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3. The Cultural Variables for Development Model of Culture

3-1. Overview

After having reviewed and understood the fundamental nature of culture in the preceding chapter 2, culture was found to have two different domains in depth, which can be stated as behavioral – cognitive, explicit – implicit, material – symbolic and phenomenal – ideological culture. As mentioned slightly in chapter 2, many scholars tried to identify elements of culture within different domains in order to understand culture. This is the concept of cultural variables that will be explained in the later.

As the first step of main part of the study, the means of interpreting the background of cultural phenomena is attempted to identify. In order to understand culture completely, it is needed to study both of explicit cultural behaviors including artifacts and implicit cognitive culture. These two domains of culture should be approached with different methods. Direct observation of cultural behavior by fieldwork is the major tools to study explicit part of culture. At the same time, as mentioned in the section of methodological characteristics in studying culture in chapter 2, the study of culture employs the interpretive approach to study implicit part of culture. However, in order to interpret implicit part of culture, some specific means should be prepared so that observed behavioral pattern by fieldwork (another methodological characteristics in studying culture) can be analyzed, compared, and finally modeled.

This chapter proposes the concept of ‘Cultural Variables’ as a means of interpretation to answer the questions of “how culture can be understood?” At first, the concept of cultural variables is introduced along with needs, definition, and application of cultural variables. Then, existing models of cultural variables suggested by various scholars are
intensively reviewed, compared and summarized. It is followed by the method of applying the cultural variables to develop the model of culture. Therefore, model of culture is viewed as a cognitive, implicit elements of culture that are extracted from various theories of cultural variables, and the question is “how it is related to design as one of explicit representations of culture.” Finally, findings of this chapter and their implication to the study of remaining chapters are summarized.

The structure of study in this chapter in the context of entire study is summarized diagrammatically in Figure 3-1.

![Figure 3-1: The Overview of Structure of Chapter 3.](image-url)
3-2. The Concept of Cultural Variables

As found out in the section of methodological characteristics in studying culture in the preceding chapter, comparison is the one of key characteristics: one individual culture cannot be understood by their own but only by finding out similarities and differences compared with other culture. For this reason, nearly all cross-cultural scholars including anthropologists and psychologists have been believing that the establishment of universally valid psychological laws is a worthwhile if not essential goal. They have strong belief that any culture must have some functional prerequisites if it is to survive. If this is so, it follows that all cultures and individual roles, and behavior within them can be compared along the bases of this generalized system: some consistent bases for making comparisons across cultures within a universalistic framework.36

Anthropologists Kluckhohn and Strodteck, pioneering scholars in this respect had tried to find out human being’s fundamental value orientations toward essential same questions posed by human biology and by the generalities of human situation. They argued “Although cultures may change slowly over time, they are essentially stable, and members of a culture group exhibit constant ‘orientations’ towards the world and humankind.” Different cultural groups exhibit different orientations, and may be compared in this principle. Since the development of their proposal of ‘the model of the value orientation’, many other variations of this model have been created. This model will be reviewed in depth at later section.37


37 Kluckhohn, F. R. and Strodteck, F. L. ‘Variations in Value Orientations,’ Row, Perterson and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerned with micro-level within societies</th>
<th>Prove universality of micro-level laws</th>
<th>Illustrate uniqueness of each society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with macro-level between societies</td>
<td>Determine types or subsets of societies</td>
<td>Determine dimensions of societies and macro-level laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-2: Four Available Research Strategies for Comparative Multi-society Studies.

Geert Hofstede, cross-cultural scholar also argued the importance of dimensions of culture for comparing cultures by similarities and differences. He listed up four different types of available research strategies for comparative multi-society study by the matrix of two axes, one of micro-level study within societies and macro-level of between societies, and the other of focus on similarities between societies and focus on differences between societies.38 (Figure 3-2) He suggested that some types of dimensions are needed for conducting the comparative research with the focus on differences in macro-level between societies (cell 4 in the matrix shown in Figure 3-2).

---

With this research method, he actually conducted huge cross-cultural survey, which will be introduced later section in this chapter.

Hoft also argued the importance of ‘International Variable’ as a tool of developing cultural model through which one can compare the similarities and differences of two or more cultures and organize cultural data. She also pointed out two functions of international variables: it can focus on objective, easy-to-research cultural differences like political and economic contexts, text directionality in writing system, and like; it can also deal with subjective information as well like the value systems, behavioral systems, and intellectual systems of one or more cultural groupings of users. Edward T. Hall also tried to lay out ‘Vocabulary of Culture’ with which one would be capable of analysis in its own terms without reference to the other systems and so organized that it contains isolated components that could be built up into more complex units, and so constituted that it reflects all the rest of culture and is reflected in the rest of culture. He listed up PMS (Primary Message System) as means of analyzing and modeling culture. He extended this concept with the additions of his three-layer-model of culture (formal, informal, and technical) so that one can trace how each element changes along with different layers.

All the scholars cited so far do not agree the term itself with each other (value orientation, cultural dimension, international variables, and vocabulary of culture), but the functions and purposes are quite similar: that is “the universal culture free frameworks by which a culture can be profiled and modeled, and cultures can be compared in terms of similarities and differences between cultures.” In this study, the

---


40 Hall, Edward T. op. cit., 1990.
term 'Cultural Variables' is chosen for referring to above meaning for two reasons. At first, 'culture' represents more directly culture itself while 'international' means 'between or among nations.' This should not limited only to nations but should be also able to be used for 'between or among generation cultures or corporation cultures and the like. Secondly, the term, 'variable' seems to represent more appropriately the flexible nature than 'dimension'.

The cultural variables can be used for other than the primary purpose of comparison and profiling cultures. As pointed out in preceding chapter, complete understanding of culture requires for one to look at not only explicit cultural behaviors but also implicit cognitive cultural value systems. Both of them are used mutually for interpreting and inferring each other: cognitive cultural value as interpretive background of cultural behavior and, in the other way around, explicit cultural behavior as manifestation of deeper value system. A set of cultural variables can be used for measuring more subjective cultural value systems by providing a series of standard questions against which each cultural value can be measured. It works like AIO (Activity, Interest, Opinion) frameworks for analyzing people's lifestyle: how people spend time (activity), what people regard important around them (interests), and how people think regarding some issues (opinions). People answer the series of AIO questions, and their lifestyles are measured and compared with other people.\(^4\) A set of questions based on cultural variables can be generated and used for measuring cognitive cultural value system, which, then, can be used as interpretive tool for understanding backgrounds of explicit level of cultural behavior or artifacts. In additions, Hofst argues that cultural variables

---

should have different assessment methods for different types of cultural models. Assessing cultural variables of cultural groups can be done by focus groups, observation, questionnaires, or interviews. Also cultural variables is used for collecting data for various purpose of cultural model: model focused on communication in business settings, model for determining patterns of thinking or feeling, or model for finding out the way in which people solve problem. Cultural variables, originally developed for academic purposes in anthropology and social psychology, are also nowadays widely used in managing international business for dealing with cultural issues: negotiating international contracts, understanding international markets, avoiding cultural taboos and so on. The concept of cultural variables is summarized and diagrammed in Figure 3-3.

![Diagram of Cultural Variables]

**Figure 3-3: Functions of Cultural Variables**

3-3. Review of Existing Cultural Variables

This section reviews the existing models of cultural variables so that common frameworks can be found, and the result of this section will be implemented in the design of main experiment for understanding respondents' cognitive cultural value system and for understanding background of respondents' specific behavior with product.

Researches on cultural variables have been conducted in various fields but major fields include anthropology, social psychology, and international business management. Anthropology is mainly interested in constructing cultural model by applying cultural variables for finding out similarities and differences, and inferring backgrounds of cultural behavior. In the mean time, social psychologists are interested in understanding 'modal psychology' itself formed in society and in relating with individual personality. Cultural variables are also widely used in the area of international business management. However, they are more interested in applying model in real world for getting business done rather than conducting serious academic research on cultural variables itself.

The existing models of cultural variables will be reviewed in the structure of some general facts (originator, research methods and the like), the focus or the purpose of the cultural variables, actual list of cultural variables with short description of each variable, and some discussion of its characteristics.

