ResearchOnline@JCU

JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY
AUSTRALIA

This file is part of the following work:

Morgan, Rhian (2010) ***A critical analysis of the intercultural communication training industry.*** **Masters (Research) Thesis, James Cook University.**

Access to this file is available from:

https://doi.org/10.25903/fyqq%2Dns20

The author has certified to JCU that they have made a reasonable effort to gain permission and acknowledge the owners of any third party copyright material included in this document. If you believe that this is not the case, please email researchonline@jcu.edu.au

A Critical Analysis of the Intercultural Communication Training Industry

Thesis submitted by

Rhian Morgan BA(Hons) UK

In January 2010

For the degree of Master by Research (Anthropology)

James Cook University, Townsville

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned author, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the university library and via the Australian Digital Thesis network and elsewhere as appropriate.

I understand that as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright act and I do not wish to place any further restrictions on access to this work.

Rhian Morgan	27.01.2010
…………………………………	…………………………..
Signature	Date

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

Declaration:

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any other university or tertiary education institution. Information derived from the work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is provided.

Rhian Morgan　　　　　　　　　　　27.01.2010

…………………………………　　　　　…………………………..

Signature　　　　　　　　　　　　　Date

STATEMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS

This thesis has been made possible through the support of the following people:

Supervisors:

Primary supervisor:

Dr Robin Rodd, School of Arts & Social Sciences, James Cook University

Secondary Supervisors:

Dr Rosita Henry, School of Arts & Social Sciences, James Cook University

Dr Marcus Barber, School of Arts & Social Sciences, James Cook University

Editorial Assistance:

Dr Rosemary Dunn, Graduate Research School, James Cook University

DECLARATION ON ETHICS

The research presented and reported in this thesis was conducted within the guidelines for research ethics outlined in the *National Statement on Ethics Conduct in Research Involving Humans* (1999), *the Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice (1997)*, the *James Cook University Policy on Experimentation Ethics*. *Standard Practices and Guidelines* (2001), and the *James Cook University Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice* (2001). The proposed research methodology received clearance from the James Cook University Experimentation Ethics Review Committee, approval number: 2799.

Rhian Morgan	27.01.2010
…………………………………	………………………….
Signature	Date

Acknowledgements

Firstly I would like to thank my supervisory team and the anthropology department at James Cook University, in particular Dr Robin Rodd for his support throughout the preparation and completion of this thesis. Secondly, I would thank the people that gave their time to participate in this study, those that completed interviews and the cross-cultural training companies that provided training materials for analysis. Thirdly, I would like to thank the entire postgraduate community within the school of Arts and Social Sciences at James Cook University, for their friendly support throughout the research and writing processes. I would also like to thank Dr Rosemary Dunn for her support and editorial help during the preparation of this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my husband and my son for putting up with me through the entire process.

Abstract

Cross-cultural training (CCT) is a form of people skills training aimed at facilitating the development of intercultural communicative competence and cultural sensitivity. Since the 1960s, cross-cultural training has developed into the product of a small, multinational, commercial industry. CCT is predominantly provided through day long training workshops and the primary consumers of CCT, within Australia, are public sector departments and service providers. CCT workshops attempt to provide trainees with an understanding of culture that will encourage cultural sensitivity and appropriate behaviours during intercultural encounters. However, 'culture' is a contested concept; there is no universally accepted definition, or theory, of culture. Over the past two hundred years the discipline of anthropology has produced multiple theories on the nature and workings of this elusive concept. In recent years, some postmodernist anthropologists have even begun to question the utility and descriptive force of 'culture', arguing that the concept promotes essentialist, deterministic and divisionary conceptions of alterity. The existence of a plethora of theories on the nature and influences of 'culture' raises questions as to which conceptions of culture CCT courses are adhering to and promoting. This thesis addresses these questions through an exploration and critical analysis of the contents and influences of cross-cultural training courses.

The primary aims of this thesis are: firstly, to determine how CCT courses conceptualise culture; secondly, to determine the relationship between CCT conceptions of culture and anthropological culture theory and thirdly, to examine the influence of CCT on trainees' orientations towards diversity. Literature reviews are used to explore the theories which inform CCT content and the relationships between CCT theory, CCT content and anthropological culture theory. Information on training content is obtained through participant observation and semi-structured interviews. Personal participation in an Indigenous cultural awareness training course and an online intercultural business communication course enable an analysis of the conceptions of culture presented within training programs. Further information on training content is provided through a series of six semi-structured interviews with CCT producers and consumers and an analysis of training materials provided by CCT companies and trainers. The interview findings are subjected to a qualitative comparison with CCT teachings and the stages of cultural competence outlined in Bennett's (1986; 1993) "Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity". These comparisons reveal the relative influence of CCT on participants' orientations towards diversity and understandings of culture. Training materials and CCT theories of culture are subjected to a

critical discourse analysis. The discourse analysis investigates patterns of expression and rhetoric within training materials and CCT theory, in order to discern how the concepts of identity, values, agency and the ‘other’ are represented within CCT. The discourse analysis, in conjunction with the literature reviews, demonstrates how CCT courses conceptualise culture and shows the relative influences of different anthropological schools of thought on the content of cross-cultural training courses. The discourse analysis also reveals whether the criticisms of ‘culture’ raised by postmodernist anthropologists apply to the conceptions of culture promoted by the CCT industry.

The findings of this thesis reveal the susceptibility of CCT conceptions of culture to the postmodernist culture critique and how problematic conceptions of culture within training programs are reducing and negating the potentially positive influences of CCT. Current CCT practice is effective at increasing awareness of cultural differences. However, some culture general training is prompting prescriptive understandings of diversity which can lead trainees to view culture as an invariable determinant of behaviour. The final section of this thesis explores how these problems could be solved through the integration of cognitive anthropological theories into CCT training programs. The results of this thesis demonstrate a need for the reformation of CCT conceptions of culture and a possible direction which this reformation could take. The improvement and augmented accuracy of CCT teachings will increase the capacity of these training programs to promote intercultural understanding and positive intercultural relations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF ACCESS II
STATEMENT OF SOURCES III
STATEMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS IV
DECLARATION ON ETHICS V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS VI
ABSTRACT VII
LIST OF TABLES IX
ABBREVIATIONS X

CHAPTER 1: THESIS INTRODUCTION 1
Cross-cultural Training 1
Aims 3
Research Questions 4
Methodology 4
Anthropology and Cross-cultural Training 9
Chapter overview 10

CHAPTER 2: THE CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING INDUSTRY 13
Introduction 13
The Origins of the Cross-cultural Training Industry 13
Australian Cross-cultural Training: An Industry Profile 18
A Cross-cultural Training Workshop 23
Conclusion 25

CHAPTER 3: CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING, MODELS OF CULTURE 26
Introduction 26
Hall's Proxemic, Contextual Communication and Temporal Theories 26
Hofstede's Five Dimensional Model of Culture 31
Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner's Seven Dimensional Model of culture 40

Conclusion 53

CHAPTER 4: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CCT MODELS OF CULTURE 54

Introduction 54

Criticisms of the Five Dimensional Model 54

Hofstede's Responses to Criticisms of the Five Dimensional Model 60

The Implications of a Dimensional Approach to Cross-cultural Training 66

Conclusion 71

CHAPTER 5: ANTHROPOLOGICAL CULTURE THEORY 72

Introduction 72

The Origins of Culture 72

Social Evolutionism 74

European Social Anthropology 75

American Cultural Anthropology 81

Structuralism and Interpretivism 87

Cognitive Anthropology 89

The Post-modernist Culture Critique 98

Conclusion 104

CHAPTER 6: CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING PRACTICE & CONTENT 106

Introduction 106

Training Methods 108

Course Content 111

Culture Shock 119

Cultural Misunderstandings 124

Conclusion 128

CHAPTER 7: CCT CONCEPTIONS OF CULTURE & THE INFLUENCES OF TRAINING 131

Introduction 131

CCT Theory and Anthropological Culture Theory 131
Conceptions of Culture within Training Materials.. 136
Participants' Understandings of Culture 146
Cognitive Anthropology and Cross-cultural Training 153
Conclusion 155

CHAPTER 8: THESIS CONCLUSIONS 157
REFERENCES 169

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: PDI scores for twenty countries/regions…………………………………34

TABLE 2: IDV scores for twenty countries/regions………………………………...35

TABLE 3: MAS scores for twenty countries/regions………………………………..36

TABLE 4: UAI scores for twenty countries/regions………………………………...37

TABLE 5: LTO scores for twenty countries/regions………………………………..39

TABLE 6: Hofstede’s eight culture areas…………………………………………...39

TABLE 7: Characteristics of Hofstede’s culture categories………………………...40

TABLE 8: Universalist responses to “The car and the pedestrian” dilemma……….43

TABLE 9: Individualist responses to “The quality of life” dilemma……………….46

TABLE 10: Neutral responses to the “Upset at work” dilemma……………………47

TABLE 11: Specific responses to the Paint the house” dilemma…………………...48

TABLE 12: Achievement orientated responses to the “Respect depends on family background” dilemma…………………………………………………….49

TABLE 13: Inner-directed responses to “The captain of their fate dilemma”……....52

Abbreviations

AUD …………Australian dollars

CCT …………Cross-cultural training

CVS …………Chinese values survey

DIMIA ………Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

DMIS ………..Developmental model of intercultural sensitivity

FSI …………..Foreign Service Institute

IDI …………..Intercultural development inventory

IDV…………..Individualism index

LD …………...Less-developed

LTO…………Long-term orientation index

MAS ………...Masculinity index

MD.………….More-developed

NGO ………...Non-governmental organisation

Orig. …………Original

PDI …………..Power-distance index

Resp. ………...Response

SIETAR ……..Society for intercultural education, training and research

UAI …………Uncertainty avoidance index

Chapter 1: Thesis Introduction

Cross-cultural training

Cross-cultural training (CCT) is a form of adult education aimed at developing "the awareness knowledge and skills needed to interact appropriately with culturally diverse customers and co-workers" (Bean, 2006, p.2). Since the 1960s, cross-cultural training has developed into the product of a small multinational commercial industry. Despite a growing body of research into intercultural communication and demographic surveys of the CCT industry, there has been little investigation into how cross-cultural training courses conceptualise 'culture' or the influence CCT has on consumers' orientations towards diversity. CCT is simultaneously representative of discourses on diversity and a facet of a wider debate on the nature of culture. This study uses participant observation, semi-structured interviews and discourse analysis to provide a critical perspective on representations of these debates within the context of Australian cross-cultural training and cognitive anthropological theory to suggest directions for the refinement of the conceptions of culture presented in CCT courses.

The Australian cross-cultural training industry predominantly consists of small consultancies and individual trainers (Bean, 2006). However, training is also offered by larger multinational CCT companies, public sector departments, NGOs and educational institutions. The Australian organisations using cross-cultural training are approximately 2/3 public sector organisations and 1/3 private sector companies (Bean, 2006, p.3). The products of the CCT industry include books, seminars, consultations and internet training. However, the most common form of CCT delivery is through day long workshops (Bean, 2006). CCT workshops attempt to cultivate understandings of culture which will encourage cultural sensitivity. However, culture is a contested concept; there is no universally accepted definition or theory of culture. The absence of academic consensus on the exact nature and influences of culture raises questions as to which understandings of culture CCT courses are adhering to and promoting. This thesis attempts to answer these questions through an exploration of the origins, content and influences of cross-cultural training courses.

Prior research into the CCT industry has documented the origins, demographics, content and methods of training courses. The origins of cross-cultural training have been traced to the work of

the anthropologist Edward T Hall, for the American foreign service institute, during the early 1950s (Leeds Hurwitz, 1990; Moon, 1996). However, the relative influences of different anthropological schools of thought, on the conceptions of culture advocated by the CCT industry, have not yet been investigated. The most comprehensive investigation of the Australian CCT industry, to date, is a review commissioned by the Department of immigration, multicultural and indigenous affairs (DIMIA) entitled "The effectiveness of cross-cultural training in the Australian context" (Bean, 2006). The DIMIA review provides comprehensive demographic and organisational information on the Australian CCT industry. However, this review does not elaborate on the content of CCT courses. The content of CCT courses has been quantitatively investigated in a previous international study conducted by Fantini and Smith (1997). Fantini and Smith (1997) surveyed fifty CCT courses in eleven different countries and identified the most popular "models" for intercultural training (Fantini & Smith, 1997). These "models" are culture theories which inform the content of CCT workshops. Previous evaluative studies have identified several theoretical and methodological problems with the manner in which cultural values are represented by these models (McSweeney, 2002). However, no prior research has investigated the relationship between anthropological culture theory and the conceptions of culture presented in CCT training models, or the manner in which theoretical CCT models are translated into training materials. The methods and goals of CCT courses have been analysed in multi-disciplinary studies. Training methods, such as lectures and simulations, have been assessed as to their success in achieving particular training goals. (Bennett, 1986; Milhouse, 1996; Pruegger & Rogers, 1994). CCT researchers have also produced and evaluated assessment tools for the measurement of intercultural competence (Bennett, 1986; 1993; Hammer & Bennett, 1998; Bennett & Bennett 2001; Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). However, there has been no investigation into the influences of CCT on trainees' orientations towards diversity. Critiques of CCT's representations of diversity demonstrate the need for such an investigation.

Critical literature on cross-cultural training is minimal, but severe. In 1999, G. Jack and A. Lorbiecki produced a damning critique of representations of cultural diversity within cross-cultural training materials. The critique was launched from a post-modernist perspective, drawing heavily on the work of Edward Said (2003, orig. 1978). The criticisms raised against the industry were that it was promoting static, essentialist interpretations of cultural identity and encouraging divisionary processes of 'othering' (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). These criticisms are similar to the arguments post-modernist critics have raised against anthropological conceptions of culture (Abu-

Lughod, 1991; Appadurai, 1996; Wikan, 1999). Jack and Lorbiecki (1999) began to apply the postmodernist critique to the cross cultural training industry. These criticisms press for further investigation if cross-cultural training is to be used as a tool for the promotion of intercultural understanding. It is also necessary to investigate whether CCT can be defended using the arguments anthropologists employed to defend ‘culture’ (Brumann, 1999).

