectical thought denies the reality of true contradiction, accepts the unity of opposites, and regards the coexistence of opposites as permanent. Belief in genuine contradiction is regarded as a kind of error. The Western Marxist dialectic treats contradiction as real but defines it differently from the Western Aristotelian tradition, in terms not of the laws of formal logic but rather by the three laws of dialectical logic (Peng and Nisbett, 2000: 1067).

²⁴ Thesis and anti-thesis form synthesis in Hegelian dialectic.

²⁵ While interpreting culture, Harris (1979) utilized the combination of etic and emic perspectives.



Table 1. Comparison of Main Cultural Studies

NAME	HOFSTEDE	SCHWARTZ	TROMPENAARS AND H-TURNER	GLOBE RESEARCH PROJECT
DATE	1980	1992	1993	2004
SURVEYED ORGANIZATION	Multinational	National and Sub-National Ethnic Group	Multinational	National
RESPONDENTS	Non-Managers and Managers	Students and School Teachers	Non-Managers and Managers	Managers
DIMENSIONS	1. Power Distance 2. Uncertainty Avoidance 3. Individualism versus Collectivism 4. Masculinity versus Femininity 5. Long versus Short-Term Orientation 6. Indulgence versus Restraint	1. Autonomy vs. Embeddedness 2. Egalitarianism vs. Hierarchy 3. Harmony vs. Mastery	1. Universalism/Particularism 2. Communitarianism/ Individualism 3. Specificity/Diffuseness 4. Achieved/Ascribed 5. Inner direction/Outer direction 6. Sequential and Synchronous Time	1. Power Distance 2. Uncertainty Avoidance 3. Collectivism I (Institutional) 4. Collectivism II (In-Group) 5. Future Orientation 6. Assertiveness 7. Gender Egalitarianism 8. Humane Orientation 9. Performance Orientation



REFERENCES

- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Boas, F. (1896). *The Limitations of the Comparative Method of Anthropology*. *Science* 4, 901-908.
- Boas, F. (1959). *Introduction*. In *Patterns of Culture*. Benedict, R. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bois, C.D. (1971). General and Theoretical. *American Anthropologist, New Series*, Vol.73, No.6, 1291-1293.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Brannen, M.Y. (2003). What is Culture and Why Does It Matter. In Boyacigiller, N.A., Goodman, R.A. and Philips, M.E. (eds.), *Crossing Cultures*, London: Routledge.
- Carrol, D.T. (1983). A Disappointing Search for Excellence. *Harvard Business Review*, 61, 78-88.
- Cole, R. (1971). *Japanese Blue Collar: The Changing Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Comtè, A. (1865). *A General View of Positivism*. Trans. by J.H. Bridges. London: Trubner and Co.
- Cyert, R.M., and March, J.G. (1963). *A Behavioural Theory of The Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *The Origin of Species*, London: John Murray.
- Deal, T.E. and Kennedy, A.A. (1999). *The New Corporate Cultures: Revitalizing the Workplace After Downsizing, Mergers and Reengineering*. Reading: MA: Perseus Books.
- Deci, E.L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- Dore, R. (1973). *British Factory-Japanese Factory: The Origins of National Diversity in Industrial Relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1912/1954). *The elementary forms of religious life*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1933). *The Division of Labour in Society*. Trans. by W.D. Halls, New York: Free Press.
- Edgar, A. and Sedwick, P. (eds.) (1999). *Key Concepts in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Eriksen, T.H. and Nielsen, F.S. (2001). *A History of Anthropology*, London: Pluto Press.
- Fang, T. (2012). Yin Yang: A New Perspective on Culture. *Management and Organizational Review*, 8:1, 25-50.
- Fox, Robin, (1985). Culture. In Kuper, A & Kuper, J (eds), *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge.
- Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and Its Discontents*. London: Hogarth Press.



- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Gobineau, A. De (1854/1915). *The Inequality of Human Races*. Trans. By A. Collins, London: William Heinemann.
- Grenfell, M. (2014). Introduction. In M. Grenfell (ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts*, 2nd Edn. London: Routledge.
- Guba, E.G and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research, in N.Denzin, and Y.S Lincoln (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 105-117.
- Hamden-Turner, and C. Trompenaars, (2004). *Building Cross-Cultural Competence: How to create wealth from conflicting values*, 2nd ed. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Harris, M. (1968). *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: T.Y.Crowell.
- Harris, M. (1979/2001). *Cultural Materialism*, New York: Altamira Press.
- Hatch, E. (1973). *Theories of Man and Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hendry, J. (2008). *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*, 2nd edn., Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R., and Capwell, D. (1957). *Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences*, 2nd edn. London: Sage Publications. First edition published in 1980.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., and Minkov, M., (2010). *Cultures and Organizations*, 3d edn. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Honderich, T. (2005). *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- House, R. J, Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. and Gupta, V., (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Howell, K.E. (2013). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Methodology*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Hsu, Shih-Yun, Woodside, A.G. and Marshall, R. (2013). Critical Tests of Multiple Theories of Cultures' Consequences, *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(6), 679 –704.
- Kalberg, S. (2012). *Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology Today*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and Value-orientations in the Theory of Action: An Exploration in Definition and Classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a General Theory of Action* (pp.388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kluckhohn, F.R. and Strodtbeck, F.L., (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Kohn, M.L., & Schooler, C. (1983). *Work and personality*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.