3-3-1. Value Orientation⁴³

'Value Orientation' model of cultural variables is the one of the most pioneering and classic one among the likes. Anthropologists, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck primarily

concerned with the exposition of theory of variation in value orientation and a method which was devised for cross-cultural testing. In their study, they tried to carry forward the investigation of the fundamental value systems of human being and the influences which values have upon behavior. The model is the output of extensive field research conducted in an area of the Rimrock at Southwest of America during 1950-1951 with the help of research fund from Rockefeller Foundation. They actually stayed there and participated in all local life. They used observed and interviewed local cultural groups including Spanish Americans, Texans, Zuni, and Navaho.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck explain the concept of value orientation as follows:

"Value orientations are complex but definitely patterned (rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements—which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of common human problems."

With this concept of value orientations, they classified value orientations under the three assumptions: 1) there is a limited number of common human problems for which all peoples at all times must find some solution; 2) while there is variability in solutions of all problems, it is neither limitless nor random but is definitely variable within a range of possible solutions; 3) all alternatives of all solutions are present in all societies at all times but are differently preferred.

They continued to identify problems to common to all human groups and figured out five common problems: namely ‘human nature orientation’, ‘man nature orientation’, ‘time orientation’, ‘activity orientation’, and ‘relational orientation’. These five common problems can be rephrased in the form of questions as follows:
• What is the character of innate human nature? (human nature orientation)
• What is the relation of man to nature (and supernature)? (man nature orientation)
• What is the temporal focus of human life? (time orientation)
• What is the modality of human activity? (activity orientation)
• What is the modality of man’s relationship to other men? (relational orientation)

They generated the range of variation for each value orientation and it is summarized in Table 3-1. Each value orientation is explained in detail in the following.

Table 3-1: The Five Value Orientations and the Range of Variations for Each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Range of Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Nature</td>
<td>Evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man Nature</td>
<td>Subjugation to Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Lineality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Human Nature Orientation

To the question of what the innate goodness or badness of human nature is, there are the three logical divisions of ‘Evil’, ‘Good-and-Evil’, and ‘Good’. This innate
human nature has been also the topic in philosophy as well: is human innately good or bad? Yet, these three varied categories can still be subdivided as shown in Table 3-1. However, the three categories of Evil, Good-and-Evil, and Good are fairly adequate to compare differences in value orientation.

There are some cultures (e.g. American) which believe that human being is innately Evil so that constant control and discipline of the self are required if any real goodness is to be achieved, and the danger of regression is always present.

Some other cultures incline to the view that human nature is a mixture of Good-and-Evil. These cultures would say that although control and effort are certainly needed, lapses can be understood and need not always be severely condemned. There may be another extreme case of cultures committed to the definition of human nature as immutably Good (logically possible but not known yet).

2) Man Nature (Supernature) Orientation

Man-Nature orientation is the value variation toward the question of “Can nature be conquered or not?” The three-point range of variation in the man-nature-orientation of ‘Subjugation-to-Nature’, ‘Harmony-with-Nature’, and ‘Mastery-over-Nature’ is also very well known from the works of philosophers and culture historians.

The typical example of the culture of Subjugation-to-Nature is Spanish-American culture in the American Southwest. Spanish-American shepherders believe firmly that there is little or nothing a man could do to save or protect either land or flocks when damaging storms descended upon them. They simply accept it as inevitable.

In the culture of Harmony-with-Nature, there is no real separation of man, nature, and supernature. One is simply an extension of the other and a conception of wholeness
derives from their unity. This orientation seems to have been the dominant one in many periods of Chinese history, and it is strongly evident in Japanese culture at the present time as well as historically.

Meanwhile, the Mastery-over-Nature position is dominant orientation of most Americans. Natural forces of all kinds are to be overcome and put to the use of human beings. Rivers everywhere are spanned with bridges; mountains have roads put through and around them. The view in general is that it is a part of human being’s duty to overcome obstacles; hence there is the great emphasis upon technology.

3) Time Orientation

Time orientation deals with value orientation on what temporal point does culture put high value, ‘Past’, ‘Present’, or ‘Future”? Some cultures, mostly Asian cultures give first-order value preference to the Past time orientation. Ancestor worship and a strong family tradition are both expressions of this preference. Their attitudes are strong, believing that nothing new ever happened in the Present or would happen in the Future; it had all happened before in the far distant Past.

Yet, there are some cultures which place the Present time alternative in first-order position. They pay little attention to what has happened in the past and regard Future as both vague and unpredictable. Planning for the Future or hoping that the Future will be better than either the Present or the Past simply is not their way of life.

However, people in some other culture (mostly Americans) place high emphasis upon the Future which is anticipated to be “bigger and better.” The ways of the Past are not considered good just because they are Past, and truly dominant Americans are seldom content with the Present. This view results in a high evaluation of change,
providing the change does not threaten the existing value order.

4) Activity Orientation

The modality of human activity is the fourth of the common human problems giving rise to a value-orientation system with the range of three fold variations: 'Being', 'Being-in-Becoming', and 'Doing'. This three-way distinction is to some degree similar to the classification of personality which Charles Morris has developed: 'Dionysian' for Being, 'Apollonian' for the Being-in-Becoming, and 'Promethean' for the Doing.\footnote{Morris, Charles, ‘Paths of Life,’ New York, Harper & Bros., 1942. Recited from Kluckhohn F. R. and Strodbeck Fred L., op. cit. pp. 15-16.}

In the culture of Being orientation, the preference is for the kind of activity which is a spontaneous expression of what is conceived to be "given" in the human personality: a release and indulgence of existing desires.

The culture of Being-in-Becoming orientation shares with the Being one a great concern with what human being is rather than what he can accomplish. However, the idea of development, so little stressed in the Being orientation, is dominant value in the Being-in-Becoming culture.

Finally, the most distinctive feature of the culture with the Doing orientation is a demand for the kind of activity which results in accomplishments that are measurable by standards conceived to be external to the acting individual. That aspect of self-judgment or judgment of others which relate to the nature of activity is based mainly upon a measurable accomplishment achieved by acting upon persons or things. What does the individual do? What can he or will he accomplish? These are almost always the primary questions in the Doing orientation people's scale of appraisal of persons.
5) Relational Orientation

The last of the common human problems is the value orientation in man's relation to other men. This orientation has three subdivisions: 'the Lineal', 'the Collateral', and 'the Individualistic'. With similar concept, sociologists have long used various types of dichotomies to differentiate homogeneous folk societies (collectivists) from the more complex urban societies (individualists).

In the culture where the Individualistic orientation is dominant, individual goal have primacy over the goals of specific Collateral or Lineal groups. There is license for the individual to pursue selfishly his own interests and in so doing disregard the interests of others. It means simply that each individual's responsibility to the total society and his place in it are defined in terms of goal (and roles) which are structured as autonomous, in the sense of being independent of particular Lineal or Collateral groupings.

A culture with dominant Collateral orientation calls for a primacy of the goals and welfare of the laterally extended group. The group in this case is always moderately independent of other similar groups, and the problem of a well-regulated continuity of group relationships through time is not highly critical.

If, in some culture, the Lineal principle is dominant, group goals again have primacy, but there is the additional factor that one of the most important of these group goal is continuity through time. Continuity of the group through time and ordered positional succession within the group are both crucial issues when Lineality dominates the relational system.

3-3-2. Four Cultural Dimensions by Hofstede

The Model of Four Cultural Dimensions of cultural variables was developed by Geert Hofstede who founded and managed the Personnel Research Department of IBM Europe during 1965-1971. While at IBM, he developed quite extensive multinational survey (covering employees in 72 national subsidiaries, 38 occupations, 20 languages, altogether 116,000 questionnaires) that mainly dealt with the employees' personal values related to the work situation. The results of this survey greatly influenced the development of his model of culture, and led him to develop or refer to other multinational surveys that validated these initial findings.

For developing his model of four cultural dimensions he borrowed Inkeles and Levinson's model of three common problems to all societies: 1) relation to authority 2) conception of self, in particular: the relationship between individual and society, and the individual's concept of masculinity and femininity 3) ways of dealing with conflicts, including control of aggression and the expression of feelings.\(^{46}\) The four cultural dimensions are summarized in Table 3-2 and each of dimensions is reviewed in detail as following.