A review of prior cross-cultural training research demonstrates some significant gaps in our knowledge of the theoretical orientations and influences of CCT. Prior investigation into CCT content has revealed the popularity of CCT models of culture as training tools, and evaluative studies have identified conceptual and methodological problems with some of these models. Yet, there has been no investigation into the theories of culture which these models adhere to, or analysis of representations of these models within training workshops. CCT researchers have developed assessment tools for the measurement of intercultural competence, but no one has examined the influence of CCT on trainees’ orientations towards diversity. CCT representations of diversity have been criticised for promoting essentialist notions of culture and encouraging processes of ‘othering’. However, further investigation is required in order to determine the applicability of this critique to CCT conceptions of culture and to explore potential avenues for the augmentation of CCT conceptions of culture using cognitive anthropological theories, such as schema theory and connectionism, as posited by Strauss and Quinn (1994). Potential defences and opportunities for the refinement of CCT teachings must also be explored. These gaps in our understandings of CCT content and influence place limitations on evaluations of CCT practice. The investigations into CCT theory, content and influence, conducted throughout the following chapters, will enable more comprehensive evaluations of the utility of CCT and identify the potential for using cognitive anthropology in the future development of this industry.

Aims

The primary aims of this study are to determine how CCT courses conceptualise culture, the relative influence of the discipline of anthropology on CCT conceptions of culture, and the impact of CCT on participants’ orientations towards diversity. The following chapters provide an analysis of manifestations of discourses on culture and diversity within the CCT industry. This analysis enables an evaluation of the applicability of the post-modernist culture critique to cross-cultural training practice. The following series of research questions have been devised in

accordance with these aims, on the basis of preliminary reviews of training materials and culture theory. The methods used to answer these questions are explained in detail in the following section.

Research questions

1. How do CCT courses conceptualise culture?
   i. How do CCT models conceptualise culture?
   ii. How do the conceptions of culture found in CCT models relate to the conceptions of culture found in training materials?

2. How do understandings of culture found in CCT courses and models relate to anthropological understandings of culture?
   i. Which anthropological schools of thought have been most influential in the emergence of the CCT industry and the development training models?

3. How does CCT affect participants' understandings of culture and diversity?
   i. Can one detect the influence cross-cultural training in participants' understandings of culture and their framing of intercultural encounters?
   ii. Do the differing conceptualisations of culture, presented in CCT courses, produce differing participant reactions to training?

4. How do debates on the nature of culture and discourses on diversity manifest in cross-cultural training?
   i. How does CCT discourse construct cultural identity, cultural values, individual agency and the 'other'?
   ii. Does the postmodernist culture critique apply to the representations of culture promoted by CCT?
   iii. If so, can CCT be defended with the same arguments employed to defend anthropological conceptions of culture?

Methodology

The primary methods used in this study are literature reviews, participant observation, semi-structured interviews, reviews of training materials and discourse analysis. Literature on CCT theory, CCT analysis and culture theory is collated and reviewed. Personal participation in two CCT courses provides a subjective experience of cross-cultural training and information on CCT content. Information on training content is also obtained through semi-structured interviews with CCT producers and consumers. These interviews also provide information on participants' understandings of culture and the influences of CCT. Additional training materials are obtained through internet searches and provided by training companies and participants. The data obtained is subjected to a critical discourse analysis. The discourse analysis examines patterns of expression and rhetoric within training materials, identifying the differing constructions of identity, agency and values, present within CCT discourse.

The review of CCT theory consists of an examination of the content of the CCT models of culture which inform the content of training materials. This examination reveals how the creators of the models define culture and the theories of culture which the models adhere to. The review of analytical CCT literature explores prior critiques of CCT models and enables the identification of conceptual problems inherent within the culture theories which these models present. The subsequent review of anthropological culture theory provides a theoretical basis for the evaluation of CCT models and training materials.

CCT training materials are obtained through participation in training, provided by participants, and gathered through library and internet searches. Personal participation, in a day-long cross-cultural training workshop and a 3 month on-line training course, provides access to training materials in the forms in which they are presented to trainees. The training materials provided by participants are analysed in conjunction with the participants' descriptions of the training programs they attended. Further information on training content is provided in the form of training videos, and booklets designed to accompany workshops. These videos and booklets are provided by training companies and obtained through library and internet searches. Training materials are examined as to their explicit and implicit conceptions of culture, identity, values and agency. The sources of training materials are not refereed to directly in order to protect the anonymity of training providers.

The analysis of training materials is conducted in conjunction with the information obtained through literature reviews. This conjunctive analysis enables the identification of CCT conceptions of culture. The examination of the explicit and implicit understandings of culture presented in training materials, combined with the reviews of CCT theory and anthropological culture theory, reveals the theoretical perspectives on which training programs are based. Comparisons between CCT content and CCT theory reveal the relative influence of CCT models on training programs and demonstrate how concepts from models are incorporated into training workshops. Comparisons, between CCT theory, training materials and anthropological culture theory, reveal the relative influences of different anthropological schools of thought on CCT content. The influence of CCT on participants' understanding of culture is examined through a process of qualitative semi-structured interviews.

The interviews are designed to reveal the influence of CCT on participants' orientations towards diversity. The interviews also provide information on CCT practice and content. The target groups for participation are adults, of any age, gender or ethnicity, with some form of intercultural experience, either through migration or interactions with culturally diverse clients and co-workers. Involvement in CCT is not an exclusive criterion for participation. Participant's actual involvement in CCT ranges from none, over CCT consumers, to CCT trainers. Participants are recruited using a snowballing technique. E-mail and postal information sent to potential participants from a range of businesses, services and NGOs, contained requests that the information be forwarded to others who may be interested in participating. Details of the study and forwarding requests sent to 86 organisations, received 27 responses, resulting in six interviews. The six participants come, primarily from multi-cultural service providers and NGOs; they are predominantly female, 35-50 years old and have some experience of CCT. These characteristics reflect trends within the Australian cross-cultural training industry as identified by Bean (2006). During the interviews participants are invited to talk about their experiences of cultural diversity, culture identity and cross-cultural training. The interviews consist of broad questions, designed to prompt narrative accounts of participants intercultural and CCT experiences. In addition, participants are asked specific questions about their involvements with CCT, about the types, duration and content of courses attended or given.

The interview findings are subjected to a comparative analysis, in which participants' narrative accounts of intercultural interactions and responses to questions on culture are compared to CCT teachings. It is assumed that greater levels of involvement with CCT will produce understandings of culture which exhibit similarities with the understandings of culture presented in CCT courses. Participants' accounts and responses are also compared with each other, in order to see if responses from participants with greater experience of CCT exhibit more similarities with CCT teachings than those of participants with less CCT experience. Participants orientations towards diversity are assessed through the comparison of interview statements with statements corresponding to diversity orientations identified in the "Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity" (DMIS) (Bennett, 1986; 1993).

The DMIS is a model for the categorisation of people's orientations towards diversity according to six basic types; the first three types are classified as ethnocentric, the second three are classified as ethno-relative (Bennett, 1986; 1993). The first of the ethnocentric DMIS orientations is "Denial". "Denial" is an attitude characterised by ignorance, or non-recognition, of cultural diversity (Bennett, 1986; 1993). The second ethnocentric orientation is "Defence" and entails recognition of the existence of cultural diversity, but diversity is seen as threatening. "Defence" is characterised by beliefs in the superiority of one's own culture, and a critical, or derogatory, attitude towards other cultures (Bennett, 1986; 1993). The final ethnocentric orientation is "minimization", a state in which diversity is recognised, but certain aspects of one's own cultural value system are perceived to be universals (Bennett, 1986; 1993). The first ethno-relative orientation is "Acceptance". People at "Acceptance" recognise the existence and validity of a multiplicity of cultural values (Bennett, 1986; 1993). The second ethno-relative orientation is "Adaptation". "Adaptation" is when one's experiences of another culture, results in the expansion of one's worldview to include perceptions, attitudes and behaviours appropriate to the other culture (Bennett, 1986; 1993). The final ethno-relative orientation is "Integration" and is characterised by the incorporation of multiple cultural worldviews into ones understanding of oneself. (Bennett, 1986; 1993; Hammer & Bennett, 1998; Bennett & Bennett, 2001). Within CCT, DMIS orientations are measured using the intercultural development inventory (IDI). The IDI is a questionnaire used to assess where a person's orientation towards diversity lies on the DMIS scale (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). Due to funding constraints the IDI was not directly accessible for use in this study. However, published literature surrounding the development of the IDI provides examples of statements which correspond to DMIS orientations

(Hammer et al, 2003). These example statements form the basis of a comparison between the narrative accounts, of experiences of diversity, provided by participants and DMIS orientations. This comparison enables conclusions to be drawn about CCT's potential to encourage ethno-relative attitudes.

The final research question, "how do debates on the nature of culture and discourses on diversity manifest in cross-cultural training?" is answered using critical discourse analysis. Patterns of expression, formulation and rhetoric within CCT theory and training materials are examined as to how they construct identities, values and agency. The public and persuasive natures of discourses on diversity within CCT are examined, in conjunction with an elucidation of the power relations implicit in CCT discourse. The critical analysis of these discourses enables the determination of whether post-modernist criticisms of 'culture' apply to representations of culture within CCT theory and training courses. The post-modernist criticisms of culture raised against anthropology and CCT centre around certain representations of 'culture' and 'the other' (Abu-Lughod, 1991; Brumann, 1999; Said, 2003; Wikan, 1999). In order to assess the validity of these criticisms, as they apply to CCT, it is first necessary to demonstrate how culture and diversity are represented by the industry; this is the purpose of the discourse analysis.

Critique of the concept of 'culture' reached prominence within anthropology in the 1990s. Criticisms centred around the idea that the concept of culture, "suggests boundedness, homogeneity, coherence, stability and structure, whereas social reality is characterised by variability, inconsistencies, conflict, change and individual agency" (Brumann, 1999, p.1)
Some anthropologists began to question whether the concept of 'culture' had acquired essentialist connotations, like the concept of race (Wikan, 1999; Appadurai, 1996). Some advocated "writing against culture" and suggested an abandonment of the concept (Abu-Lughod, 1991; 1993), others defended the concept, arguing that criticisms of culture only apply to certain misuses of the concept, not the concept itself and that culture "should be retained as a convenient term for designating the clusters of common concepts emotions and practices that arise when people interact regularly" (Brumann, 1999; p.1). The contours of this debate are explored in full in the review of anthropological culture theory contained in chapter Five. It is suggested that cognitive anthropological theory may be used to negotiate the contradictions between the existence of cultural specificity and universal human traits, as raised by critics of the concept of culture. The

subsequent critical analysis of CCT discourse enables, firstly, a demonstration of how culture is conceptualised by the industry and secondly, an assessment of whether criticisms surrounding the misuse of 'culture' apply to representations of culture within the CCT industry.

Anthropology and cross-cultural training

CCT aims to influence trainees understanding of culture(s) in a manner that will produce 'appropriate behaviours' during intercultural interactions. The success of CCT is not only dependent on whether training influences trainees' understandings of culture, but also how training influences trainees' understandings of culture. Cross-cultural training has the potential to become usable a tool for the wide scale promotion of positive intercultural relations. However, whether these ends are achievable through cross-cultural training depends on what is being taught and how training is affecting participants' orientations towards diversity. If the accusations of neo-imperialism raised by Jack and Lorbiecki (1999), or the arguments of the 'culture critique', apply to current CCT teachings then the aspiration, of using CCT to promote intercultural understanding, is not achievable without the reformulation of training programs. Cognitive anthropology provides a possible direction for the reformation of CCT conceptions of culture and the final chapter of this thesis will explore how and why this reformation should occur.

Many of the researchers that have produced and assessed CCT models have a large stake in the industry, often owning or selling their work to CCT companies. The most damning criticisms of the industry have accused CCT of promoting reductive, essentialist, notions of culture (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). If these criticisms are valid, and the CCT industry is characterised by a hegemonic discourse surrounding specific interpretations of culture, one must ask whether this discourse is perpetuated by the fact that the academic impetus and evaluation of CCT is dominated by those with stakes in the industry. At least, the interplay of research and corporate investment, should raises questions about whether subjectivities and vested interests are influencing trends within CCT evaluations.

Some anthropologists exhibit a slightly disparaging attitude to cross-cultural training describing it as a "packaged way to know 'other' cultures" (Peacock, 2001, p.76, orig. 1986). Others interpret CCT as an aspect of the commoditisation of a consumer concept of culture (Kahn, 1995). However, if criticisms of CCT's representations of 'culture' and 'the other' apply, surely it is the responsibility of anthropologists to refine the understandings of culture promoted by this industry. As Wikan (1999) argues it is "*our* concept that is loose on the streets." (p.62). The cross-cultural training industry developed out of the teachings of anthropology. It is therefore the responsibility of anthropologists to monitor, evaluate and if necessary refine CCT teachings; and aid the development of this industry in a direction that will promote positive intercultural relations and public wellbeing in multicultural societies, such as Australia.

This thesis uses anthropological culture theory as a framework for the analysis of CCT teachings and suggests that schema theory and connectionism, as posited by Strauss and Quinn (1994) could be used as a framework for refining CCT conceptions of culture in such a way as to avoid the accusations of neo-imperialism raised by Jack and Lorbiecki (1999). The processes of participation observation and semi-structured interviews provide qualitative data on the teachings and influences of cross-cultural training. A critical analysis of CCT discourses enables an assessment of the validity of criticisms raised against the CCT industry. The results of this thesis demonstrate how CCT courses conceptualise culture, the relative influences of anthropological culture theory within the CCT industry, and the influence of CCT on trainees' orientations towards diversity. These results enable conclusions to be drawn about the utility of cross-cultural training and the identification of how CCT conceptions of culture could be refined through the integration of CCT and cognitive anthropological theory.

.

Chapter overview

Chapter two begins with an introduction to the CCT industry. This introduction provides a review of the historical origins and growth of the CCT industry. This historical review is followed by a profile of the contemporary Australian CCT Industry. The Industry profile is followed by a generic description of a CCT workshop. The purpose of this chapter is to familiarise the reader with the character and practices of the industry under investigation.

Chapter three introduces CCT models of culture. The chapter focuses on three of the most popular CCT models, as identified by Fantini and Smith (1997). The chapter begins with an explanation of Edward Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) theories on the influences of culture on peoples' temporal, spatial, and communicative orientations. This explanation is followed by descriptions of Geert Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five dimensional model of culture and Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) seven dimensional model of culture. The introduction to these models provides the reader with an understanding of the theories which inform CCT content.