- Korman, A. (1974). *The Psychology of Motivation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kuper, A (1985). Cultural Anthropology. In Kuper, A & Kuper, J (eds), *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge.
- Legge, K. (2005). *Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities*, Palgrave: New York.
- Marsh, R.M. and Mannari, H. (1971). Lifetime Commitment in Japan: Roles, Norms and Values. *American Journal of Sociology*, 76, 795-813.
- Maslow, A.H. (1965). *Eupsychian Management*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985a). *Human Motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- McClelland, D. C. (1985b). *How motives, skills, and values determine what people do*. *American Psychologist*, 40(7), 812-825.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Culture Differences and Their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith- A Failure of Analysis, *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89-118.
- Mead, M. (1970). *Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap*. London: The Bodley Head Limited.
- Meletinsky, E.M. (2000). *The Poetics of Myth*. Trans. by G. Lanoue and A. Sadetsky, New York: Routledge.
- Moberg, M. (2013). *Engaging Anthropological Theory*, London: Routledge.
- Moore, J.D. (2012). *Visions of Culture*. Plymouth: Alta Mira Press.
- Morton, S.G. (1839). *Crania Americana; or A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America*. Philadelphia, J.Dobson.
- Morris, C.W. (1956). *Varieties of Human Value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mulder, M. (1976). Reduction of Power Differences in Practice: The Power Distance Reduction Theory and Its Applications. In G. Hofstede and M.S. Kassem (Eds.), *European Contributions to organization theory* (79-94). Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Mulder, M. (1977). *The Daily Power Game*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Mulder, M., Ritsema van Eck, J.R., and De Jong, R.D. (1971). An Organization in Crisis and Non-Crisis Situations. *Human Relations*, 24, 19-41.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ouchi, W.G. and Price, R.L. (1978). Hierarchies, Clans, and Theory Z: A new Perspective on Organization Development. *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn, 25-44.
- Ouchi, W.G. and Wilkins, A.L. (1985). Organizational Culture. *Annual Review Sociology*, 11, 457-483.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Pascale, R.T. and Athos, A.G. (1981). *The Art of Japanese Management*. New York: Simon & Schuster.



- Peterson, M.F. (1988). PM Theory in Japan and China: What's in it for the United States? *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 22-38.
- Pettigrew, A.M. (1979). On Studying Organizational Cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570-581.
- Pettigrew, A.M. (2000). Foreword. In Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M. and Peterson, M.F. (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Putnam, R.D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rapport, N. and Overing, J. (2000). *Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Schroeder, R. (1992). *Max Weber and the Sociology of Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Reynolds, P.D. (1986). Organizational Culture as Related to Industry, Position, and Performance: A Preliminary Report. *Journal of Management Studies*, 23, 333-345.
- Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 3d ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). The universal content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25:1– 62.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1999). A theory of Cultural Values and Some Implications for Work, *International Association of Applied Psychology*, 48(1), 23-47.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). A theory of cultural value orientations: Explication and applications. *Comparative Sociology*, 5(2-3), 137-182.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. Online Readings in *Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116>.
- Siehl, C. and Martin, J. (1981). *Learning Organizational Culture*. Working Paper, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3), 339-358.
- Stocking, G.W. (1966). Franz Boas and The Culture Concept In Historical Perspective. *American Anthropologist*, *New Series*, Vol, No.68: 867-882.
- Tichy, N.M. (1982). Managing Change Strategically: The Technical, Political and Cultural Keys. *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn, 59-80.
- Trompenaars, F., and Hampden-Turner, C. (1999). *Riding the Waves of culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Global Business*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw – Hill.
- Tylor, E.B. (1871). *Primitive Culture*. London: J. Murray.
- Xenikou, A. and Furnham, A. (2013). *Group Dynamics & Organizational Culture*. London: Palgrave Millan.
- Vogel, E. (1979). *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vogt, C.C. (1864). *Lectures on Man: His Place in Creation and in the History of Earth*. London: Anthropological Society of London.



Wacquant, L. (2008). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key Sociological Thinkers*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Waisfisz, B. (2007). An Organizational Cultural Perspective. Itim Focus. Available through http://geerthofstede.com/tl_files/art%20organisational%20culture%20perspective.pdf

Weber, M. (1930/2001). *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Routledge.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*. Henderson, A.M and Parsons, T. (Trans.), Parsons, T. (ed.), New York: The Free Press.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, R. M., Jr. (1968). *Values*. In E. Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan.

Wilson, J. (1973). *Introduction to Social Movements*. New York: Basic Books.