**Table 3-2: Four Cultural Dimensions by Hofstede**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Dimensions</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>Social inequality, including the relationship with authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism vs. Collectivism</td>
<td>The relationship between the individual and the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity vs. Femininity</td>
<td>The social implications having been born as a boy or a girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>Relating to the control of aggression and the expression of emotions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Power Distance

The issue Power Distance deals with is human inequality. Different cultures have different inequalities depending on areas such as prestige, wealth, and power; different cultures put different weights on status consistency among these areas. As means of measuring the amount of Power Distance, Hofstede suggested so called PDI (Power Distance Index), which is derived from country mean scores on three questions in the survey. These questions deal with perceptions of superior’s style of decision-making and of colleagues’ fear to disagree with superiors, and with the type of decision-making which subordinates prefer in their boss. Actual questions used to survey are as follows:

- Non-managerial employees’ perception that employees are afraid to disagree with their managers
- Subordinates’ perception that their boss tends to take decisions in an autocratic or persuasive/paternalistic way.
- Subordinates’ preference for anything but a consultative style of decision-making in their boss: that is, for an autocratic, a persuasive/paternalistic, or a democratic style.

What Hofstede found through multi-national survey was that high power distances tend to exist in Latin American countries, France, Spain, and in Asia and Africa. In these countries, subordinates tend to be afraid of their bosses, bosses tend not to confer with their subordinates, and bosses tend to be paternalistic or autocratic. The social norms of low power distance include “Inequality in society should be minimized”, “All should be interdependent”, or “Powerful people should try to look less powerful than they are.”

Low-power-distance countries include the United States, Great Britain, much of the
rest of Europe (Sweden, Germany, Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark), New Zealand, and Israel. In these countries, subordinates are more likely to challenge bosses and bosses tend to use a consultative management style. Some examples of social norms of low PDI cultures include “There should be an order of inequality in this world in which everyone has his rightful place”, “A few should be independent and most should dependent”, and “Other people are a potential threat to one’s power and rarely can be trusted.”

2) Individualism vs. Collectivism

The cultural variable of Individualism vs. Collectivism describes the relationship between the individual and the collectivity which prevails in a given society. This concept is similar to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s value orientation of Relational Orientation introduced in the preceding section. It is reflected in the way of people live together – for example, in nuclear families, extended families, or tribes; and it has all kinds of value implications. In some cultures, individualism is seen as a blessing and a source of well-being; in others, it is seen as alienating.

Hofstede also developed Individualism Index (IDV) like PDI for Power Distance Index. Individualism Index uses country mean answer scores on the 14 “work goals” questions: challenge, desirable area, earnings, cooperation, training, benefits, recognition, physical conditions, freedom, employment security, advancement, manager, use of skills, personal time. Some examples of questions include “How important is it to you to have an opportunity for high earnings?” and “How important is it to you to fully use your skills and abilities on the job?”

In Individualistic cultures, people are expected to look out for themselves. There is
little social cohesion. Examples of countries with Individualistic value include the United States, France, Germany, South Africa, and Canada. Those cultures put high emphasis upon the value of personal time, freedom, and challenge. Some examples of social norms of high IDV (Individualistic cultures) include “In society, everyone is supposed to take care of him or herself and his or her immediate family” and “Everyone has a right on a private life and opinion.”

Meanwhile, in Collectivist cultures, individuals develop strong personal and protective ties and are also expected to provide unquestioning loyalty to the group during their lifetimes and sometimes beyond. Collectivist cultures were appeared to place high value in training, physical conditions, and use of skills. Low IDV (Collectivist) cultures have social norm like “In society, people are born into extended families or clans which protect them in exchange for loyalty” and “Private life is invaded by organizations and clans to which one belongs.”

3) Masculinity vs. Femininity

The cultural variable of Masculinity and Femininity refers to the issue of whether the biological differences between the sexes should or should not have implications for their roles in social activities. The duality of the sexes is a fundamental fact with which different societies cope in different ways. The sex role distribution common in a particular society is transferred by socialization in families, schools, and peer groups, and through the media. The predominant value in this cultural variable, in many cases’ is for men to be more assertive and for women to be more nurturing.

Masculinity Index (MAS) was also developed for measuring to what extent respondents to survey in a country (of both sexes) tend to endorse goals usually more
popular among men (high MAS) or among women (low MAS). MAS was evaluated by mean answer scores on the 14 “work goals” questions used in measuring Individuality index.

High MAS cultures were shown to put more values upon some work goals like “have a high opportunity for earnings”, “get recognition you deserve”, “have an opportunity for advancement to higher-level jobs”, and “have challenging work to do to derive a sense of accomplishment.” Countries with high MAS include United States, Japan, Mexico, Great Britain, Hong Kong, Italy, Germany, and New Zealand.

Low MAS cultures were appeared to have tendency to put emphasis on work goals such as “have a good working relationship with your direct supervisor”, “work with people who cooperate well with one another”, “live in an area desirable to you and your family”, and “have the security that you will be able to work for your company as long as you want to.” Sweden, Israel, Spain, Korea, France, Denmark, Finland, and Indonesia are countries which have showed high inclination toward low MAS.

4) Uncertainty Avoidance

This cultural variable of Uncertainty Avoidance focuses on the extent to which people feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations. The tolerance for uncertainty varies considerably among people in subsidiaries in different countries; the three indicators used are rule orientation, employment stability, and stress. The three together produce a country Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI).

Cultures with high UAI tends to perceive unknown situations, as threatening and that people therefore, tend to avoid these situations. Countries included in this group include Latin American countries, Japan, and South Korea. These cultures have social
norms such as “The uncertainty inherent in life felt as a continuous threat that must be fought”, “Time is money”, “Strong need for consensus”, and “Deviant persons and ideas are dangerous.”

Low UAI indicates that a culture is less threatened by unknown situations. Examples of countries where this is so include the Netherlands, Germany, United States, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Great Britain. These countries put high value upon social norms like “The uncertainty inherent in life is more easily accepted and each day is taken as it comes”, “Hard work is not a virtue per se”, “Conflict and competition can be contained on the level of fair play and used constructively”, and “Achievement determined in terms of recognition.”

3-3-3. LESCANT 47

LESCANT is another model of cultural variables developed by, then, professor at Eastern Michigan University, David A. Victor. LESCANT is the acronym standing for Language, Environment and Technology, Social Organization, Contexting, Authority Conception, Nonverbal Behavior, and Temporal Conception. He developed this model of cultural variables for providing a framework for formulating right questions in a multicultural environment when assessing the role cultural differences play in any international business interaction. As shown in this goal of model, this model is oriented toward quite practical application for international business communication. It was not generated from the serious original research like Hofstede nor form theoretical perspective as Kluckhohn or Inkels. LESCANT is rather a combined model of more or less every bit of many existing models of cultural variables including Kluckhohn’s,

Hofstede's, Hall's and others with some additions of his own. However, there is some characteristics of LESCANT own in the point of that it includes some physical elements such as Kinesics, Appearance, Oculistics, Haptics, and Proxemics. The structure of LESCANT is summarized diagrammatically in the Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: LESCANT Model of Cultural Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Variables</th>
<th>Elements of Cultural Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Degree of fluency, Accent, Dialects, Regional Differences, Sociolinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>Physical characteristics, Natural resources, Perception of technology, culture, &amp; physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Organization</td>
<td>Kinship &amp; Family structure, Class systems &amp; Economic stratification, Gender roles, Individualism &amp; Collectivism, Religion, Occupational Institutions, Political &amp; Judicial system, Mobility &amp; Geographic attachment, Recreational Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contexting</td>
<td>High and Low contexting, Face saving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority Conception</td>
<td>Power perception, Power distance, Leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal communicaion</td>
<td>Kinesics, Appearance, Oculistics, Haptics, Proxemics, Passive nonverbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Conception</td>
<td>Monochronic &amp; Polychronic, Past, Present, &amp; Future oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Language

Victor viewed that language is one of the most influencing factors on culture. While a myriad of minor influences may be made to the culture by language, he identified three of these which are most likely to affect culture.

First one is linguistic determinism which is the assertion that one's view of reality
stems largely from the language one uses. Unconscious linguistic forms influence the way people behave and think. Some example of linguistic determinism: the language of the Eskimo people, has no word for snow although it has dozens of words for types of snow for which most European and Asian languages have no equivalent. They only have, powdery snow, slushy snow, granular snow, crusty snow, and many other varieties of snow.

The second one is language as a ‘cultural password.’ The language itself is a window through which some outsiders can participate in the culture and gain the trust of its members. To the extent that a language is closely tied to a culture, the use of that language tends to admit entry into that society. The use of a language, for many cultures, symbolizes understanding of or even membership in that culture.

The third issue of Language in LESCANT is linguistic equivalence. At best, a translation provides equivalence, not an exact reproduction of meaning of certain culture. Seemingly well-translated words can cause many misunderstanding in another culture.