Chapter four provides an evaluation of these training models based on critical literature produced by Brendan McSweeney (2002). The evaluation explores the merits and applicability of the criticisms raised against CCT models of culture, with a specific focus on Geert Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five dimensional model. The evaluation also explores Hofstede's (2002) replies to the criticisms raised by McSweeney (2002), and investigates whether these replies constitute a comprehensive defense of the five dimensional model. Chapter four concludes with an exploration of the impacts of dimensional models on training content and an introduction to alternative, developmental, approaches to CCT. This chapter explains some of the theoretical and conceptual problems inherent in the models introduced in chapter three and discuses the impacts of these problems on cross-cultural training programs.

Chapter five contains a review of anthropological culture theory. The purposes of this chapter are to demonstrate the contested nature of the concept of culture and introduce some diverse theoretical perspectives on the nature and influences of culture. The chapter begins with an exploration of the historical origins of the term 'culture' and continues with a discussion of early European social anthropology. This discussion covers Tylor's (1958, orig. 1871) theory of social evolutionism, Durkheim's (1964) theory of social solidarity, and the differing functionalist theories of Malinowski (1944), Radcliffe- Brown (1952) and Evans-Pritchard (1976; 1940). The chapter continues with an exploration of American cultural anthropology and the theories of Boa's (1931, 1932), Benedict (1955, 1975), Kroeber (1944, 1952) and Sapir (1968). The review of early American cultural anthropology is followed by an introduction to Levi-Strauss' (1963) theory of structuralism and Geertz's (1973) interpretivist theory of culture. The chapter then explores developments in the field of cognitive anthropology and explanations of culture which utilise schema theory and connectionism (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The introduction to cognitive

anthropology is followed by an exploration of the arguments of the post-modernist culture critique, as raised by theorists such as Abu-Lughod (1991), Appadurai (1996) and Wikan (1999). The chapter concludes with the suggestion that conceptualisations of culture based on cognitive anthropological theory could be used to avoid the criticisms of the culture critique. This chapter demonstrates the intricacies and contested nature of the concept on which cross-cultural training is based and provides a basis for the evaluation of CCT conceptions of culture.

Chapter six provides an analysis of CCT content based on the findings of semi-structured interviews, processes of participant observation and collections of training materials. This chapter identifies themes within CCT content, demonstrates how CCT models of culture are integrated into training workshops and investigates participants' responses to training. The analyses in this chapter demonstrate the positive and negative aspects of current CCT practice and show how content influences participants' reactions towards training.

Chapter seven investigates CCT conceptions of culture by means of critical discourse analysis. The chapter begins by comparing the conceptions of culture presented in CCT models with the anthropological theories of culture outlined in chapter five. This comparison explores the applicability of the culture critique to representations of culture within dimensional CCT models. Patterns of expression and rhetoric within training materials are examined as to how they construct identities, values and the 'other'. Participants' conceptions of culture and orientations towards diversity are then examined and compared to the orientations outlined in the DMIS. The comparison of participant orientations towards diversity with DMIS orientations enables conclusions to be drawn about the relative influences of cross-cultural training on these participants' understandings of culture. The final section of chapter seven suggests directions for future CCT research and the further development of the industry using cognitive anthropology, schema theory, and connectionism. In conjunction, the following chapters aim to contribute to an expansion of our evaluative knowledge of CCT content and influence.

Chapter 2: The Cross-cultural Training Industry

Introduction

The following chapter provides an introduction to cross-cultural training (CCT). The origins of CCT, in the work of Edward T. Hall for the American Foreign Service Institute (FSI), are discussed, along with the paradigm that this early training set for future CCT. This discussion is followed by a historical overview outlining the circumstances that led to the development and expansion of the cross-cultural training industry. Following the historical overview is a contemporary profile of the Australian CCT industry, based on the findings of Robert Bean (2006), as outlined in the DIMIA report "The effectiveness of cross-cultural training in the Australian context". The profile identifies norms among CCT producers and consumers, and introduces distinctions among types of training. The contemporary CCT profile is followed by a generic description of a cross-cultural training workshop. The workshop description is based personal experiences of CCT, in conjunction with information on training provided by participants, and the findings of the DIMIA report. The purpose of this chapter is to familiarise the reader with cross-cultural training and the CCT industry.

The origins of the cross-cultural training industry

"The story of Intercultural communication starts at the foreign service institute"
(Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990, cited in Rogers, Hart & Mike, 2002, p.8)

The origins of modern cross-cultural training are often traced to the work of the anthropologist Edward T. Hall, for the American Foreign service institute (FSI), during the early 1950s. The FSI was developed in 1947, within the US department of state, in response to the underwhelming performance of American diplomats on overseas assignments (Moon, 1996). The institute provided language and foreign affairs training for state department employees, diplomats, Foreign Service and government agency workers, and military service branches (Rogers, et al, 2002). Hall was part of a team of linguists and anthropologists employed by the FSI to provide culture and language training for Foreign Service officials between 1950 and 1955 (Rogers, et al, 2002). Hall's experiences of training at the FSI not only shaped his own subsequent studies of culture, but also created a paradigm for cross-cultural training which is still reflected in CCT courses today.

The FSI training originally consisted of introductory language training, mission orientation training, demographic studies of host countries and information on anthropological culture theory (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990). Culture was taught about as a system of "shared information along with shared methods of coding, storing and retrieving that information" (Hall & Hall, 1989, cited in Moon, 1996, p.3). This original training used macro-level, mono-cultural analysis and focused on traditional anthropological topics of enquiry, such as kinship systems and socio-cultural institutions (Rogers, et al, 2002). The FSI trainees responded negatively to the anthropological culture theory taught by Hall (Moon, 1996). Trainees reported finding the culture theory difficult to understand, lacking in specific, or concrete, information and irrelevant to their assignments (Moon, 1996). The training was generally perceived as unnecessary and unimportant (Moon, 1996). The training was further complicated by the ethnocentrism of the trainees, the political and bureaucratic objectives of the FSI, and a disregard for the practical value of anthropology (Hall, 1959, cited in Rogers, et al, 2002; Moon, 1996). These negative responses prompted Hall and his colleagues to modify the FSI curriculum. The FSI trainers abandoned the teaching of anthropological perspectives on culture in favour of a more "pragmatic and goal-orientated" approach (Moon, 1996, p.3).

The modified FSI curriculum focused on comparisons between 'national' cultures, rather than the study of single cultures (Moon, 1996). Trainees studied non-verbal communication and training focus changed to an emphasis on micro-cultural analysis and the provision of information on specific cultural traits such as orientations towards time, body language and tone of voice (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990). The emphasis on traditional anthropological areas of enquiry, like kinship systems, was replaced by a dyadic approach which concentrated on the nature of interactions between individuals from different cultures (Moon, 1996). Anecdotal accounts of intercultural interactions were introduced as training tools and trainers began to utilise participatory training methods, such as simulations and role plays. Intensive day-long workshops became the main method of CCT delivery (Moon, 1996; Rogers, et al, 2002).The FSI trainees were far more receptive to the new curriculum; Hall used it to train approximately 2000 people during his five years of employment at the FSI (Rogers, et al, 2002).

The new training paradigm, set by the revised FSI curriculum, influenced both the methods and content of future training programs. The methods of training introduced by the FSI curriculum,

such as intensive workshops, the use of anecdotes, role plays and simulations, have become standard CCT practices, albeit in refined forms. The dyadic focus of the FSI training, which compared practices from different cultures, is reflected in the 'cultural contrast' approaches utilised by many CCT trainers today. The equation of cultural identity with nationality, set up by the early FSI training, still occurs within some contemporary training courses. The under recognition of intra-national diversity, which can result from such equations, is an expressed concern of many contemporary CCT analysts (Moon, 1996; Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). The extent to which the FSI paradigm has influenced training methods is demonstrated in the industry profile contained in the following section of this chapter.

The pragmatic, goal orientated approach of the FSI training heavily influenced the content of future CCT. The reform of the FSI training program shifted training focus from, ideational anthropological conceptions of culture, onto pragmatic "operationalised notions of cultural variation" (Moon, 1996, p.7). These "operationalised notions of cultural variation" focus on the micro level analysis of specific cultural traits, such as time orientation or societal tendencies towards individualism or collectivism (Moon, 1996). The apparent incompatibility of anthropological culture theory and the desires of CCT trainees is reflected in an account of training given by Tina, a CCT trainer, during her interview. During a conversation about the influence of trainers' philosophical view points on training, Tina gave the following account of a young anthropologist employed as a trainer by her company:

> We've actually got a worker at the moment that has some of these issues. He's from an anthropologist background, so he's got some major issues. When you're training you have to use the language of the audience and you have to link it. ..., it's not simple English, but he can't go on and talk about dialectics and things like this, because you're just going to create a barrier ... The first session he did they all walked out and told their co-ordinator they felt dumb and stupid and they didn't want [him] back.
> (Tina, Personal communication, 27.04.08)

Tina's account of the consequences of mixing anthropology with CCT mirrors Hall's (1959) reports of teaching anthropological culture theory at the FSI. The anthropologist's trainees found the culture theory incomprehensible and irrelevant, demonstrating there is still no place for traditional anthropological theory in cross-cultural training. Earlier during the interview Tina talked about trainees' wants and expectations;

> They want to know "how can I improve my way of communicating with Mr Blogs, so that …" or "we've got a worker that slams down the phone anytime someone's got an accent."
>
> (Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

Tina's experiences of trainees' desires for relevant, practical, goal-orientated training also reflect Hall's experiences of trainee responses at the FSI. The FSI training recognised trainees desires and laid out norms for CCT. However, it was demographic change and globalisation that drove the growth of CCT, from its origins at the FSI, into the product of an international industry.

The growth of the cross-cultural training industry is primarily attributable to changes in population demographics and corporate internationalisation (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). During the 1960s, corporate internationalisation began to stimulate interest in questions about how companies should best respond to the challenges of international commerce, such as foreign finance, international marketing, and international human resources management (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). Demographic changes, caused by increased migration and international employment opportunities, in the period after world war two, had resulted in increasingly diverse workforces within many countries. During the 1970s, companies in so-called 'developed' countries were becoming progressively concerned with how best to recruit, manage and retain workers within culturally diverse societies (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). Debate surrounding diversity management emerged in the early 1980s, replacing discourses on the a-cultural nature of management, which had previously dominated the fields of management and business studies (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). During the 1980s, cultural differences were increasingly conceptualised, by both corporations and scholars, as potential sources of national and international corporate ineffectiveness (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). Nationally based companies and multi-nationals, in Europe, the US, Canada and Australia, were becoming increasingly concerned about the impact of cultural diversity on company efficiency and CCT appeared to be the solution to these concerns.

Globalisation and increasing competition on the global market, combined with diversifying workforces, presented companies with new challenges in the areas of recruitment, retention and management. Managers were concerned with how to recruit and retain employees in

multicultural societies and executives were concerned about the internal conflicts which differing cultural interpretations of effective group membership could cause and the affects these internal conflicts could have productivity and competitiveness (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). Companies sought a competitive edge as they tried to break into foreign markets, negotiate international mergers and manage diverse workforces. Increasing staff's intercultural competence was seen as a possible means by which companies could gain this competitive edge (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). Cultural differences were conceptualised as a potential source of corporate weakness and cultural awareness was perceived as a resource for negating this weakness. As a result, cultural differences were increasingly perceived as legitimate areas for management control (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). "The moral imperative of respect and tolerance at work ... [was] given commercial respectability through its connection with improved business performance and a better bottom-line" (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999, p.7). By the mid 1980s, the business case for cross-cultural training was made. There was a perceived need for managers and staff to develop their knowledge of different cultural values and increase their intercultural communication skills. This need prompted corporate investment in academic research which led to the development of models of culture and frameworks for corporate cross-cultural training (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). This institutional response to the challenges of globalisation grew into the contemporary cross-cultural training industry.

The emergence of the cross-cultural training industry was fuelled and legitimised by the corporate drive for competitiveness on the global market, yet the character of this industry was still heavily influenced by the paradigm set by Hall's FSI training program. The models of culture and training frameworks developed during the1980s and 1990s, in response to the corporate need for cultural awareness, retained many characteristics of the revised FSI curriculum. The models of culture created for training frequently utilised the dyadic approach to intercultural study introduced by Hall and simulations, role plays and anecdotes became common CCT training methods. Jack and Lorbiecki (1999) situate the impetus for the growth of the CCT industry in the world of international commerce. However, since its emergence in the mid 1980s the cross-cultural training industry has increasingly come to be utilised by public sector organisations, NGOs and governments.

Australian cross-cultural training: An industry profile

The following industry profile describes the defining characteristics of the contemporary Australian CCT industry. The Australian CCT industry is currently dominated, in both provision and consumption, by public sector organisations and NGOs (Bean, 2006). Yet, the paradigm set by the FSI curriculum and the influences of international commerce are still apparent in modern Australian training methods. The following profile describes the multiple products of the CCT industry and the characteristics of CCT producers and consumers. The statistical data included in this profile are taken from the DIMIA report "Cross-cultural training in the Australian context" (Bean, 2006). This report constitutes the most comprehensive review of CCT in Australia, to date. The use of CCT has undoubtedly fluctuated slightly in the years since the DIMIA study. However, the general nature, parameters and distribution of CCT remain fairly consistent, so the information in the report can still be considered representative of the general character of the Australian CCT industry.

Australia is a multicultural society, approximately one quarter of Australia's resident population was born overseas and Indigenous Australians make up an estimated 2.5% of the total population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2007). Cross-cultural communication, defined simply as a communicative act between people who identify themselves as coming from different cultural backgrounds, is an everyday occurrence for many Australians. Cultural competence is defined in the DIMIA report as "the ability of systems, organisations, professions and individuals to work effectively in culturally diverse environments and situations" (Bean, 2006, p.2). Australia's cultural diversity makes cultural competence a necessity for successful business practice and service provision. Cross-cultural training is increasingly being recognised, by the Australian public sector, as a resource for aiding the development of cultural competence among employees. The increasing demand for CCT, within the Australian public sector, is being driven by both customer expectations and diversity orientated policy initiatives (Bean, 2006). However, public sector demand has not altered the corporate character of CCT.

