Most cultures are collectivist

**Individualist**
- Smallest unit is person, take care of yourself, don’t be a burden to someone else.

**Collectivist**
- Smallest unit is the group—be generous, think of others, they will take care of you, group comes first.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualist</th>
<th>Collectivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-Africa, C-China, F-France, G-Germany, I-India, M-Mexico ME-Middle East, R-Russia, S-Spain, SEA-Southeast Asia, UK-United Kingdom, US--United States

Correlates of “smallest unit” dimension

**Individualist**
- Direct Communications
- Low Context
- Universalist — *knowing*

**Collectivist**
- Indirect Communications
- High Context
- Particularistic — *being*
Implications for communications

› Individualistic (direct, low context):
  - People are more heterogeneous and weight is given to text, words, contracts, law. Reliance on non-verbal “understandings” arising out of the situation itself—not dependable.

› Collectivist (indirect, high context):
  - People have more “in common,” and tend not to put “everything in words. Understandings arise from the situation (context) without the need to codify in words or contracts.
“Indirect” communication

› Like that between twins
› Need to read between the lines
› Almost never hear “No.”
› “Yes” means “I hear you.”
› Status of messenger as important as the message
› People say what you want to hear
› Intermediaries often used for messages
› Lukewarm tea means all is not well (from Peace Corp Workbook)

Intercultural Teamwork
“Direct” communication

› Best to tell it like it is.

› Ok to disagree with your boss at a meeting.

› “Yes” means yes.

› The message is more important than the messenger.

› Lukewarm tea means the tea got cold.
Mapping Cultures...since 19th Century

› 19th century Germany: Ferdinand Tonnies

› 19th century Germany: Max Weber

› 19th century France: Emile Durkheim

› 1900’s U.S. Franz Boaz, Columbia, founded department of Anthropology

› 1950’s U.S. More recently: Talcott Parsons, Harvard

› 1970’s U.S. (IBM) Business Schools: Geert Hofstede
Tonnies

› Gemeinschaft
  - Community, family, farming, organic wholeness
  - understanding from similarity

› Gesellschaft
  - Society, company with hierarchy and specialization, industry
  - understanding comes from exchange based on differences, and on rules

Intercultural Teamwork
Feature of bureaucracy: “rational,” “fair,” (advance on merit), rules yield predictable behaviors—even for strangers, “roles” define combinations that work, e.g., responsibilities/rights defined, seen as “democratic”

Growth of bureaucracy made possible: Efficiencies of division of labor (Henry Ford), specializations fueled competence.
Talcott Parsons -- contrasting interactions

› **Affectivity**—emotional connection

› **Affective neutrality**—neutral emotionality

› **Collectivity**—orientation → **Self-orientation**—power to work together decide

› **Particularism**—depends on “who” “one-of,” unique

› **Universalism**—applies to everyone

› **Ascription**—birth, static

› **Achievement**—function, dynamic

› **Diffusity**—whole person

› **Specificity**—job, function

Intercultural Teamwork
Hofstede’s results for the U.S.  
http://geert-hofstede.com/united-states.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Dimension</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Orientation</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indulgence</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagrams:**
- Bar chart showing cultural dimensions for the U.S.
- Figures for each dimension: Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Pragmatism, Indulgence.
Hofstede’s results for China
http://geert-hofstede.com/china.html

1. Power—80
2. Individualism—20
3. Masculinity—66
4. Uncertainty
5. Acceptance--30
6. Long Term Orientation/Pragmatism--87
7. 6. Indulgence--24

Purdue University Global Engineering Programs
U.S., China, compared

http://geert-hofstede.com/china.html
Chinese dinner—what do you see?
Chinese waiting--do you see?