2) Environment and Technology

Environment and Technology in LESCANT describes the nature of environment in which people live and work. To survive, people adapt to the natural world around them and, in doing so, define an integral part of their own culture. While the way in which people adapt to their environment is the defining cultural element here, the natural world is the building block on which the superstructure of adaptive behavior is erected. The five physical elements most likely to influence culture were identified as climate, topography, population size and density, and the availability of natural resources

‘Climate’ affects significantly the nation’s development. Some researchers link
tropical climate to underdevelopment, citing increased levels of harmful insects, disease, and parasites. Climate also influences behavior of those who live there: cold weather forces people to stay longer inside. However there are some differences from culture to culture to the extent how much they accept climate as per se. American is accustomed to view climate as generally irrelevant because they think climate can be controlled with technology while for some other cultures, climate is what people should adapt.

'Topography' can affect the cultural behavior of those who live in a region. Topography can be defined as area's physical and natural features, such as mountains, bodies of water, and internal distances. In some cases, marked topographical barriers within a country can produce strong domestic cultural differences. Some example of what topological features affect a whole nation and help define its culture can be found in the Netherlands. The Dutchman was always open to - and appreciative of - foreign influences, precisely because of his close bond with the sea. As a result, topological features of the Netherlands have shaped the Dutch mentality toward internationalism. Depending on topological condition, people also have different perception on distance. Canadian may think nothing of driving from Toronto to Windsor, a four-to five-hour trip while a Briton traveling from London four hours north to Newcastle might consider the trip a significant obstacle.

'Population size' is a major factor in the way the members of a society view the world around them. Industrialized nations with small populations are often export-driven countries such as Sweden or Switzerland. Companies in countries with small population size are likely to move at the earliest stages of production into the international arena. Such ventures, in turn, reinforce a tendency toward greater cross-cultural awareness. On the other hand, companies in more populous nation with large
domestic market (America, Japan) are less likely to establish transnational leadership with multiple headquarters of equivalent strength. Countries with large populations can think on a global scale.

'Population density' also strongly influences underlying assumptions about how people use their environment: transportation, shopping habits, land use, the way of parking, the way in which people use product, and office arrangement. For example, crowd traffic makes Hon Kong flexible about punctuality and goes to neighborhood shop rather than big shopping mall far away. The scarcity of space in Japan as a whole affects the perceptions the Japanese hold, even in sparsely populated areas: modular house and double-decker home garage. Density makes influences on product use: for example, Japanese having less refrigerator space, shop more often for perishable or frozen goods. Tupperware is a great success in Japan.


3) Social Organization

Cultural variable of Social Organization is defined broadly as the common institutions and collective activities shared by members of a culture. The influence of these institutions and collective activities shapes the behavior of people in all aspects of life. Unlike the other cultural variables, social organization can be seen as an overt, external influence on individuals. Most of other cultural variables may seem so natural that individuals may be unaware that the particular formulation of that variable is not universal. However, the exact opposite is true for social organization. Individuals almost
always understand the artificiality of social organization. Even so, people may be
critical of deviations from their system of social organization. While people often do not
recognize the influence of internal factors— for instance, the way their language limits or
extends their ability to express themselves—they are likely to be aware of the way social
institutions (an external influence) restrain or extend the limits of acceptable behavior.

The social structures that are most likely to affect the culture include the following
ten areas:

- Kinship and family structure
- Educational system and ties
- Class systems and economic stratification
- Gender roles
- Individualism and collectivism
- Religion
- Occupational institutions
- Political and judicial system
- Mobility and geographic attachment
- Recreational institutions

4) Contexting and Face Saving

Victor borrowed the concept of Contexting from the model of Edward T. Hall which
will be reviewed in depth at later section. He defined Contexting as “the amount of
information transmitted and the amount of information stored or assumed.” Victor
himself also redefined in his own terms as “the way in which one communicates and
especially the circumstances surrounding that communication.”
The greater the amount of knowledge and experience two communicators share, the less important it is for them to express directly what they wish to say or write. Conversely, the less these communicators share, the more necessary it is for them to convey their meaning through words and gestures — that is, the less they can assume to be understood.

Contexting is to a large extent culturally learned behavior. Members of the same culture need to be aware of a host of nuances; those nuances, however, are at least relatively familiar to the participants. Members of the same culture, therefore, select the interpretation of contexting cues in their communication from a limited menu of culturally determined acceptable behaviors. As a result, members of the same culture (as compared to members of different cultures) rarely expend a great deal of conscious effort determining the appropriate level of contexting. The degree of contexting varies from culture to culture. Moreover, the degree of contexting itself reflects and affects attitudes toward another cross-cultural variables.

Victor also categorized Contexting as being either high or low. When individuals have considerable knowledge and experience in common, their communication is generally highly contextual. In highly contextual interactions, the communicators commonly anticipate that what is not actually said is already understood.

When communicators rely relatively little on shared knowledge and experience, their communication is called low context. Hints based on inferred messages between low context communicators are less apparent than between high context communicators. As a result, more information must be explicitly stated in low context exchanges than in high context ones. Emphasis is placed on verbal self-disclosure.

Along with 'contexting', Victor also introduced the concept of 'Face-Saving' as one
of cultural variables. It is defined as the act of preserving one's prestige or outward dignity.

Table 3-4: Characteristics of Face-Saving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>High face-saving</th>
<th>Low face-saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contexting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favored business communication approach</td>
<td>Politeness strategy; indirect plan</td>
<td>Confrontation strategy; direct plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of directness</td>
<td>Uncivil; Inconsiderate; offensive</td>
<td>Honest; Inoffensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of indirectness</td>
<td>Civil; Considerable; honest</td>
<td>Dishonest; offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of verbal self-disclosure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagueness</td>
<td>Tolerated</td>
<td>Untolerated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The more highly contextual a culture is, the more importance its members attach to face-saving. In large measure, the indirection employed by members of high context cultures is engaged in precisely to avoid even accidentally causing another person to lose face. The directness characteristic of low context cultures, on the other hand, is possible specifically because communicators are relatively less likely to feel that they have been affronted or that their prestige or dignity has been attacked. He summarized the characteristics of Face-Saving as Table 3-4.

5) Authority Conception: Power Perception and Leadership Style

Victor included Authority Conception in his model of LESCANT, which is similar
concept of Power Distance of Hofstede’s model reviewed in the preceding section. He defines authority as “shared beliefs about the power or influence of an organization or an individual representing that organization.”

In the model of LESCANT, the concept of authority has two elements that represent aspects of authority: power and leadership style. Authority and power are inseparable. Authority is the right to command or act and is the power you have over others. In the mean time, leadership style can be defined as the aspect of authority that places the application of power in its symbolic context. Power as an element of authority deals only with substantive action while leadership deals with the meaning of the action involved.

Victor argued that differences in Authority Conception directly influence on many aspects of communication as follows:

- The way in which members of a culture view authority affects many functions of communication.
- The nature and frequency of upward and downward communication between subordinates and superiors
- The degree of freedom to communicate with those outside the hierarchical structure of the organization
- Laying the foundation for the importance of adherence to rules, the use of titles, and the acceptance of strangers.

Leadership style also derives in large part from the culture to which the leader belongs. Subordinates are culturally taught to expect their leader to behave in certain ways and, in turn, those views shape the leader’s behavior. For example, leaders in some cultures who employ a participative management style encourage communication with
considerable egalitarianism and feedback. Those who do not, resist feedback and do not wish to have their orders questioned. For the first three decades following World War II, leadership principles and theories of U.S. style such as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, and McGregor’s Theory X and Y were viewed as being universally applicable. However, as other industrialized countries such as Japan, Germany, and Italy became recovered from WW II, theories and principles of leadership style of U.S. were faced serious doubt in applying different cultures.

6) Nonverbal Communication

Nonverbal Communication in LESCANT is rather unique cultural variable which cannot found in other models of cultural variables. Nonverbal Communication in LESCANT is defined as “the exchange of information through nonlinguistic signs.”

He asserted that the amount of information people communicate nonverbally exceeds what they communicate by using words. Roy L. Birdwhistell, in a groundbreaking, systematic study, suggests that as much as 65 percent of a message’s meaning is transmitted through the sender’s nonverbal communication. Moreover, in certain situations different cultures may rely more heavily on nonverbal (versus verbal) communication. Although the expression and inner experiences that characterize the fundamental emotions are innate and universal, the degree to which individuals are taught to mask those facial expressions remains a cross-cultural variable. In other words, it is more permissible in some cultures to show emotion than others.