The role of CCT, as a tool for increasing competitiveness, is still apparent in the terminology of the DIMIA report. The DIMIA report refers to the cultural competencies, which CCT aims to facilitate, as necessary for the development of the "social cohesion" which Australia needs in

order to increase its chances of attracting skilled migrants on the international labour market (Bean, 2006, p.2). Situating CCT so firmly in the language of commerce demonstrates the continued role of CCT as a tool for increasing competitiveness. However, the DIMIA report also illustrates further developments in the story of this industry. The report found that two thirds of Australian CCT consumers are public sector organisations, whereas private sector companies only account for one third of Australian CCT consumption (Bean, 2006). The report also identified a diversification and specialisation of CCT products, which has occurred since the emergence of the industry in the mid 1980s.

Cross-cultural training has come to be used as a broad label for a number of specialised sub-categories of culture and communication training. The DIMIA report identifies four broad types of cross-cultural training (Bean, 2006). These types are culture general training, culture or ethno specific training, training on working with interpreters and specialised, or industry specific, training (Bean, 2006, p.31). Culture general CCT is a broad form of training, focusing on the influences of culture on perceptions, values, behaviours and interactions (Bean, 2006). Culture general CCT provides trainees with information on cultural differences, often presenting strategies for successful intercultural interactions and using information on specific cultures as a means of illustrating the affects of culture on behaviour. Culture, or ethno, specific CCT also provides information on the nature and influences of culture. However, the focus is on the practices of a particular subject culture and often the nature of interactions between the subject culture and the trainee's home culture (Bean, 2006). Indigenous cultural awareness training is a form of culture specific CCT particular to Australia. Indigenous cultural awareness training focuses on Indigenous culture, service provision for Indigenous Australians and relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Training on working with interpreters provides information on the utilisation of interpreting services and the cultural dynamics of translation (Bean, 2006). Specialised, or industry specific, CCT is culture and communication training tailored to the needs of people in specific professions, such as policing or health care. Specialised CCT is also used to address specific topics, such as international business or working with refuges (Bean, 2006). The most common form of training provided and utilised within Australia is culture general CCT (Bean, 2006).

Demand for CCT is identified, by bean (2006), as being driven primarily by managers requesting training for staff and staff requesting training. Demand is also driven by customer or client recommendations for staff and recommendations by trainers and multi-cultural officers within organisations (Bean, 2006). The organisations surveyed in the DIMIA report stated that their primary motivation for commissioning training events was the improvement of customer service (Bean, 2006). Improving workplace or community relations was also a commonly stated reason for conducting cross-cultural training, as was improving compliance with anti-discrimination, or access and equity, policies (Bean, 2006). The majority of organisations surveyed by Bean (2006) predicted that customer service requirements, demographic changes and multi-cultural policy initiatives would result in increased future demand for CCT.

CCT consumption patterns are fairly uniform. Organisations using CCT hold, on average, five training events a year (Bean, 2006). The main participants are staff level employees and the most commonly used form of training is culture general workshops (Bean, 2006). Training tends to be specifically tailored to either the needs of particular companies, or the occupations of attendees (Bean, 2006). Bean's (2006) current practice survey showed that 48.7% of organisations had all training tailored to their organisation, whereas 42.3% had most of their training tailored to their organisation. The majority of trainees in the DIMIA survey reported that their attendance at training was voluntary (Bean, 2006). However, compulsory training is also common. Tina, a CCT trainer, provided the following comment regarding voluntary training;

> Often it's a case of "train these volunteers, you, you, you and you".
> (Tina, Personal communication, 27.04.08).

Vera, a second trainer interviewed, reported that attendance is compulsory for most of the specialised CCT she provides;

> It is compulsory. We've done a few that were on the voluntary side, we didn't have a bad turn out but it wasn't as good as I would have hoped.
> (Vera, Personal communication, 22.04.08).

Vera's comments demonstrate that the compulsory or voluntary nature of training may impact turn-out. Two out of the four other participants interviewed also reported that the training they had attended was compulsory. Given the limited number of case studies undertaken, this finding should not be considered representative of any significant change within the industry. However, Tina's comment demonstrates that participation in training, which is reported as being voluntary, may not be as elective, on the part of staff, as the label voluntary can make it appear.

Training providers in Australia are, to 96.6%, nationally based companies or independent trainers, with numbers of providers dispersed across the country relative to population density (Bean, 2006). Overseas and multinational training companies only account for 3.4% of Australian CCT provision (Bean, 2006). Most training providers are small to medium sized companies, approximately 64% employing 3, or fewer, full-time trainers (Bean, 2006). Organisations commission trainers both internally and externally. Bean (2006) found that 44% of organisations using CCT sourced trainers internally, whilst 20.9% sourced trainers externally and 35.2% sourced trainers both internally and externally. Externally sourced training is provided by government departments (45.7%), community organisations (42.9%), individual training consultants (37.1%) and private training organisations (27.1%) (Bean, 2006). Trainers are also occasionally sourced from academic institutions (Bean, 2006). The average cost of a CCT workshop is between $1750AUD and $3000AUD, the price range is similar to other forms of 'people skills training' (Bean, 2006). The cost of workshops in larger cities tends to be higher and costs also vary in accordance with the expertise of trainers (Bean, 2006). Workshops provided by NGOs and community organisations tend to be cheaper, costing only a few hundred dollars a day (Bean 2006). Like consumption, provision of CCT on the Australian market is dominated by the public sector (Bean, 2006). Training providers are characteristically small to medium sized nationally, or locally, based public sector organisations.

CCT trainers tend to be Australian citizens, female, with extensive training experience and an average age of forty-eight (Bean, 2006). Bean (2006) found 90% of trainers to be Australian citizens and 77% to be female. Trainers present an average of twenty workshops a year and have an average of eleven years experience providing CCT (Bean, 2006). For many trainers, the provision of CCT is an additional aspect of their job, rather than their primary occupation (Bean, 2006). Most cross-cultural trainers have personal experience of immersion within a foreign culture and many have qualifications in areas related to CCT such as linguistics, the humanities, or psychology (Bean 2006). Currently, there is no national accreditation process for cross-cultural trainers. However, 64% of trainers surveyed in an international CCT study were found to have attended some form of professional development training (SIETAR, 2004, cited in Bean, 2006).

Approaches to cross-cultural training can be represented as existing on a continuum, ranging from purely didactic training to purely experiential approaches (Bean, 2006, p.32). Didactic training is presentation based, using methods such as lectures, discussions and the presentation of country profiles (Bean, 2006). Experiential training is interactive and utilises exercises, such as role plays and simulations (Bean, 2006). Trainees responding to Bean's (2006) longitudinal survey reported, to 80.7%, that their training used a combination of both didactic and experiential approaches, 12.4% reported training used mainly didactic methods and 6.2% reported training used mainly experiential methods (Bean, 2006).

Workshops are the most frequently utilised methods of CCT delivery (Bean, 2006). However, some trainers and companies also offer distance or e-learning courses, in-house training, consultancy, or project management (Bean, 2006). All of the trainers and training providers surveyed in the DIMIA study reported that they provide training workshops (Bean, 2006). Half of the trainers surveyed for the DIMIA report also provide some form of private consultancy, such as mentoring or project management (Bean, 2006). The average length of a cross-cultural training workshop is 5.2 hours (Bean, 2006). Over 90% of the workshops utilised by public sector departments, between 2000 and 2005, were up to five hours long (Bean, 2006). Over Sixty percent of trainees surveyed by Bean (2006) expressed a desire for more training. Forty-one percent of trainees recommended longer training programs (Bean, 2006). Vera also mentioned that she would prefer to give longer training sessions.

> I would love to do a really good workshop that goes for about three days, but we can't afford it. The staff can't be out for that long, and so four hours was my compromise. With three days I think I could give people more of an immersion. Then get them to operate before and after and see how confident they're feeling, things like that.
> (Vera, Personal communication, 22.04.08)

The short duration of training workshops is significant given the complexity of the materials being taught and the attitudinal changes that CCT is attempting to facilitate.

Methods of training include lecturing, the use of cultural assimilators and simulations, role plays, anecdotal accounts of intercultural interactions and cultural contrasts (Bean, 2006). Lectures are used to present models of culture and theories of intercultural interaction (Bean, 2006). Cultural assimilators and simulations are case studies of intercultural interactions used to

demonstrate cultural differences and give participants practice in identifying and avoiding cultural misunderstandings. Role plays are used to provide trainees with practice in intercultural interactions, and to demonstrate different aspects of intercultural communication. Role plays are also used to demonstrate how cultural features, such as kinship systems, influence people's lives, associations and behaviours. Anecdotal accounts of intercultural interactions and cultural misunderstandings are also commonly used as in training tools. These anecdotes illustrate how cultural differences affect interactions and reiterate arguments for the necessity of CCT. Cultural contrasts are also used to illustrate cultural differences by comparing different sets of cultural practices (Bean, 2006). Training topics include the nature of culture, cultural differences, cultural values and body language, working with culturally diverse teams, international negotiation, conflict resolution and customer service techniques (Bean, 2006). The most popular training tools are models of culture, case studies, exercises and activities, simulations and role plays, training games, checklists, tip sheets and assessments of intercultural competence (SIETAR, 2004, cited in Bean, 2006).

Cross-cultural training occupies a small, but firm place within the Australian people skills training market. Cultural competence is progressively being recognised as a useful skill for both workers and organisations. The provision and consumption of CCT, in Australia, is dominated by the public sector. The demand for CCT is driven by managers, employees, consumers and multi-cultural policy objectives. Day long culture general workshops are the most commonly used form of CCT and these workshops tend to utilise both didactic and experiential training methods. Models of culture are some of the most frequently utilised training tools and training tends to be voluntary. The following section provides a generic description of an average Australian CCT workshop.

A cross-cultural training workshop

The following description of a cross-cultural training workshop is based on personal experience of CCT, accounts of training provided by trainees and trainers and the findings of the DIMIA report. Workshops are extremely varied, factors like audience make-up and trainer idiosyncrasies mean that it is unlikely that any two workshops will be exactly alike. However, there are general trends within the industry regarding the manner in which courses are presented and received. These general trends are reflected in the DIMIA report, in participants'

accounts of training and the author's personal experiences of CCT. The following paragraphs provide a generic description of a fictitious cross-cultural training workshop based on these trends. This description will familiarise the reader with the character and presentation methods typical of this form of training.

This culture general CCT workshop is available to both organisations and the general public. The workshop is approximately five hours long and is held at a local conference centre. Trainees are sent from their respective organisations, departments and companies. For some participation is voluntarily, for others it is compulsory. There are approximately sixteen participants at this workshop, and all work in professions which bring them into contact with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. The majority of participants are female, staff-level employees and identify themselves as belonging to the dominant cultural group, in this case Anglo-Australian. Participants' have different levels of work experience and intercultural experience. This workshop does not conduct an assessment of trainees' levels of cultural awareness prior to commencement.

The workshop begins with introductions, during which participants are asked to identify where they are from. The facilitator then gives a brief presentation on the nature and influences of culture. The points made during the presentation are illustrated with anecdotal examples of intercultural experiences and cultural misunderstandings. The workshop, broken up by occasional lunch and tea breaks, continues with question and answer sessions, role plays and the presentation of models for understanding cultural differences. The workshop ends with a question and answer session, which allows participants to ask the facilitator about their individual intercultural problems and concerns. Participants' reactions to the workshop are mixed. Some found the content difficult to understand or unimportant, some feel enlightened, and some feel the workshop was too basic. Some participants will pass on what they learned; some will apply what they learned or find they have a new way of interpreting intercultural interactions, whilst others may forget or even resist the teachings. In many ways a CCT workshop is very similar to other kinds of people skills training, often the only distinguishing feature is the content.

Conclusion

The contemporary CCT industry developed out of the teachings and experiences of Edward Hall at the FSI, during the 1950s. Hall identified an apparent incompatibility between CCT and anthropological culture theory, and created a pragmatic, goal orientated, paradigm for CCT which is still reflected in training today. Globalisation, international migration and diversifying workforces, during the 1970s and 1980s, prompted increased corporate interest and investment into strategies for improving diversity management and enhancing competitiveness on the global market. This corporate interest and investment prompted the development of CCT training models and enabled the emergence of CCT as an international industry. The contemporary Australian branch of this industry is characterised by public sector provision and consumption. Training companies tend to be small and nationally based and the most frequently utilised forms of CCT are culture general training workshops. CCT trainers tend to be female, Australian citizens and have an average age of forty-eight. There is no national accreditation system for CCT trainers, but most trainers have related qualifications and extensive training experience. Training tends to be voluntary and utilises a combination of didactic and experiential approaches. Models of culture, simulations and roles plays are some of the most frequently utilised training tools. The previous section provided a generic description of a CCT workshop, demonstrating that the format and character of cross-cultural is generally very similar to other forms of people skills training. The defining feature of a CCT workshop is most often the content and as the industry profile demonstrated, CCT models of culture are one of the primary sources of this content. The following chapter provides a review of the theories of culture provided by some of most popular CCT models.

.

Chapter 3: Cross-cultural Training, Models of Culture

Introduction

Models of culture are some of the most widely used training resources within the cross-cultural training (CCT) industry (SIETAR, 2004, cited in Bean, 2006). These models are theories about the nature of cultural variation developed by intercultural communication scholars, primarily as tools for cross-cultural training. Some of the most popular training models are Edward Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) proxemics, contextual communication and time orientation theories, Geert Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five value dimensions model, and Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner's (1997) seven dimensional model (Fantini & Smith, 1997). The manner in which models are integrated into training varies between courses. However, the fundamental premises and theories presented by the models remain constant. The translation of models into training programs is discussed in detail in chapters six and seven. The current chapter provides an introduction to these models as they are presented in their original formulations.

Hall's proxemic, contextual communication, and temporal theories

Edward Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) proxemics, contextual communication and temporal theories are some of the earliest representations of intercultural variation developed for CCT. Hall's (1959) book "The silent language" has been described by CCT analysts as "the founding document of the field" (Rogers, Hart & Mike, 2002, p.12). "The silent language" and Hall's subsequent works "The hidden dimension" and "Beyond culture" expand on the micro-analytic, dyadically focused training paradigm developed by Hall during his years at the Foreign Service institute (FSI). Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) theories elucidate the influence of cultural identity on areas of non-verbal communication, such as orientations towards time, space and communicative contexts. Hall's (1977) monochromatic/polychromatic time orientation theory explains cultural differences in peoples' perceptions, and experiences, of time. His contextual communication theory illustrates cultural differences in the roles people assign to the contexts of interactions and his work on proxemics explains the affects of culturally determined spatial orientations on communication (Hall, 1959; 1969; 1977). The following section provides an introduction to Hall's definitions of culture and each of his three most influential theories.

Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) definitions of culture are strongly influenced by Freudian Gestalt psychology and mid-twentieth century American cultural anthropology. Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) works are based on a conception of culture as learned, shared, patterned and pervasive. Hall (1977) describes culture as subconsciously influential: "The natural act of thinking is greatly modified by culture" (p.9). Hall (1977) conceptualises cultural identity as affecting a person's personality, thought patterns and interpretations of experiences. He defines culture as "a series of situational models for behavior" (Hall, 1977, p.13). He also describes culture as a primary factor in the differentiation of one group of people from another: "Culture patterns … make life meaningful and differentiate one group from another" (Hall, 1977, p.14). Culture is described by Hall (1977) as primarily perceivable through a society's explicit material products. However, his primary foci are the non-verbal, implicit manifestations and influences of culture: "my purpose is to raise … the latent to conscious awareness and give it form so that it can be dealt with …. My emphasis is on the non-verbal, unstated realm of culture." (Hall, 1977, p.16). These 'unstated realms' are the subconscious influences of culture on spatial, temporal and communicative orientations. Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) illuminations of the subconscious influences of culture provided some of the first practical content for cross-cultural training courses.

Proxemics is the study of human spatial orientations. Hall (1969) was one of the first researchers to elaborate on the influence of culture on proxemics. Hall (1969) identified cultural variations in peoples' perceptions of the 'appropriate' distance which should be kept when interacting. Perceptions of appropriate amounts of interpersonal distance vary according to factors such as personality, situation, relationship and context. However, there are general cultural trends in the degree of interpersonal distance deemed appropriate for various interactions (Hall, 1969). From these trends Hall (1969) identified four 'distance zones' labeled intimate, personal, social and public. Each of these distance zones includes definitions of far and near. The amount of interpersonal distance defined as far or near, appropriate or inappropriate, within each of these zones is described as a cultural variable (Hall, 1959; 1969).

> In Latin America the interaction distance is much less than in the United Sates. Indeed, people cannot talk comfortably with one another unless they are very close to the distance that evokes either sexual or hostile feelings in the North American.
> (Hall, 1959, p.209)

Spatial orientations are said to affect how comfortable or uncomfortable people feel when interacting (Hall, 1959). Spatial orientations affect one's perceptions of another's personality,

whether they are seen as warm or distant, polite or rude. Spatial orientations also affect tone of voice and judgments about the appropriateness of another's actions. Cultural differences in spatial orientations can result in misinterpretations of another's actions or intentions (Hall, 1959). Hall's (1959; 1969) identification of this subconscious affect of culture does not only provide a framework for cross-cultural trainees to understand why misunderstandings may occur, it also provides a formula for understanding subconscious cultural behaviors and a reason for trainees to suspend ethnocentric judgments during intercultural encounters. This framework for understanding the subconscious influences of culture is complimented by Hall's (1959; 1977) contextual and temporal orientation theories.

High/low context communication theory explains cultural variations in the role assigned to context during interactions (Hall, 1977). According to Hall (1977), meanings within interactions are determined by both internal and external contexts. Internal contexts are the a priori assumptions on which interpretations of a message are based (Hall, 1977). External contexts are determined by the situation or environment within which the communicative act takes place (Hall, 1977). "Sentences can be meaningless by themselves. Other signs may be much more eloquent…" (Hall, 1959, p.121). The deciphering of these "other signs," which may add to, or even determine, the meanings of messages, is labeled "contexting". Contexting consists of filling in the missing parts of messages in order to understand their meanings: "Contexting makes it possible for human beings to perform the exceedingly important function of automatically correcting for distortions or omissions of information in messages" (Hall, 1977, p.117). Communications can be characterized as high, low or middle context, depending on the amount of contexting required to determine their meaning (Hall, 1977). Within low context communications the bulk of the message is contained in explicit and specific verbal expressions, little information is omitted or distorted and the degree of contexting required to determine meaning is minimal (Hall, 1977). Meaning within high context communications is determined primarily through contexting; little specific information is expressed through verbal messaging (Hall, 1977).

High context communications tend to be unspecific; it is the role of the interlocutor to decipher a message, on the basis of shared contexts (Hall, 1977). The success of high context communications depends on the degree to which people share experiences, prior knowledge, and

common internal contexts. Communications with a stranger will tend to be lower context than communications with one's spouse, simply due to the amount of shared experiences and common prior knowledge people may or may not have (Hall, 1977). Preferences and tendencies towards high or low context communication are also said to be influenced by culture (Hall, 1977). According to Hall (1977) within some countries, like North America, people tend to prefer low context communication, whereas within other countries, like Japan, people tend to prefer high context communication (Hall, 1977). Cultural contexting does not only affect how people communicate with each other but also orientations towards aspects of reality, such as time.

Monochromatic/polychromatic time orientation theory was developed by Hall (1977) in order to explain differing cultural perceptions of, and orientations towards, time. Hall (1977) describes time as a form of communication, an organizing framework, as fundamental to ones' worldview and perceptions of others as spatial orientations and contextual communication tendencies. Time systems are culturally shared; they are also internalized and have emotional, practical, and communicative implications (Hall, 1977). Statements such as, "it takes ages", "just a minute" or "a little while", can only be understand through references to shared, internalized, temporal frameworks (Hall, 1977). Waiting exactly sixty seconds in response to the statement "just a minute" is likely to provoke irritation. The correct interpretation of timeframe reference statements, such as "just a minute," depends on the existence of shared cultural contexts. Hall (1977) identifies two distinct cultural contexts, for understanding time, monochromatic time and polychromatic time.

Monochromatic time is linear, segmented and tangible (Hall, 1977). There are two extensions in monochromatic time orientation systems, the future and the past (Hall, 1977). Events are ordered and perceived as points on a linear continuum stretching between the future and past extensions. Monochromatic time is tangible, it is perceived as something one can "have", it can be "saved", "wasted" or "lost", it can "run-out" and be "spent" (Hall, 1977, p.19). Cultures with monochromatic time orientations tend to address tasks "one at a time" and because time is perceived as a tangible resource, monochromatic cultures place great importance on punctuality, scheduling and time management (Hall, 1977).

Polychromatic time, on the other hand, is synchronic, holistic and intangible (Hall, 1977). Within polychromatic cultures, time is perceived as a "point", rather than as a linear continuum (Hall, 1977, p.17). Polychromatic cultures are said to allow several things to occur at once, spontaneously and flexibly (Hall, 1977). Polychromatic time is intangible, perceived as something that "is" rather than something one "has" and schedules are therefore understood as adaptable, according to circumstance, rather than fixed and absolute (Hall, 1977). Orientations towards time, like spatial orientations, are described as interpersonally, as well as interculturally, variable (Hall, 1977).

The categories monochromatic and polychromatic are not mutually exclusive, but simply distinct (Samovar & Porter, 2004). Hall (1977) did not claim that all individuals, who share a common culture, share the same orientations towards time. However, Hall (1977) did claim that cultures exhibit tendencies to prefer one orientation over the other. North Americans, for example, are said to prefer monochromatic time orientations, whereas Latin Americans and Middle Eastern people are said to be more polychromatically orientated (Hall, 1977, p.17). A person's cultural orientation towards time affects how they manage their own life and also their judgments of, and emotional responses to, the actions of others (Hall, 1977). Hall's (1977) monochromatic/polychromatic time orientation theory provides a further formula for understanding different cultural orientations and the behaviors and judgments that result from these orientations. Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) time orientation, proxemic, and contextual communication theories uncover some of the subconscious influences of culture on people's perceptions of themselves, reality and others.

Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) research into proxemics, chronemics and contextual communication built on the micro-analytic, nationally focused paradigm for cross-cultural training set by his work at the FSI. Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) theories on the subconscious affects of culture, on communications, provided the first practical content for cross-cultural training. Hall's (1959; 1969; 1977) spatial, temporal and contextual models are still widely used by CCT trainers today (Fantini & Smith, 1997). The corporate interest in CCT that arose during the 1970s and 1980s, and the resulting investment in intercultural research, allowed for the expansion of the micro-analytic, pragmatic intercultural research initiated by Hall. Hall's micro-analytic focus has since been emulated by other intercultural researchers, resulting in 'models of culture' which have

come to shape the form and content of contemporary cross-cultural training programs. The contents of two of the most influential models are described in the following section.

Hofstede's five dimensional model of culture

Geert Hofstede's (1980, 2005) five dimensional model of culture is one of the most influential and widely used CCT models. There is an entire multi-national company based on Hofstede's (1980, 2005) work and many training resources utilize his theory. Hofstede's (1980) model was originally based on two rounds of surveys, completed by approximately 117,000 IBM[1] employees, in over 50 countries, between 1967-1969 and 1971-1973 (Hofstede 1980). The surveys resulted in the identification of four dimensions of cultural value variation and the creation of country profiles (Hofstede, 1980). The four original value dimensions, identified by Hofstede (1980), are referred to as: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, and masculine versus feminine. Since the initial publication of the IBM data in "Cultures Consequences" (Hofstede, 1980) subsequent and replicating studies have been carried out, resulting in the addition of a fifth value dimension, labeled long-term/short-term orientation (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, orig.1991). Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model now represents cultural value variations, or "dimensions of culture", along five continuums ranging, for example, from individualist to collectivist. Countries are assigned a numerical score identifying where on the continuums their cultural values lie, relative to other nations.

Hofstede (2005) defines culture as "patterns of thinking, feeling and potential acting … learned through a lifetime" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.2). He recognises that culture is learned and passed on and that culture is a collective phenomenon, "it is at least partly shared with people who live or lived within the same social environment" (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p.4). Hofstede (2005) also emphasises distinctions between culture, personality and human nature. In "Cultures and Organizations; software of the mind" Hofstede (2005) uses an analogy with a computer to describe these different layers that make up who we are. Human nature is described as the hardware, or 'operating system', the universal genetically inherited physical and basic

[1] In the original publication of the value dimensions data in "Culture's Consequences" (Hofstede, 1980) IBM was referred to under the pseudonym "Hermes".

psychological aspects of humanity, common to all (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.4). Culture, is analogous to the software, “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group, or category, of people from others” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.4). Personality is described as the custom programming specific to the individual, which draws on both learned and inherited features, mediated by individual experiences (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p.5).

Culture is depicted by Hofstede (2005) as manifesting in layers, like an onion. The outermost layer consists of “symbols”, described as: “words, gestures, pictures or objects that carry a particular meaning only recognized as such by those who share the culture” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.7). “Symbols” are described as the most superficial and changeable manifestations of cultures (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.7). The next layer of the culture onion, moving inwards, is labeled “heroes” and defined as: “persons, alive or dead, real or imaginary who possess characteristics that are highly prized in a culture and thus serve as models for behavior” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.7). The next layer consists of “rituals”, or collective conventions, such as ways of greeting and ceremonies “technically superfluous to reaching desired ends, but which within a culture are considered socially essential” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.8). These three outer layers of the culture onion are collectively referred to under the heading “practices” and represent the most changeable manifestations of cultures (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.13). The manifestation “values” lies at the centre of the culture onion (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). “Values” are described as the generationally reproduced products of early socialization (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Values are often unconsciously held and consist of feelings, judgments and opinions about things like, good and bad, dirty and clean, moral and immoral (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). These “broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others” constitute the durable core of culture (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.8).

The dimensions of culture, presented in Hofstede’s (1980; 2005) model, are manifestations of the national values that form the core of the culture onion. A cultural dimension is defined as “an aspect of a culture that can be measured relative to other cultures.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.23).The dimensions measured by the IBM surveys were values, rather than practices, as values were seen to be the more stable manifestations of cultures. The IBM survey identified statistically significant norms, in survey responses, from people in the same nation. These response norms are

described as representative of trends in national cultural values (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Hofstede (2005) recognizes that nations are modern socio-political constructions and that "strictly speaking the concept of a common culture applies to societies, not to nations" (p.18). Societies are defined as; "historically, organically developed forms of social organization" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.18). However, the value dimensions and country profiles are presented at the national level. Hofstede (2005) argues that nations are "often the only feasible criterion for classification" (p.18) and that common conventions, such as shared languages, common religions and dominant political ideologies, work as forces for cultural integration within nations. These forces for integration are described as fostering tendencies for in-group identification within so called "durable nations"; therefore, justifying the investigation of dimensions of cultural values on a national rather than a societal level. (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Hofstede's (1980; 2005) analysis of cultural value dimensions, is based on the premise that all societies face a common set of basic problems, but have developed differing solutions. The idea that cultures are collective responses to a set of common human problems was first developed by European social anthropologists, such as Bronislaw Malinowski (1944), during the first half of the twentieth century. Similarities between Malinowski's (1944) and Hofstede's (1980; 2005) approaches to culture theory are discussed in detail in chapter seven. The common human problems, identified by Hofstede (2005), correspond to cultural value dimensions. These problems are described as:

1. Social inequality, including relationships with authority.
2. The nature of the relationship between the individual and the group.
3. Gender constructs and roles; concepts of masculinity and femininity.
4. Dealing with uncertainty and ambiguity, including the expression of emotion and control of aggression.

(Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.23)

The first problem, "social inequality," corresponds to the dimension "power-distance" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The second problem, the nature of relationships, corresponds to the dimension "collectivism versus individualism" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The third problem area corresponds to the dimension "masculinity versus femininity" and the fourth problem area corresponds to the dimension "uncertainty avoidance" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The nature and implications of these dimensions are described below.

The “power-distance” dimension concerns orientations towards authority and the degree to which inequalities are accepted within a given society (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Hofstede (2005) defines power-distance as, “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations, within a country, expect and accept that power is distributed unequally” (p.46). Countries with low power-distance (PDI) scores tend to emphasize the minimization of inequalities and prefer interdependent relationships (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Countries with high power-distance scores are said to emphasize the dependence of subordinates on superiors and regard power inequalities as expected and desirable (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). In the workplace, the power-distance score of a country is said to affect people’s perceptions of hierarchy, centralization, autocracy and the use of status symbols (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Table 1 provides an overview of PDI scores for twenty of the seventy-four countries featured in the PDI index.