Nonverbal Speaking is again subdivided into two categories: active and passive. Active nonverbal communication is defined as nonverbal behavior the communicator can consciously modulate. Active nonverbal communication falls into six main categories:

- **Kinesics**, or movement: covers a broad range of nonverbal activity, including facial expressions, pacing and other leg movement, body posture and gestures of the hands, arms, head, and torso.

- **Appearance**: An individual's general appearance is a strong nonverbal communicator both within a culture and across cultures. Appearance can be divided into inherent biological differences (such as skin color) and acquired non-biological differences (such as dress).

- **Oculsics**, or eye behavior: the term used to describe the way in which people use their eyes in a communication exchange. Often such behavior is referred to as eye contact, which popularly refers to a mutual interlocking of eyes. However Oculsics does not just refer to eye contact, extending to comprehensive eye behavior: looking at one another, mutual gaze, looking at the other passengers when riding elevators, squinting, winking, and fluttering eyelids.

- **Haptics**, tacesics, or touching behavior: the way in which people communicate through their touching behaviors: handshaking, backslapping, kissing. The frequency of haptic exchanges and the amount of physical contact customary is subject to great variability. For instance, there is wide discrepancy in the extent of physical contact preferred by Japanese and Americans during conversation. Americans reported two to three times greater physical contact with parents and twice greater contact with friends than the Japanese.

- **Proxemics**, or space usage: refers to the way in which people structure the space around them. All people maintain a sphere of space around them for comfort. If another person intrudes into that space, the individual feels that other person is invading his or her space and is too close. Depending on the context of the intrusion, the intruder may be thought of as overly aggressive or overly intimate.
This concept of Proxemics was greatly dealt with Edward T. Hall’s “Hidden Dimension.”

- Paralanguage: represents all sounds that people produce with their voices that are not words. It is divided it into the three broad categories: voice quality, vocalization, and vocal qualifiers.

In the meantime, Passive Nonverbal Communication is defined as nonverbal communication over which the sender has less control. It can be divided into four main groupings that tend to differ across cultures:

- Color: describes person’s preference for and rejection of specific colors
- Numerals and counting indicators: refers to the number system used in certain culture.
- Nonkinesic emblems or symbols: refers to emblems, tokens, or signs culture associated.
- Olfactory communication, or smell: natural odors human being generates.

7) Temporal Conception

In cultural variable of Temporal Conception, Victor explores various perspective of time, highlighting Edward T. Hall’s Polychronic time and Monochronic time, and how they can affect business communication, particularly with respect to scheduling. Any further discussion in this cultural variable of Temporal Conception is not be done in this section because P-time and M-time will be dealt with more extensively in the model of Hall’s section.

3-3-4. Edward T. Hall

Edward T. Hall is well-known anthropologists and wrote many best-seller books

---

related to cross-cultural issues which contributed to make anthropology more publicly accessible topic: ‘Hidden Dimensions’, ‘Beyond Culture’, ‘Silent Language’, ‘The Dance of Life’, ‘An Anthropology of Everyday Life’, and others. His theories were widely applied for practical purpose for other fields such as architecture, design, and international business as well. He has not developed seamless neat model of cultural variable, which is why he does not have the name of model. In this section, individual cultural variables which are rather widely spread over Hall’s various books are collected and introduced. They are summarized in Table 3-5.

Table 3-5: Cultural Variables of Edward T. Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Polychronic and Monochronic Time: Number of things done at once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>High and Low Context: Amount of information in a communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Territoriality, Personal Space, Multisensory Space, Unconscious Reaction to Spatial Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS (Primary Message Systems)</td>
<td>Interaction, Association, Subsistence, Bisexuality, Territoriality, Temporality, Learning, Play, Defense, Exploitation (use of materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Velocity</td>
<td>The speed with which people decode and act on message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Chain</td>
<td>A sequence of events that lead to the accomplishment of a goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Time: P-time and M-time\textsuperscript{51}

Hall dealt with cultural conception to time by categorizing two different types: He uniquely termed them as “Polychronic Time (P-time)” and “Monochronic Time (M-time).” This cultural variable is widely adopted to other models of cultural variables including, Victor’s LESCANT, Trompenaar’s model which will be reviewed in the later

section of this chapter. At first time, he discovered this different temporal conception from his Spanish friend who does many things at once without any linear schedule.

M-time and P-time designate two mutually exclusive kinds of solution to the use of both time and space as organizing frames for activities. At first, this Time cultural variables dealt with only temporal issues but later other elements such as space, communication, and human relationships are included because they are functionally interrelated.

M-time is characterized as having temporal conception of “one-thing-at-a time”. It emphasizes schedules, segmentation, and promptness. M-time cultures put high values upon time commitments and rather concentrate on job itself. They work hard to make nice plan but once plan is set up, they adhere strictly to the plan as much as possible. They are very accustomed to short-term relationship and flexible changes. Northern European countries and America are included in M-time cultures.

In the meantime, P-time cultures are characterized by several things happening at once. They stress involvement of people and completion of transactions rather than adherence to preset schedules. P-time is treated as much less tangible than M-time. P-time also put emphasis upon human relationship rather than task or job and think long time relationship as very important. Examples of P-time cultures include Middle Eastern, Latin American, and Mediterranean cultures. For example, in the markets and stores of Mediterranean countries, one is surrounded by other customers vying for the attention of a clerk. There is no order as to who is served next.

There are some cultures without exclusive P-time or M-time. For example, Japanese are known to be polychronic in their dealings with other people, but monochronic in their approach to official business dealings.
Characteristics of M-time and P-time is summarized in Table 3-6 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monochronic Cultures</th>
<th>Polychronic Cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do one thing at a time</td>
<td>Do many things at once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate on the job</td>
<td>Are highly distractible and subject to interruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View time commitments as critical</td>
<td>View time commitments as objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are low-context and need information</td>
<td>Are high-context and already have information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are committed to job</td>
<td>Are committed to people and human relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere strictly to plans</td>
<td>Change plans often and easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize promptness</td>
<td>Base promptness on the importance of and significance of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are accustomed to short-term relationships</td>
<td>Have a strong tendency to build lifetime relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Context: High Context and Low Context

The cultural variable of High and Low context are another well known one developed by Hall so that many other models of cultural variables adopt this one. High context or Low context refers to the amount of information that is in a given communication as a function of the context in which it occurs: i.e. the ratio between information clearly shown in the surface of message and hidden in context. Victor summarizes the characteristics of High context and Low context in diagram revising original Hall's diagram as shown in Figure 3-4.

---

As shown in Figure 3-4, a highly contexted communication is one in which most of the meaning is in the context while very little is in the transmitted message. In high contexted cultures, 'Yes' does not necessarily mean literally 'Yes'. Correct communication requires high sharing of contextual information. They do not strictly adhere to hard 'fact' but context around it. In law enforcement, contextual evidence frequently overrides the hard legal fact. One of most highly contexted countries is Japan, and Arabic, Latin American, and Italian cultures also are included in High Context cultures.

A Low Context communication is similar to interacting with a computer – if the

---

53 Victor, David A. op. cit. p.143.
information is not explicitly stated, and the program followed religiously, the meaning is distorted. In the Western word in general, the law is Low Context, in comparison with daily transactions of an informal nature. In Low Context cultures, words are literally communicated to the receiver in straightforward mode. They do not have hard time to decode the message. Most Northern European and American cultures belong to this Low Context culture.

3) Proxemics

Proxemics (also shown in the section of Victor’s LESCANT) is the study of people’s use of space as a function of culture. That is, the effect of culture on the structuring and use of space. It deals with personal distancing and the unstated rules for laying out houses and towns. Hall conducted many extensive field works regarding Proxemics in his book “Hidden Dimensions”. Hoft reorganized Hall’s Proxemics into four categories of Territoriality, Personal Space, Multi-sensory Space, and Unconscious Reaction to Spatial Differences.

Territoriality describes ‘ownership’, and extends to communicate power. For example, interior layouts differ from culture to culture. In some cultures, status or power of people is clearly conveyed in the size of space or layout while in others, no clear difference.

Every culture has its own personally comfortable space. There are unspoken and unconscious rules about when personal space is violated: different psychological distance of ‘intimate’, ‘personal’, and ‘public’. In Hall’s example, in Northern Europe, people do not touch others, and even brushing the overcoat sleeve of another in passing is enough to warrant an apology.
Invisible spatial boundaries extend to all the five senses. Cultures have unconscious rules about what is too loud and intrusive. In some cultures, like Germany, a loud conversation is perceived as infringing on another’s private space while in Italy, loud conversations are not perceived as infringing on invisible boundaries.

Additionally, the distance kept when having a conversation can influence the response the person has to other person and his conversation. Greater distance than expected can send an unconscious and negative message to other person.

4) Primary Message Systems (PMS)\textsuperscript{54}

Hall also identified ten separate kinds of human activities which he labeled ‘Primary Message Systems’. He argued that PMS is most fundamental human activities and with this one can analyze any culture and eventually come out with a complete map of culture. For each elementary activity, people from different cultures have different orientation, so that PMS can function as profiling frameworks of any given culture. PMS of ten activities is listed up: ‘Interaction’, ‘Association’, ‘Subsistence’, ‘Bisexuality’, ‘Territoriality’, ‘Temporality’, ‘Learning’, ‘Play’, ‘Defense’, and ‘Exploitation (use of materials)’. As easily shown in the list, PMS includes many cultural variables shown in others: for example, Bisexuality (masculinity and femininity), Territoriality (Proxemics), and Temporality (Temporal conception). What is really good about PMS comes from Hall’s addition of three layers of ‘Technical’, ‘Informal’, and ‘Formal’ over PMS as shown in Figure 3-5.

\textsuperscript{54} Hall, Edward T. op. cit. 1959.
Every elements of PMS is shown in the line of cultural layers so that one can easily understand how PMS changes over the levels of culture: for example of Play, technical level of 'games' becomes 'playing' in the level of informal, and 'concepts of fun and humor' in formal level.

5) Message Velocity

The cultural variable of Message Velocity is closely related one with High and Low
Context. Message Velocity refers to the speed with which people decode and act on message. All cultures settle on particular spots on the Message Velocity spectrum where members feel most comfortable. For example, in the United States, personal relationships and friendships tend to be somewhat transitory. However, in many other cultures, friendship takes a long time to develop; however once established, it persists and is not taken lightly. As another example, Commercial message in American TV is fast and low contextual while as European one is rather slow and high contextual.

6) Action Chain

Final cultural variable of Hall’s model is Action Chain borrowed from the field of animal behavior. It describes an interaction process in which one action releases another in a uniform patterned way. Each action has a sequence of events, and has a beginning, a climax, and an end with a number of intermediate stages. These steps and stages differ significantly from culture to culture. For example, even a short action chain like hand shake can have different steps and stages: who will extend hands first, senior or junior, or no matter, what is the amount of grip pressure; how many times should hands be shaken and so on.

3-3-5. The Cultural Variables by Fons Trompenaars

Fons Trompenaars is a managing director of the Center for International Business Studies, Netherlands-based international management and training consultancy where he is running cross-cultural training programs. His model of cultural variables is the result from the huge database (15,000 participants) he established from many cross-

cultural surveys.

He came up with seven cultural variables out of 3 categories adopted mainly from Parsons and Shils’ model of ‘Pattern Variables’ which will be briefly dealt with in the following section: Universalism vs. Particularism, Individualism vs. Collectivism, Neutral vs. Emotional, Specific vs. Diffuse, Achievement vs. Ascription, Attitude towards Time, Attitudes toward the Environment. Trompenaars’ model is summarized in Table 3-7 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with People</th>
<th>Cultural Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship and Rules</td>
<td>Universalism versus Particularism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group and individual</td>
<td>Individualism versus Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings and Relationship</td>
<td>Neutral versus Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Range of Involvement</td>
<td>Specific versus Diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How We Accord Status</td>
<td>Achievement versus Ascription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with Time</th>
<th>Atitudes toward Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with Environment</th>
<th>Atitudes toward Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Universalism versus Particularism

This category of cultural variable seems to be somewhat similar to M-time and P-time in Hall’s Model in the sense that it deals with rules and particular context. Universalism applies rules and procedures universally to ensure equality and consistency. It focuses more on rules than relationship and they strongly believe that there is only one truth or reality. They think that a deal is deal and legal contracts must
be drawn up.

However, in the mean time, Particularists encourage flexibility by adapting particular situations. They put high emphasis upon relationship than upon rules and feel trust with a person who honors changing mutuality. In Particularist culture, there may be several perspectives on reality relative to each participant.

The question used in the survey of Trompenaars for measuring Universal and Particularist response well illustrates the concept of Universalism and Particualrism:

Imagine that you are riding in a car driven by a close friend. He hits a pedestrian. You know he was going at least 35 miles per hour in an area of the city where the maximum allowed speed is 20 miles per hour. There are no witnesses. His lawyer says that if you testify under oath that he was only driving 20 miles per hour it may save him from serious consequences. How would you do?

Universalist would not testify that he was going 20 miles an hour because his rule overrides his relationship with friend. However, Particularist would tell 'white lie' because his special situation of relationship with friend is regarded more important than hard rule. Countries which showed Universalistic response to above question include Canada, USA, Switzerland and mostly Northern European countries while Particularistic countries include Korea, Venezuela, Russia, and China. Japanese were found to be in the middle of both extremes.

2) Individualism versus Collectivism

This cultural variable is the one of most commonly shown cultural variable models. Almost all scholars related to the cultural variables deal with this issue of Individualism versus Collectivism. This cultural variable addresses the issue of how people regard themselves primarily as individuals or primarily as part of group.

Individualists regard themselves as individual and put high value on individual
freedom and responsibility. They use more frequently “I” form and most of decisions are made on the spot by representatives. They behave mostly individually like trip by alone, eat alone and so on.

Collectivists regard themselves as part of group and think first how others will think before making decision. Collectivism cultures encourage individuals to work for consensus in the interests of the group. They use more frequently “We” form in communication, sometimes even “our wife”. They think that it is ideal to achieve in groups which assume joint responsibility. They enjoy organized group behavior or with extended family like group tour. Trompenaars also used the following questions for measuring people’s orientation of Individualism versus Collectivism:

A: “It is obvious that if individuals have as much as freedom as possible and the maximum opportunity to develop themselves, the quality of their lives will improve as a result.”
B: “If individuals are continuously taking care of their fellow human beings, the quality of life will improve for everyone, even if it obstructs individual freedom and individual development.”

Which of the two ways of reasoning do you think is usually best, A or B?

Highest scoring Individualists were turned out to be Canadians, closely followed by the Americans, Norwegians, and Spanish. Nepal, Kuwait, and Egypt were shown to be strong Collectivist cultures. Japan is appeared to be relatively Individualistic compared to other neighboring Asian countries.

3) Affective versus Neutral

This cultural variable measures the extent to which people express emotion in the relationship with people, particularly when dealing with others in business context. Members of Neutral cultures do not easily show their feelings, but keep them carefully controlled and subdued. But it does not necessarily mean that Neutral cultures are cold
or unfeeling, nor that they are emotionally constipated or repressed.

In contrast, in cultures high on Affectivity, people reveal their feelings plainly by laughing, smiling, and gesturing. They attempt to find immediate outlets for their feelings. For them, transparency and expressiveness release tensions. In the workshop, different cultures were asked by how they would behave if they felt upset about something at work. Would they express their feelings openly? Japan was shown to be in the extreme of Neutral and Italy was in another extreme of Affective.

![Figure 3-6: The Styles of Verbal Communication in Different Cultures](image)

Along with the line of this value orientation, Trompnaars also interestingly compared the way in which different cultures exchange verbal communication. (Figure 3-6) In the styles of verbal communication, he found out for Anglo-Saxon, when A stops, B starts. It is not regarded as polite to interrupt by starting before other finishes. The even more verbal Latin people integrate slightly more than this; B will frequently interrupt A and vice versa to show how interested each is in what the other is saying.
However, the pattern of silent communication is occurred in the verbal communication of oriental cultures.

![Diagram showing the styles of tone of voice for different cultures: Anglo-Saxon, Latin, and Oriental.](Figure 3-7: The Styles of Tone of Voice for Different Cultures)

He also compared different styles of tone of voice in cross-cultural communication. Figure 3-7 shows typical patterns of tone of voice for Anglo Saxon, Latin, and oriental languages. For some Neutral cultures, ups and downs in speech suggest that the speaker is not serious. But in most Latin societies, this exaggerated way of communicating shows that you have your heart in this matter. Oriental societies tend to have a much more monotonous style; self-controlled, it shows respect. Frequently, the higher the position a person holds, the lower and flatter the voice is.