Table 1: Sample PDI scores for twenty countries/regions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005)

Country/Region	Score	Rank	Country/Region	Score	Rank
Malaysia	104	1-2	Turkey	66	32-33
Slovakia	104	1-2	Uruguay	61	39-40
Russia	93	6	Iran	58	43-44
Mexico	81	10-11	Italy	50	51
Arab Countries	80	12-14	Hungary	46	55
China	80	12-14	United States	40	57-59
India	77	17-18	Australia	36	62
Slovenia	71	21	Great Britain	35	63-65
France	68	27-29	New Zealand	22	71
Hong-Kong	68	27-29	Austria	11	74

The dimension “collectivism versus individualism” measures whether a society places greater importance on the individual or the group (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Collectivism versus individualism levels are represented by the individualism index or IDV. Higher IDV scores indicate that a country tends to emphasize the individual, over the group (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). ‘The group’ is defined as any assemblage of people that experience some form of common identification, such as kinship groups, family units, or organizations (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Hofstede (1980) describes societal relationships between the individual and the collective as not only affecting how people live together, but also collective value systems and people’s conceptions of self. “It [individualism in society] therefore affects both people’s mental programming and the structure and functioning of many other types of institutions besides the family: educational, religious, political, and utilitarian.” (Hofstede, 1980, p.214-215). Hofstede (1980) describes the person, in individualist societies, as being defined as distinct from the

society, culture, or family to which they belong; whereas, within collectivist societies group affiliations are perceived to be defining characteristics of personal identity, determining not only who one is, but also with whom one should associate (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). IDV scores, like PDI scores, are conceptualised as points on a continuum ranging from collectivist to individualist[2]. Nations with high IDV scores prefer individualism over collectivism, people from these nations are said to define themselves as "I" and prefer libertarian principles over egalitarian ideologies (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Nations with low IDV scores are more collectivist and tend to value and encourage inter-dependence (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). People from collectivist nations are said to define themselves as "we" in accordance with their group affiliations (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Associations in collectivist countries are said to be predetermined by social grouping, with group interests taking moral precedence over concepts of self-determination and individual autonomy (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The majority of countries find themselves in between these extremes. Table 2 provides a sample of the IDV scores for twenty of the seventy-four countries accounted for in Hofstede's (1980; 2005) IDV index.

Table 2: Sample IDV scores for twenty countries/regions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Country/Region	Score	Rank	Country/Region	Score	Rank
United states	91	1	Croatia	33	44
Australia	90	2	Romania	30	46-48
Denmark	74	10	Mexico	30	46-48
France	71	13-14	Slovenia	27	49-51
Sweden	71	13-14	Hong-Kong	25	53-54
Germany	67	18	China	20	56-61
Argentina	46	33-35	Thailand	20	56-61
Russia	39	37-38	Costa-Rica	15	67
Turkey	37	41	Panama	11	72
Greece	35	43	Guatemala	6	74

The dimension "masculine versus feminine" corresponds to the third basic problem of the human condition "gender constructs and concepts of masculinity and femininity" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.23). The masculine versus feminine dimension is measured by the masculinity (MAS) index (Hofstede& Hofstede, 2005). MAS' scores illustrate the extent to which cultures prefer "masculine goals", such as assertiveness and ambition, over "feminine goals" such as, nurturing and modesty (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.133). "Masculinity-femininity is about a stress on

[2] Hofstede also plots the different scores together on x/y axis in two dimensional models correlating different value indices, such as PDI versus IDV (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p.83)

ego versus a stress on relationships with others, regardless of group ties" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.123). Emotional gender roles in masculine societies are described as more distinct than those in feminine societies (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Masculine societies are said to expect men to be assertive, competitive and ambitious, whereas women are expected to be empathetic and nurturing (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Feminine societies, on the other hand, are described as preferring both men and women to be modest, empathetic and more concerned with quality of life than earnings or power (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Masculine societies tend to advocate rewards based on equity, they also tend to have a lower proportion of women in professional occupations than feminine societies, and prioritize individual, organizational and national economic growth (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Organizations in masculine societies are said to prefer decisiveness and adversarial handling (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). In contrast, organizations in feminine societies emphasize negotiation, compromise and consensus (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). A country's MAS score is again represented as a point on a continuum. Countries with high MAS scores are described as masculine societies, countries with low MAS scores are described as feminine. Countries with moderate MAS scores, exhibit values from both the masculine and the feminine societal typologies. Table 3 presents a sample of MAS scores for twenty of the countries surveyed by Hofstede (1980; 2005).

Table 3: Sample MAS scores for 20 countries/regions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005)

Country/Region	Score	Rank	Country/Region	Score	Rank
Slovakia	110	1	Turkey	45	43-45
Japan	95	2	France	43	47-50
Mexico	69	8	Iran	43	47-50
China	66	11-13	Croatia	40	55-58
Germany	66	11-13	Uruguay	38	60
Ecuador	63	17-18	Russia	36	63
United States	62	19	Thailand	34	64
Australia	61	20	Slovenia	19	70
Hong-Kong	57	25-27	Netherlands	14	72
Arab Countries	53	31-32	Sweden	5	74

The fourth dimension "uncertainty avoidance" refers to the degree to which uncertainty and ambiguity are tolerated, or feared, within a given society (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). "Uncertainty avoidance" levels are measured by the uncertainty avoidance index or UAI, with scores ranging from strong to weak (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). A high UAI score indicates strong uncertainty avoidance and that ambiguous situations are viewed as

threatening. Strong uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to have many conventional, legal and institutional measures in place for reducing uncertainty and therefore anxieties within their societies (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). A low UAI score indicates that members of a society suffer little uncertainty related anxiety and can tolerate high levels of ambiguity (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). UAI scores are said to affect societal orientations towards rules, religion, and technologies, in addition to, perceptions of security and degrees of reliance on ‘experts’ (Hofstede, 1980). Levels of uncertainty related anxiety are also said to affect the degree to which expressions of aggression, or emotion, are accepted within a given society (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Countries with High UAI scores, are said to, accept “appropriate” expressions of aggression and emotion (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.176). Conceptions of that which constitutes “appropriate” are presumably defined by social norms. Countries with Low UAI scores, on the other hand, frown upon open expressions of aggression or emotion (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005). Hofstede (2005) describes low UAI scoring countries as viewing difference as curious; whereas, countries with high UAI scores view difference as dangerous. Table 4 presents a brief summary of some national UAI scores and country rankings.

Table 4: Sample UAI scores for twenty countries/regions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005)

Country/Region	Score	Rank	Country/Region	Score	Rank
Greece	112	1	Austria	70	35-38
Portugal	104	2	Luxemburg	70	35-38
Guatemala	101	3	Pakistan	70	35-38
Poland	93	9-10	Arab Countries	68	40-41
Japan	92	11-13	Germany	65	43
Romania	90	14	West Africa	54	52
Peru	87	16	Australia	51	55-56
Chile	86	17-22	United States	46	62
France	86	17-22	Jamaica	13	73
Brazil	76	31-32	Singapore	8	74

The fifth value dimension, documented by Hofstede (2005), “long-term versus short-term orientation” was not identified in the original IBM study. This fifth dimension was added as the result of a modified values survey, designed to eliminate the “western bias” of the original IBM questionnaires (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p.30). Shortly after the original publication of the IBM data, in “Culture’s Consequences” (1980), Hofstede collaborated with Michael Harris Bond, a Canadian researcher working at the University of Hong Kong, in order to develop the “Chinese Value Survey” or CVS (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The CVS was an attempt to manage the “western bias” of the original IBM values survey, which Hofstede (2005) attributes to the dynamics of the research team.

> There is usually a senior researcher, the one who took the initiative, and he (rarely she) is usually from a western background. Researchers from countries where respect for the senior guru and harmony within the team prevail will be almost too eager to follow the magic of the prestigious team leader. This means that the project team will maintain its western bias even with predominantly non-western membership.
> (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.30)

In order to overcome this bias, Bond created a forty item values questionnaire with a deliberate Chinese bias, the CVS (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The CVS was administered to a hundred students, in twenty-three countries (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).The statistical analysis of CVS responses, by Hofstede and Bond, also yielded four value dimensions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Three of these dimensions correlated with dimensions identified in the IBM surveys (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). However, the CVS analysis produced no correlation for the dimension “uncertainty avoidance” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The fourth dimension in the CVS represented a new facet of culture, concerning people’s orientations towards the past, present and future (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). This new dimension was labeled “long-term versus short-term orientation” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

“Long-term versus short-term orientation” concerns people’s cultural orientations towards time. This dimension is represented by the “long-term orientation index” (LTO) (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). A high LTO score indicates that people within a country tend to orientate towards the long-term, whereas a low LTO score indicates short-term time orientations (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Long-term orientations entail “the fostering of virtues orientated toward future rewards - in particular, perseverance and thrift” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 210). Short-term orientations are described as, “the fostering of virtues related to the past and present - in particular respect for tradition, preservation of face and fulfilling social obligations,” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.210). Short-term orientated cultures are said to expect effort to produce quick results, experience social pressure to spend and exhibit greater deference to tradition, than long-term orientated cultures (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Long-term orientated cultures are said to prefer perseverance and accept slow-progress in the pursuit of long term goals (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). People within long-term orientated cultures are said to be thrifty, sparing, respectful of circumstances and concerned with adaptability (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Within organizations, LTO levels are described as affecting whether companies focus on their “bottom-line” (low LTO) or market position (high LTO), and also perceptions of “business relationships”; whether they are perceived as variable in accordance with “business needs,” (low LTO), or as

investments in lifelong social-networks (high LTO) (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.225). The CVS questionnaire was administered in fewer countries than the IBM survey resulting in an LTO index which features fewer countries than the indices for the other four dimensions, thirty-nine as opposed to seventy-four. Table 5 presents a brief overview of LTO scores and rankings for twenty of the thirty nine featured countries.

Table 5: Sample LTO- Long-term orientation scores for twenty countries /regions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005)

Country/Region	Score	Rank	Country/Region	Score	Rank
China	118	1	Sweden	33	23
Hong Kong	96	2	Australia	31	25-27
Taiwan	87	3	Germany	31	25-27
Japan	80	4-5	United States	29	31
Brazil	65	7	Zimbabwe	25	32-33
India	61	8	Canada	23	34
Singapore	48	11	Philippines	19	35-36
Netherlands	44	13-14	Nigeria	16	37
Bangladesh	40	17-18	Czech Republic	13	38
Switzerland	40	17-18	Pakistan	0	39

Hofstede's (1980; 2005) value dimensions form a five dimensional model of cultural variation. These dimensions exert a combined influence on a country's culture (Hofstede, 1980). The dimension scores for individual countries can be arranged into clusters according to trends in scores for each of the dimensions (Hofstede, 1980). These score clusters are the basis of Hofstede's (1980) description of "eight culture areas" which he labels; "more developed Latin, less developed Latin, more developed Asian, less developed Asian, near-Eastern, Germanic, Anglo, and Nordic." (Hofstede, 1980, p.313). Culture area resemblances are attributed to the existence of shared languages, shared histories and similarities in political systems and/or climates (Hofstede, 1980). Table 6 presents a brief overview of some of the countries which fall within each of the "culture area" categories; Japan is described as constituting a category of its own (Hofstede, 1980).

Table 6: Eight culture areas and examples of countries in each category (Hofstede 1980)

M.D[3] Latin	L.D Latin	M.D Asian	L.D Asian	Near-Eastern	Germanic	Anglo	Nordic
Belgium	Colombia	Japan	Pakistan	Greece	Austria	Australia	Denmark
France	Mexico		Taiwan	Iran	Israel	Canada	Finland
Argentina	Venezuela		Thailand	Turkey	Germany	U.K	Netherlands
Brazil	Chile		India		Switzerland	Ireland	Norway

[3] M.D = more developed, L.D = less developed.

Spain	Portugal		Singapore			USA	Sweden

The characteristic value dimensions of each particular category are described by Hofstede (1980) as follows:

Table 7: Characteristics of Hofstede's culture categories (Hofstede, 1980)

	M.D Latin	**L.D Latin**	**M.D Asian**	**L.D Asian**	**Near-Eastern**	**Germanic**	**Anglo**	**Nordic**
PDI	High	High	High	High	High	Low	Low-medium	Low
UAI	High	High	High	Low-medium	High	Medium-high	Low-medium	Low-medium
IDV	Medium-high	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	High	Medium-high
MAS	Medium	Low-high	High	Medium	Medium	Medium-high	High	Low

The five dimensional model is one of the most influential CCT frameworks for understanding the influences and facets of culture (Fantini & Smith, 1997). However, despite the popularity and influence of this model, its premises, approach and conclusions are contested. Criticisms of the five dimensional models are addressed in the following chapter. Despite the controversy surrounding Hofstede's theory the five dimensional model remains the most influential work in the field of CCT since Hall's training at the FSI. Hofstede's (1980; 2005) research did not simply follow the FSI paradigm it expanded it to include the dimensional quantification of cultural diversity. The influence of Hofstede's (1980; 2005) quantitative dimensional approach, is nowhere more apparent than in the work of some of his competitors and most vocal critics, Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner.

Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's seven dimensional model of culture

Fons Trompenaars' and Charles Hampden-Turner's (1997) seven dimensional model of culture is not only widely utilized in cross-cultural training it is also, like Hofstede's model, the theoretical basis for an entire multi-national CCT company. Hofstede's (1980) model and Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) model exhibit many similarities in both their approaches to intercultural studies and their conceptualisations of culture. Hofstede's (1980) model, and Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) model both follow aspects of the FSI paradigm such as, the dyadic approach, the focus on non-verbal communication and the analysis of "national cultures". Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) model of culture also adopts a

quantitative dimensional approach to intercultural study, similar to the one developed by Hofstede (1980). The methodology of using values surveys to study cultures is common to both models and the theoretical starting points of the two models are also similar. Both Hofstede's (1980) and Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) models are based on the idea that all societies face a set of common problems and that culture is the manner in which societies differentially address these problems. However, descriptions of the nature of these problems and the dimensional categories of culture identified by the two models differ.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) define culture as "the way in which a group of people solves problems and reconciles dilemmas" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p. 6). Culture is described as subconscious, directive, learned and conventionalized, historically and geographically constituted, variable and functional (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Different geographical locations, and corresponding differences in environmental challenges and available resources, are said to have led to differing solutions to a set of basic human problems. The basic problems of human existence described by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) are derived from the work of the anthropologists F. Kluckhohn and F.L Strodtbeck (1961, cited in Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961, cited in Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997) describe five categories of basic problems faced by all societies. These categories are:

1. The relationship of the individual to the other
2. Orientations towards time
3. Orientations towards activity
4. The relationship between humans and nature
5. The character of human nature

(Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961 cited in Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.26).