4) Specific versus Diffuse

This cultural variable addresses the issue of how far people get involved in other people's lives. Should people get involved beyond the public area or private or should
they be sealed off? In Specific cultures, public and private life and spaces are compartmentalized. There is clear division between business relationships and private relationships with others. A good business relationship is often kept separate from a good friendship. All the relationships are made directly to the point and messages are precise, blunt, definitive, and transparent. Principles and consistent moral stands independent of the person being addressed. United States, Australia, UK, Netherlands, Sweden, and Germany belong to Specific cultures.

![Diagram: Diffuse, high context (from general to specific) vs. Specific, low context (from specific to general)](image)

*Figure 3-8: Different Approaches to the Point Taken by Diffuse and Specific Cultures*

In Diffuse cultures, there is very little differentiation between a public and private life, and business relationships are extended easily to personal area. Their approach to relationship is very indirect, circuitous, and seemingly aimless, and their communication is evasive, tactful, ambiguous, and even opaque. All the matters in relationship are highly situational depending upon the person and context encountered. Typical Diffuse cultures include China, Singapore, Japan, Mexico, and France. Trompenaars visualized the different approaches taken to the point by Diffuse and Specific cultures as shown Figure 3-8 in the preceding page.
5) Achievement versus Ascription

This cultural variable deals with the issue of how people's status is accorded, by their achievements or by other ascribing factors such as title, education, age or profession. In Achievement oriented cultures, status of people is accorded based on individual achievements. They use title only when relevant to the competence they bring to the task. Respect for superior in hierarchy is depending on his or her performance. Senior managers are not necessarily older than subordinates. They are positioned only by their proficiency in specific jobs. Examples of this culture include Norway, United States, Denmark and other Northern European countries.

In the mean time, in Ascription-oriented cultures, status is accorded based on birth, kinship, gender, age, educational record, and personal connection. People in Ascription-oriented cultures frequently use their titles for clarifying their status in the organization. Respect for superior in hierarchy is seen as a measure of people's commitment to the organization and its mission. Positions of senior managers are predominantly taken by male, middle-aged, and qualified by their background. Example countries belonging to this orientation include Russia, Japan, Spain, France, China, and Belgium.

6) Attitudes toward Time -- Past, Present, and Future

This cultural variable is similar to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeek's value orientation of Relationship with Time. It measures the relative importance cultures give to the past, present, and future. Since many issues regarding this cultural variable are already dealt with, in this section it will be just briefly reviewed.

People in Past-oriented cultures show respect for ancestors and predecessors, and talk frequently about history, origin of family, and nation. Everything is viewed in the
context of tradition or history. In the Present-oriented cultures people show interests in present relationships, here and now, and they regard activities and enjoyment of the moment as most important. Plans are not objected to but rarely executed and everything is viewed in terms of its contemporary impact and style. Finally, members of Future-oriented cultures have great interests in the youthful and in the future potentials and they use or even exploit present and past for future advantage. They talk much of prospects, potentials, aspirations, and future achievement. Planning and future strategy are regarded very essential and done enthusiastically.

Figure 3-9: Different Perception toward Past, Present, and Future

As shown in Figure 3-9, Trompenaars introduced interesting diagram of ‘Circle Test’ for measuring people’s relative importance toward past, present and futures, and their mutual relationships. Respondents were asked to draw different size of circle

56 Cottle, Tom, ‘The Circles Test: An Investigation of Perception of Temporal Relatedness and
depending on relative importance and to layout to show their mutual relationships.

7) Attitudes toward Environment - Internal Control and External Control

The last cultural variable of Trompenaars model concerns the role people assign to their natural environment: Should people control the nature or go along with nature as given? This dimension is also similar to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's Relationship with Nature: Control, Harmony, and Subjugation.

Cultures with Internal Control believe that they can and should control nature by imposing their will upon it. They have often dominating attitude bordering on aggressiveness towards environment and have tendency of focusing on self, function, own group, and own organization. They feel discomfort when environment seems out of control or changeable.

Contrastingly, people in External Control cultures believe that man is part of nature and must get along with its laws, directions, and forces. They have flexible attitude, willing to compromise and keep the peace. They focus on 'other' that is customer, partner and colleague, and feel comfortable with waves, shifts, cycles if these are 'natural.'

3-3-6. Other Models of Cultural Variables

There are still other models of cultural variables which are not reviewed in this study because they are more or less similar to those already introduced in this chapter. However, they are still deserved brief review in this section. These include models of Schien, Parson and Shils, and Inkeles and Levinson.

1) Edgar H. Schien\textsuperscript{57}

Schien focused on organizational culture rather than national scale of culture which is of interest in this study. However, his model can be easily extended to the scale of country.

He suggested three 'Dimensions of Culture' consisting of four categories. He argued "The content of organizational cultures reflects the ultimate problems that every group faces: dealing with its external environment and managing its internal problems. Beyond these external and internal problems, cultural assumptions reflect deeper issues about the nature of truth, time, space, human nature, and human relationships." This argumentation is somewhat similar to those of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck who tried to find out 'universal problems' every human being faces and listed up diverse relationships between human being and nature, time and so on.

His cultural dimensions include 'surviving in and adapting to external environments', 'managing internal integration', 'assumptions about reality, truth, time, and space', and finally 'assumptions about human nature, activity, and relationships.'

2) Standard Analytical Issues by Inkeles and Levinson\textsuperscript{58}

Social Psychologists, Inkeles and Levinson extensively reviewed articles about the national character and modal personality, and summarized a number of studies. Eventually they had come up with three "Standard Analytical Issues". This model was also widely adopted to other models like Hostede's model. His three standard analytical issues include 'Relation to Authority', 'Conception of Self', 'Primary Dilemmas or

\textsuperscript{58} Inkeles, Alex and Levinson, Daniel J. op. cit. 1969.
Conflicts, and Ways of Dealing with Them’.

Relation to Authority addresses three aspects: people’s ways of adapting behaviorally in interaction with authority; people’s personal ideology, that is, their beliefs, values, and attitudes regarding authority and authority-subordinate relations; the more central fantasies, defenses, and conceptions of authority and self that underlie and are reflected in their behavior and ideology.

Conception of Self includes the individual’s concepts of masculinity and femininity; his values in the form of moral prohibitions and ideals; and his models of dealing with inner dispositions and with external opportunities and demands.

At last, Primary Dilemmas or Conflicts, and Ways of Dealing with Them deal with the control of aggression and the expression versus inhibition of affect.

3) Pattern Variables by Parson and Shils

Social Psychologists, Parsons and Shils defined ‘Pattern Variables’ as ‘a dichotomy, one side of which must be chosen by an actor before the meaning of a situation is determinate for him, and thus before he can act with respect to that situation.’ They suggested five ‘Basic Pattern Variables’ derived directly from the frame of reference of the theory of action. Those Pattern Variables include ‘Affectivity – Neutrality’, ‘Self-Orientation – Collectivity-Orientation’, ‘Universalism – Particularism’, ‘Ascription – Achievement’, and ‘Specificity – Diffuseness.’ This model is adopted by Trompenaars reviewed in the previous section. Parsons and Shils’ model is not reviewed any further because Trompenaars used this model almost without any change.

---

3-3-7. Summarization of Existing Model of Cultural Variables

The models of existing cultural variables reviewed so far in this section can be summarized in Table 3-8.