The problem of how to understand and manage each of these areas is said to be a universal condition of human existence (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Cultural differences are the different ways in which societies collectively understand and manage each of these problem areas (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner 1997). Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) identify seven dimensions of culture based on differing societal solutions to three of these five problem categories: the relationship of the individual to the other, orientations towards time and orientations towards nature.

The seven dimensions of culture, identified by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997), are conceptualised differently to Hofstede's (1980; 2005) value dimensions. In order to avoid, "getting stuck by perceiving cultures as static points on a dual axis map," (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.27) Trompenaars and Hampden–Turner (1997) describe cultural categories as "managing" their opposites, and value dimensions as "self-organising" into new systems that generate new meanings. "We believe that cultures dance from one preferred end to the opposite and back. In that way we do not run the risk of one cultural category excluding its opposite." (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.27). Instead of using linear scales Trompenaars and Hampden–Turner (1997) describe cultures as "circles with preferred arcs joined together," (p.27). The dimensions are described using simulations which illustrate characteristics of particular dimensions. There are no tables assigning countries numerical scores along dimensional indices. Instead, bar graphs are presented showing national percentages of responses to questions that epitomise certain aspects of the value dimensions (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The seven dimensions are labelled; universalism versus particularism, individualism versus communitarianism, neutral versus emotional, specific versus diffuse, achievement versus ascription, attitudes to time and attitudes to the environment (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The first five dimensions correspond to the problem category "relationships with others" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The final two dimensions deal with the problem categories "orientations towards time" and "the relationship between humans and nature" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.8). The dimensions are described using examples of pure types or extremes. However, the inclusion of a culture on one side of a dimensional typology does not exclude the existence of behaviours associated with the opposite dimensional typology.

The dimension "Universalism versus particularism" corresponds to the problem area "relationships with others" and describes how people judge others behaviours (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Universalism refers to the obligation to adhere to culturally defined standards or rules (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Universalist societies are said to emphasise the equal applicability of rules or standards over the adaptation of behaviours, or judgements, to particular circumstances (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Universalist cultures resist exceptions to rules, due to the belief that their allowance would undermine the entire rule or social system (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Conversely, particularist cultures tend to allow judgements and behaviours to be guided by specific circumstances and

accept exceptions to rules in particular situations (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Organisations in particularist societies readily modify contracts, adapt procedure to circumstance and focus on evolving interpersonal relationships (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). In contrast, organisations in universalist societies are said to rely heavily on contracts, 'uniform procedures' and 'rational arguments' (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Universalist organisations also tend to distinguish between personal and business relationships (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) warn that "business people from both societies will tend to think each other corrupt," (p.31).

The seven dimensions are measured using "dilemmas". Responses to these dilemmas are said reflect cultural preferences. "The car and the pedestrian dilemma" reflects cultural preferences for either universalist or particularist perspectives. The car and the pedestrian dilemma is based on the following situation:

> You are riding in a car driven by a close friend. He hits a pedestrian. You know he was going at least 35mph in an area of the city where the maximum allowed speed is 20mph. There are no witnesses. His lawyer says that if you testify under oath that he was only driving 20mph it may save him from serious consequences. What right does your friend have to expect you to protect him?
> (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.33).

The response options presented are:

1. My friend has a definite right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure
2. He has some right as a friend to expect me testifies to the lower figure.
3. He has no right to expect me to testify to the lower figure.

(Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.34).

Respondents are asked to choose between response options and state whether they would testify to the lower speed. Option three and option two, combined with a refusal to testify to the lower speed, are universalist options. The respondent that chooses these options is choosing their obligations to a universally binding system, in this case law, over the protection of their friend. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) present a bar graph showing the percentages of universalist responses to this dilemma for thirty-one nationalities. Table 8 presents a summary of their findings.

Table 8: Universalist responses to "The car and the pedestrian" dilemma (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

Country	Universalist resp.	Country	Universalist resp.
Venezuela	32 %	Nigeria	73 %
Nepal	36 %	France	73 %
South Korea	37 %	Spain	75 %

Russia	44 %	Czech Republic	83 %
China	47 %	Germany	87 %
India	54 %	Netherlands	90 %
Greece	61 %	UK	91 %
Cuba	65 %	Australia	91 %
Japan	68 %	USA	93 %
Argentina	70 %	Switzerland	97 %

These percentages are not “country scores” of the type presented by Hofstede (1980; 2005). Rather, the percentages reflect universalist or particularist tendencies, within cultures, that arise in response to a particular dilemma. Subsequent dilemmas, measuring “universalism versus particularism”, are presented and the percentages of Universalist responses within nations vary. The Czech Republic, for example, produced a high percentage of universalist responses to “the car and the pedestrian” dilemma (83%). However, Czech responses to the dilemma of whether to write a good review of a friend’s bad restaurant demonstrate much lower levels of universalism (49%) (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.37). The different percentages of universalist answers in response to different situations demonstrates Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) argument, that cultural preferences “dance” from one perspective to the other in response to changing circumstances. The Czech example demonstrates that in legal matters a universalist perspective maybe preferred, whereas in more trivial circumstances a particularist option is acceptable. However, whilst cultural value orientations may alternate with changing circumstances, the relative positions of national preferences on the universalism versus particularism scales tend to retain similarities. US responses tend to lean towards the universalist end of the scale, while Russian responses tend to lean towards the particularist end. There are, however, anomalies in responses that may be better explained in terms of national contexts as opposed to cultural value orientations. For example, in response to the dilemma of whether you, as a doctor, should write a favourable health report to an insurance company for your friend, despite some minor difficulties in diagnoses, US informants scored towards to the middle of the scale, with a universalist response rate of 57%, on par with that of China. In response to the other dilemma’s US informants had scored closer to the universalist end of the scale and the percentage differences between China and the US had been much greater. In response to “the car and the pedestrian” there was a 50 percentage point difference between Chinese and American answers (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). In response to “the bad restaurant” dilemma there was a 16 percentage point difference in Chinese and American answers. In both cases Chinese scores are more particularist and US scores more universalist. The lower US score in response to “the doctor and the insurance company” dilemma may have more to do with the American health and

insurance systems than universalist or particularist value orientations. On occasion seemingly value based responses, to the dilemmas, may be confounded by national circumstances. The sometimes confounding nature of the dilemmas is also apparent in responses for the other value orientations.

.

The second of the seven dimensions is labelled "individualism versus communitarianism" and also corresponds to the problem category "relationships with others" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Individualism is described, according to a definition offered by Parsons and Shills, as "a prime orientation to the self," (Parsons & Shills, 1951 cited in, Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.50). Communitarianism is described as "a prime orientations towards common goals and objectives" (Parsons & Shills, 1951 cited in, Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.50). This dimension is similar to Hofstede's (1980) "individualism versus collectivism" dimension. People within individualist societies tend to refer to themselves using "I", whereas people in communitarian societies tend to refer to themselves using "we" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Within individualist cultures, the individual is seen as an "end" served by the "means" of the community (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2007). Communitarian cultures, on the other hand see the group as the "end" to which the improvement of the individual is the "means" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

Individualist or communitarian orientations, within organisations, are said to affect attitudes towards representation, performance analysis, decision making, motivations and organisational structure (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).Organisations within communitarian cultures tend to prefer plural representation; whereas, organisations within individualist cultures are happy with individual representation (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Communitarian cultures do not distinguish between individual contributions and group achievements; whereas, individualist cultures assume that the singling out of individual contributions is both possible and desirable (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Such assumptions affect the reception of business practices such as "pay-for-performance" and decision making processes (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Individualist organisations are comfortable with representatives making decisions on behalf of the group; whereas, communitarian organisations prefer to make group decisions, based on consultation and consensus (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

The dimension "individualism versus communitarianism" is again, illustrated using dilemmas and bar graphs. One of the dilemmas used to illustrate this dimension is "the quality of life" dilemma. The quality of life dilemma asks participants to choose between libertarian ideals of individual freedom and socialist ideals of the common good (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Table 9 summarises the percentages of managers, from different nations, who opted for individualist, libertarian ideals. Again, these percentages are not static country ratings, but examples of tendencies towards particular perspectives, in response to a particular dilemma.

Table 9: Individualist responses to "The quality of life dilemma" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.51)

Country	Individualist resp.	Country	Individualist resp.
Egypt	30 %	Venezuela	53 %
Nepal	31 %	Poland	59 %
India	37 %	Russia	60 %
Japan	39 %	UK	61 %
Brazil	40 %	Australia	63 %
China	41 %	Czech Republic	68 %
France	41 %	USA	69 %
Malaysia	46 %	Nigeria	74 %
Italy	52 %	Romania	81 %
Germany	53 %	Israel	89 %

The third dimension is labeled "affective versus neutral" and reflects the degree to which expressions of emotion are deemed acceptable within particular cultures (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Affective cultures are said to expect and accept open expressions of emotion, whereas neutral cultures expect people to control and subdue emotional responses (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The acceptability of emotional expression is described as resulting from convention, and affecting people's expectations with regard to others (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). People from affective cultures tend to expect emotional responses, whereas people from neutral cultures tend to expect others to separate emotional and objective responses (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Within organisations, neutral or affective tendencies affect expectations regarding business conduct, negotiations and personnel involvement (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Neutral cultures tend to separate emotional responses from objective reasoning; the latter being considered more appropriate business conduct. Neutral cultures will deem overt expressions of emotion, in the workplace, "unprofessional" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Reserve, self-control, and emotional detachment are the ideal, as emotional involvement is perceived as

potentially clouding a person's capacity for objective reasoning (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2007). Taboos, concerning physical contact are stricter within neutral cultures and negotiations focus on goals or products, rather than the individuals involved (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.79). Affective cultures, on the other hand, incorporate emotional responses into reasoning processes (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Negotiations, within affective cultures, focus on the people involved and heated expressions of emotion are considered indicative of involvement and commitment (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Touching, gesturing and physical contact are expected within affective cultures, however excited involvement does not necessarily signal agreement (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Affective/neutral orientations are also said to affect verbal communication styles in areas such as, tone of voice, the use of silences and the acceptability of interruptions (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Affective cultures tend to have more undulating speech patterns, with fewer pauses and accept interruptions, whereas neutral cultures have more monotone speech patterns, longer pauses during speech and frown upon interruptions (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The dimension "affective versus neutral" is illustrated using the "feeling upset at work" dilemma. This dilemma asks participants whether they would express their emotions if they were feeling upset at work (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Table 10 presents a summary of neutral national responses to this dilemma.

Table 10: Neutral responses to the "Upset at work" dilemma (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997)

Country	Neutral resp.	Country	Neutral resp.
Kuwait	15 %	Portugal	47 %
Spain	19 %	Australia	48 %
Venezuela	20 %	India	51 %
Russia	24 %	China	55 %
France	30 %	Austria	59 %
Italy	33 %	Hong Kong	64 %
Germany	35 %	New Zealand	69 %
Brazil	40 %	Poland	70 %
USA	43 %	Japan	74 %
UK	45 %	Ethiopia	81 %

The fourth dimensions is labelled "specific versus diffuse" and concerns the permeability of relationships (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Within 'specific' cultures relationship roles are segregated according to the domains in which they occur; the authority of superiors does not translate to meetings outside of the workplace (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

Authoritative relationships are task bound "each area in which people encounter each other is considered apart from the other, a specific case" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.81). Within diffuse cultures authoritative relationships permeate all levels of people's involvement with each other (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The dimension "specific versus diffuse" affects expectations within relationships and the degree to which people separate their private and professional lives (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). People within 'specific' cultures only acknowledge titles and skills when they are deemed relevant to the current situation (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). 'Specific' cultures also advocate a strict separation between private and professional domains with different conventions governing behaviours within each relationship category (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Diffuse cultures advocate an acknowledgement of titles, skills and status at all times, because personal and professional spheres are perceived as interrelated (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

The dimension "specific versus diffuse" is illustrated using the "paint the house" dilemma (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Participants were asked whether they would feel obligated to help their boss paint his/her house, outside of work hours, despite not wanting to. Table 11 summarises the percentages of people who gave a 'specific' response, saying they would not feel obligated to help their boss.

Table 11: 'Specific' responses to the "paint the house" dilemma. (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

Country	**Specific resp.**	**Country**	**Specific resp.**
China	32 %	Australia	78 %
Nigeria	46 %	USA	82 %
Venezuela	52 %	Germany	83 %
Singapore	58 %	Russia	86 %
Austria	65 %	France	88 %
India	67 %	UK	88 %
New Zealand	70 %	Czech Republic	89 %
Japan	71 %	Switzerland	90 %
Spain	71 %	Netherlands	91 %
Brazil	77 %	Sweden	91 %

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) conducted further interviews with Japanese participants, in response to the surprisingly 'specific' orientations of Japanese respondents (71%). The results of these interviews showed that "Japanese never paint houses," and that the absence of this practice had confounded the results of the survey (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.87). Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) describe this anomaly as demonstrative of "the

relativity of empirical data" (p.87). However, this anomaly is equally demonstrative of the ethnocentric nature of some of the dilemmas used to measure orientations.

The fifth value dimension is labelled "achievement versus ascription" and describes the manner in which status is accorded within a given society (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Achievement orientated cultures accord status on the basis of individual actions, or accomplishments (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Ascription orientated cultures, attribute status on the basis of identity, in accordance with a person's age, gender, social or familiaral connections, education and profession (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Within organisations achievement/ascription orientations are said to influence the use of titles, the basis of hierarchies, the make-up of negotiating teams and the forms of motivation used (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Organisations within achievement orientated cultures tend to use titles to reflect individual competencies (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Hierarchies, within achievement orientated cultures, reflect job performance and levels of expertise (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997) Achievement orientated cultures view the potential success of negotiating teams as dependent on their members relevant technical knowledge and pay-for-performance is perceived to be an effective motivational tool (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Conversely, organisations within ascription orientated cultures use titles to indicate status and create hierarchies on the basis of personal characteristics, or social standing (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Ascription orientated cultures see the effectiveness of negotiating teams as being dependent on the status of those involved and direct rewards, or praise from superiors, are more effective motivational tools than pay-for-performance (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). National orientations within the dimension "achievement versus ascription" are illustrated using the "respect depends on family background" dilemma. Table 12 presents a summary of the percentages of Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) respondents who disagreed with the ascription orientated statement "respect depends on family background," (p.106).