**Table 3-8: Comparison of Models of Cultural Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Model</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Orientation</td>
<td>Kluckhohn &amp; Strodtbeck</td>
<td>• Human nature • Man nature • Time • Activity • Rational</td>
<td>To find out universal problems mankind is facing</td>
<td>Field Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Dimension</td>
<td>Holstede, Geert</td>
<td>• Power distance • Individualism vs. Collectivism • Masculinity vs. Femininity • Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>To determine cultural dimensions of work-related values</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESCANT</td>
<td>Victor, David A.</td>
<td>• Language • Environment and Technology • Social Organization • Contexting • Authority Conception • Nonverbal Communication • Temporal Conception</td>
<td>To determine the aspects of culture to affect communication in a business setting.</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing specifically</td>
<td>Edward T. Hall</td>
<td>• Time • Context • Proxemics • PMS • Message velocity • Action Chain</td>
<td>To find out what releases the right response.</td>
<td>Field Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing specifically</td>
<td>Trompenaars, Fons</td>
<td>• Universalism vs. Particularism • Individualism vs. Collectivism • Neutral vs. Emotional • Specific vs. Diffuse • Achievement vs. Assorption • Attitudes toward time • Attitudes toward environment</td>
<td>To determine the way in which a group of people solves problem</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of Culture</td>
<td>Schien, Edgar H</td>
<td>• Surviving in &amp; adapting to external Environment • Managing internal Integration • Assumption about reality, truth, time, &amp; Space • Assumption about human nature, activity, and relationship</td>
<td>To understand what are the major dimensions to affect organizational culture.</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Analytical Issues</td>
<td>Inkels, Alex &amp; Levinson.</td>
<td>• Relation to authority • Conception of self • Primary dilemmas or conflicts &amp; the way of dealing with them</td>
<td>To find out what are major universal free categories to modal personality</td>
<td>Theoretical literature study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Variables</td>
<td>Parsons, T. &amp; Shils E. A.</td>
<td>• Affectivity vs. Affective neutrality • Self vs. Collectivity orientation • Universalism vs. Particularism • Ascription vs. Achievement • Specificity vs. Diffuseness</td>
<td>To understand general pattern variables for action</td>
<td>Theoretical literature study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As shown in Table 3-8, there are many commonly shared cultural variables even though they have different names. This will be shown shortly after in Table 3-9. Some researchers tried to find more theoretical original findings like Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, and Parson, T & Shils E. A. while some researchers focus more on applying existing theoretical models. For example, Trompenaars almost borrowed Parson T & Shile’s ‘Pattern Variables’ without any changes.

Table 3-8 is modified as Table 3-9 to figure out common cultural variables so that more summarized model can be elicited. The number of cultural variables for each model between Table 3-8 and Table 3-9 are not exactly matched because some cultural variables are inclusive enough to belong to more than one category or reversibly some cultural variables are too specific to be combined to one. For example, Victor’s ‘Social Organization’ embraces both of ‘Relationship with People’ and ‘Range of Involvement’. For same reason, Shein’s ‘Assumptions about ‘Human Nature, Activity, and Relationship’ accounts for ‘Human Being’s Basic Nature’, ‘Human Being’s Activity’, and ‘Relationship with People’.

For eliciting summarized model of cultural variables, at first those cultural variables which have more than three common variables from existing model (shown in gray shade in Table 3-9) were selected. Among them, the variable of language was eliminated because the language itself is very concrete and observable compared with other variables. The purpose of usage of cultural variable in this study is to understand implicit cultural value. Secondly, based on above screening process, again KJ method was used to cluster and summarize the cultural variables. As a result, the variable ‘Range of Involvement’ was evaluated somewhat similar to ‘Relationship with People’ and it was eliminated. In the mean time, ‘Adherence to Rules’ was judged to be
independent variable and it was included, which results a set of eight cultural variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Variables</th>
<th>Kluckhohn</th>
<th>Hofstede</th>
<th>Victor</th>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>Trompenaars</th>
<th>Shian</th>
<th>Inkels</th>
<th>Parson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human being's basic nature: Evil, Neutral, Good</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception to Nature: Control, Harmony, Subjection</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Perception: Past, Present, Future P-time &amp; M-time</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human being's Activity: Being, Being in Becoming, Doing</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with People: Individualism, Collectivism</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority Conception: Hierarchical, Equal</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Conception: Masculinity, Femininity</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of Emotion: Neutral, Emotional</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Fluency, Accent, Tone of voice</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Contexting: High context, Low context</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal Communication: Proxemics, Kinesics, Gesture</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to Rules: Universalism, Particularism</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Involvement: Specific, Diffuse</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accordance of Status: Achievement, Ascription</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In another study, K. P. Lee also somewhat differently summarized all the models of cultural variables by comparing and clustering hierarchically through KJ method as shown Figure 11:  

![Hierarchical Summarization of Cultural Variables](image)

Figure 3-11: Hierarchical Summarization of Cultural Variables

As shown in Table 3-8, 3-9, and Figure 3-11, findings from review of existing models of cultural variables can be summarized as follows:

- They share many respects each other even if they named somewhat differently.

---

• Fields of studying the model of cultural variables include Anthropology, Social Psychology, and International Business Management with somewhat different goals: Anthropology for confirming cultural variables in real world; Social Psychology for identifying theoretical frameworks for modal personality; International Business Management for applying cultural variables for real business world.

• Methods for studying the model of cultural variables include field observation, survey, theoretical literature study, and empirical study.

3-4. Application of Cultural Variables for Development of Model of Culture

Now after having understood the nature of cultural variables, this section explores the way of application of cultural variables for development of model of culture, with the specific perspective of this study: relationship between culture and design.

There are various definitions of ‘Cultural Model’ as many as the definition of culture has. However, since goal of this study is not to study extensively the definition of cultural model itself, it adopts the one of widely accepted definition of cultural model: Roy D’ Andrade. In an important survey of the field, Roy D’Andrade succinctly defined a cultural model as “a cognitive schema that is intersubjectively shared by a cultural group.”61 This definition may be rather vague and abstract but it points out that cultural model can provide the structure of cognitively shared mental model regarding a specific culture by its members. If reinterpreted along with the context of this study (relationship between culture and design), cultural model is abstraction of peoples’

shared behavior toward design in the context of culture. In other words the cultural model related to this study can provide the abstracted description of how people behave with specific design and what are roles of culture there.

This function of cultural model is also articulated by Shore in his book 'Culture in Mind: cultural model provides a bridge between the empiricist concept of culture as 'objects' and the cognitive concept of culture as forms of knowledge (or, more pretentiously, as mental representation). This notion clarifies the role of cultural model will play in this study: that is, cultural model can bridge (interpret) behavior toward design with cognitive, implicit cultural value. Particularly cultural variables dealt so far in this section can be used for understanding cognitive cultural value (this is already assumed in the beginning of this chapter). For example, let us suppose that we observed user's interaction with specific user-interface design. Observed user's interaction can be understood in terms of why he interacts with user-interface design in specific ways and what effects the cultural values make on user's behavior.

This function of cultural model and cultural variables is illustrated in Figure 3-12. In the horizontal axis in Figure 3-12 represents the sequence of user's interaction behavior with user-interface patterned by Norman's seven stages of action: 'Forming the goal', 'Forming the intention', 'Specifying an action', 'Executing the action', 'Perceiving the state of the world', 'Interpreting the state of the world', and 'Evaluating the outcome.' The vertical axis of matrix shows cultural variables with user's characteristics of cultural values like those from Hall's PMS. By confronting the

---


characteristics of user's interaction behavior with the characteristics of user's cognitive cultural value, we can interpret the relationship between design and culture: that is, understand what influence characteristics of cultural value made on user's behavior toward design.

**Figure 3-12: Matrix of Cultural Variables and User's Interaction**

3-5. Findings and Implications

The nature of cultural variables has been discussed in this chapter with the focus on the concepts of cultural variables, review of existing models of cultural variables, and application of cultural variables for development of cultural model. The findings of this chapter and their implications to further remaining chapters of this study are summarized as follows: Implications are written in italic font.
• The Concepts of Cultural Variables

  • Cultural variables are set of culture-free universal frameworks by which a culture can be profiled and modeled, and cultures can be compared in terms of similarities and differences between cultures.

  *The study can use cultural variables for identifying characteristics of implicit cultural values and for understanding cross-cultural similarities and differences.*

• Review of Existing Models of Cultural Variables


  *A set of eight common cultural variables can be used for generating a list of questions for the experiment.*

• Application of Cultural Variables for Development of Cultural Model

  • Cultural model can bridge (interpret) behavior toward design with cognitive, implicit cultural value. And particularly cultural variables can be implemented for understanding characteristics of cognitive cultural value.

  *The study should establish the cultural model which can describe people’s specific behavior toward design with the relation of characteristics of implicit cultural value. In turn, characteristics of implicit cultural variable should be able to interpret the background of people’s behavior toward design.*

With the findings and implications mentioned above, next chapter will deal with how design is structured; what are the methods available to understand various people’s behavior toward design.

Figure 3-13 summarizes diagrammatically the findings and implications mentioned above as follows:
### Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; comparing implicit cultural value</td>
<td>The study should use cultural variables for understanding implicit cultural values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight cultural variables identified</td>
<td>A set of 8 cultural variables should be used for generating questions of main experiment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridging design behaviour with cultural value</td>
<td>The study should build the cultural model to understand the relationship between design &amp; cultural values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3-13: Summarization of Findings and Implications of Chapter 3.**