Table 12: Achievement orientated responses to the "Respect depends on family background" dilemma (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

Country	Achievement resp.	Country	Achievement resp.
Kuwait	50 %	Japan	79 %
Austria	51 %	Italy	80 %
India	57 %	China	81 %
Hong Kong	58 %	France	83 %
Kenya	62 %	Australia	86 %

Cuba	69 %	USA	87 %
Brazil	70 %	UK	89 %
Switzerland	73 %	New Zealand	89 %
Russia	74 %	Ireland	94 %
Germany	74 %	Norway	94 %

The sixth dimension, described by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997), is labelled "sequential versus synchronic" and corresponds to the problem category "orientations towards time". The dimension "sequential versus synchronic" describes how cultures experience and order time (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Sequential cultures, are said to, view time as a series of events; whereas, synchronic cultures experience past, present and future as interrelated (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Sequential cultures are described as experiencing time as a linear construct; whereas, synchronic cultures have cyclical notions of time (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Sequentially orientated cultures tend to arrange events in succession, whereas, synchronically orientated cultures, handle events simultaneously (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Sequential cultures are described as placing great importance on schedules, planning, and punctuality, experiencing time as quantifiable and subordinating relationships to schedules (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Synchronic cultures, on the other hand, experience schedules and appointments as approximations and subordinate time to relationships (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.139). The dimension "Synchronic versus sequential" corresponds to Hall's (1977) monochromatic/polychromatic time orientation theory. The only significant differences between the two models are the labels given to each of the orientations and the fact that Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) model incorporates differences in conceptions of past, present and future.

The dimension "sequential versus synchronic" describes the influences culture has on perceptions of past, present and future and understandings of the relationships between these temporal constructs (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Some cultures are said to experience past, present and future as overlapping and interrelated, whereas others, experience them as separate and distinct (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.127). Some cultures place greatest importance on future events, some on past events, and some on the present, others consider each of these temporal constructs equally important (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Sequential/synchronic orientations also affect the placing of "time horizons", a person's

perception of where the ‘past’ begins, when the ‘present’ occurs and ends, and when the ‘future’ begins (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). People from past orientated cultures are described as tending to be concerned with the origins of things, showing great respect for predecessors or ancestors and viewing events in the context of history or tradition (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). People from present orientated cultures are described as placing the greatest importance on present events, perceiving plans as malleable and viewing events in the context of “the here and now” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). People from future orientated cultures tend to plan ahead, talk in terms of potentials, or aspirations, and experience the past and present in terms of their relationships to future prospects (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

The dimension “Sequential versus synchronic” is not illustrated using dilemmas, instead national tendencies are described using anecdotes. One of these anecdotes is an account of one of the author’s experiences of an Italian butcher’s shop. The authors describe the butcher unwrapping salami for one customer and then calling out “who else for salami?” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.123). This example of synchronic service is then contrasted with practices in Dutch and British butchers’ shops where customers are served in succession (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.123). The anecdote is intended to demonstrate that Italian time orientations are synchronic, whereas British and Dutch time orientations are sequential. Similar anecdotes are used to demonstrate the synchronic nature of South Korean, Japanese, Argentinean and French cultures, and the sequential nature of American culture (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

The seventh dimension of Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) model is labelled “inner-directed versus outer-directed” and corresponds to the problem category “human relationships with nature”. This final dimension concerns the role people assign to nature and their orientations towards the challenges of the natural environment (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Inner-directed cultures are said to believe that nature can and should be ‘controlled’ by the imposition of human will (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Outer-directed cultures perceive themselves as part, or a product, of nature and accept that they are subject to natural laws, or forces (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). These different orientations towards nature affect whether people perceive themselves as in control of, or subject to, the workings of

external forces. Inner-directed cultures are said to adopt dominating attitudes towards environments, emphasise internal centres of control and concentrate on mastering nature and problems (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Inner-directed cultures also tend to be competitive, classifying events in terms of winning and losing (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The achievement of objectives is of primary importance within inner-directed cultures and people from such cultures tend to feel discomfort when not in control (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Outer-directed cultures, on the other hand, are described as adopting a flexible attitude towards nature (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). The primary locus of control, within outer-directed cultures, is perceived as lying with natural trends and forces, located outside of the individual. Outer-directed cultures are said to be less controlling and more compromising than inner-directed cultures, valuing harmony, responsiveness to circumstances and patience, and perceiving change as natural, rather than threatening (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). National tendencies within the dimension “inner-directed versus outer-directed” are illustrated using the dilemma “The captains of their fate” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.144). This dilemma asks participants to choose between two alternative statements, the first of which is inner-directed, the second of which is outer-directed. The statements are:

1. What happens to me is my own doing.
2. Sometimes I feel that I do not have enough control over the directions my life is taking.

Table 13 presents a summary of the percentages of people that selected the inner directed statement 1 as the truest reflection of their feelings.

Table 13: Inner-directed responses to “the captain of their fate dilemma” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997)

Country	**Inner-directed resp.**	**Country**	**Inner-directed resp**
Venezuela	33 %	Spain	76 %
China	39 %	France	76 %
Russia	49 %	Switzerland	77 %
Czech Republic	59 %	UK	77 %
Japan	63 %	New Zealand	80 %
India	63 %	Australia	82 %
Germany	66 %	USA	82 %
Sweden	71 %	Norway	86 %
Italy	72 %	Israel	88 %
Thailand	72 %	Uruguay	88%

Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) seven dimensional models provide a further framework for understanding cultural diversity and intercultural interactions. The influence of Hall’s (1959; 1969; 1977) work is clearer in Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) model

than it is in Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model; the dimension 'synchronic versus sequential' is an extension of Hall's (1977) monochromatic/polychromatic distinction. There are also areas in which the seven and the five dimensional models overlap. The seven dimensional model, like the five dimensional model, follows the pragmatic, micro-analytic, CCT paradigm set by Hall. In addition, the seven dimensional model uses the quantitative dimensional approach to intercultural study initiated by Hofstede (1980). The theoretical starting points and approaches of the two models are also extremely similar, as are aspects of the dimensions which they describe. These similarities are hardly surprising as both models are attempting to describe the same phenomenon for the same purpose. However, these similarities leave both models open to many of the same criticisms.

Conclusion

The seven dimensional model, like the five dimensional model, is not uncontested. However, as with the five dimensional model, the academic controversy surrounding the seven dimensional model has had little affect on its popularity as a cross-cultural training tool. The above section briefly introduced some of the potential problems with the seven dimensional model, such as the ethnocentric nature of some of the measurement dilemmas. The following chapter expands on this evaluation and investigates the implications potential criticisms may have on the utility of these dimensional models of cultural diversity.

Chapter 4: A Critical Analysis of CCT Models of Culture

Introduction

The CCT models of culture outlined in the previous chapter are subject to controversy. The assignment of cultural values to nations is problematic. Intra-national diversity, the volatility of national boundaries and the existence of sub-cultures and diasporas confound the picture of national cultural homogeneity painted by dimensional CCT models. The attribution of supreme value determining causality to the concept of 'culture' is questionable. As is the segregation and quantification of cultural value systems into numerical, or percentile, dimensions. The current chapter examines the controversies and criticisms surrounding dimensional models of culture. The implicit assumptions on which the models are based are explicated and evaluated. Then the affects of dimensional approaches to culture study on training objectives are examined, in conjunction with a presentation of alternative, developmental, approaches to cross-cultural training.

Criticisms of the five dimensional model

Criticisms of Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five value dimensions model have been raised by a number of scholars, most notably Brendan McSweeney (2002) and the creators of the seven dimensional model Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner (1997a). Criticisms of Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model tend to concentrate on the implicit assumptions on which the model is based. The most fundamental of these assumptions is a belief in the existence of 'national' cultures and the attribution of causal properties to these cultures. Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model also assumes that national cultures are uniform, that cultural values are constants, that the IBM data is representative of national cultural values and that alternative positions, within cultural value dimensions, are mutually exclusive. The following section examines some of these assumptions, the criticisms surrounding them and the implications of these criticisms for Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model.

The assumption that distinctive, influential, 'national' cultures exist is one of the defining features of Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five dimensional model. Hofstede (2005) justifies the use of nations, as primary unit of analysis, on the basis of utility, arguing that the ease of acquiring data for nations makes them "the only feasible criterion for classification" (p.19). Hofstede (2005) also

argues that internal forces towards integration, such as shared languages and political systems, result in shared national values (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The five dimensional model contains only minimal acknowledgement of the existence of intra-national cultural diversity. Individual nations are depicted as representative of particular sets of value configurations. These value configurations are, in turn, depicted as the primary distinguishing factors which differentiate members of one nation from another (McSweeney, 2002). Hofstede's (1980; 2005) work contains little discussion of the distorting potential that the attribution of particular cultural values to particular nations can have. The UK, for example, is analysed as a single cultural unit, whereas in reality the UK consists of four 'countries' with different languages, different histories, and differing cultural practices. Australia and America are also analysed as single cultural units. Their respective Indigenous cultures and the multi-cultural natures of these societies are subordinated, in their causal roles, to the influence of a single 'national' culture. "A unique national culture is assumed to be individually carried by everyone in a society." (McSweeney, 2002, p.93). The criteria for an individual's inclusion, as a carrier of a particular national culture, are unclear. The assignment of cultural identity on the basis of passport nationality, in a world characterised by international migration and multiculturalism, is almost certainly fallacious. The assignment of cultural identity according to the country of primary socialisation constitutes a failure to recognise the influence that migrations and intercultural interactions can have on people's cultural values. Hofstede (2005) recognises that nations are not constants, but his focus on so called "durable nations" diminishes recognition of the volatile nature of these socio-political constructs. Even if the existence of 'national' cultures is accepted, the attribution of supreme causal properties to these national cultures is problematic.

The five dimensional model ignores the influence of individual life experiences on value systems. The failure to concede influence to individual life experience is a result of Hofstede's (1980) strict separation of the individual and the cultural levels of analysis, and his assertion that cultural values are durably formed in early childhood. These assumptions result in a form of cultural determinism, which depicts national cultures as singular causal forces determining constant and uniform value systems, shared by all members of a nation. The possibility of the lifelong malleability of value systems, influenced by both culture and personal experience, finds no potential for expression within the five dimensional model. Yet, a story recounted by Tina, during her interview, appears to indicate that cultural values are malleable. Tina describes herself as Anglo-Australian, her husband is Fijian. In the story Tina describes the naming of her daughter.

> …things that I won't accept from my Australian side of the family, I absolutely accept from the other side of the family ... when my daughter was born my mother in-law was there and she picked up the baby and named her, which is her right as the grandmother, and if I thought about it, if my own mother walked in, there'd be no way I'd accept that. (Tina, Personal communication, 27.04.08).

This story demonstrates Tina's adoption of 'other' cultural value standards, later in life, as a result of her personal experiences of Fijian culture. Tina describes the grandmothers naming of the baby as "her right" and appears to accept it as such. Tina's unquestioning acceptance of a "right" so alien to her own culture, demonstrates an incorporation of alternative value standards, that could only have happened later in life, once she was married, as a result of her life experiences. This example, of the adaptation of cultural values, appears to contradict the absolute causal roles which the five dimensional model attributes to national identity and childhood socialisation. However, even if the existence and value determining causal properties of national identity are accepted, there are further logical problems with Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model.

The five dimensional model appears to be based on circular reasoning. Hofstede (1980) assumes the existence of that which he seeks to prove, national culture. Without an a priori belief in the existence of national cultures Hofstede (1980) would have no grounds for treating localized data as representative of nationally shared values (McSweeney, 2002). "To assume national uniformity, as Hofstede does, is not appropriate for a study which purports to have found it" (McSweeney, 2002, p.100). The stratification of the IBM data on the basis of nationality occurs prior to the identification of national cultural differences. "Hofstede's unjustified analytical leap is to treat the differences identified on the basis of national stratification as a consequence of national culture." (McSweeney, 2002, p.102). It is plausible that an alternative data stratification basis would have produced differing response groupings (McSweeney, 2002). In order to generalise from local to national levels one has to assume the existence of some form of national uniformity or at least, that particular micro-level data are representative of national level tendencies. However, the representativeness of the IBM data, used in the development of the five dimensional model, is questionable.

The supposed representativeness of the IBM data is based on the assumptions, that national cultures are shared by all members of a nation and that value survey trends reveal national value tendencies (McSweeney, 2002). McSweeney (2002) claims that Hofstede's (1980) reasoning

jumps between these two assumptions and that neither are justified. The first assumption, that national cultures are equally shared, is used to justify the inference of national tendencies from micro-level data (McSweeney, 2002). The second assumption, that survey trends reveal national values, is used to justify the inference of nationally shared values, despite anomalies in survey responses (McSweeney, 2002). If the first assumption is true, then it must be assumed that any national group surveyed would exhibit the same value responses, be they McDonald's employees, animal rights activists, militant Marxists, or white supremacists (McSweeney, 2002). Even if it is assumed that nationally 'typical' groups will demonstrate 'nationally typical' values, it is questionable whether 1970s IBM subsidiaries can be classified as nationally typical organizations. McSweeney (2002) lists seven atypical characteristics of IBM subsidiaries that contradict Hofstede's (1980) claim that IBM employees represented a nationally typical sample at the time of the surveys. The atypical characteristics of 1970s IBM subsidiaries, delineated by McSweeney (2002), are:

1. The selective recruitment of the middle classes
2. International training
3. The technologically advanced products
4. Frequent personal contacts between subsidiaries and the companies international headquarters
5. Internationally centralized control of the subsidiaries.
6. US ownership
7. The comparatively young average age of managers

(McSweeney 2002, p.101)

According to McSweeney (2002) "there are no valid reasons for assuming that IBM responses somehow reflected the national average" (p.101). It is also questionable whether fixed choice answers to preconceived survey questions can be deemed representative of the entire possible spectrum of cultural value orientations. The nature of surveys is such, that respondents are forced to appropriate their opinions to a fixed set of predetermined answers. The addition of a fifth dimension, as a result of the CVS responses, demonstrates that the original IBM questionnaires could not possibly have covered the entire range of cultural value possibilities. "Is it not probable that Hofstede would have 'found' different national cultures had he used additional, amended or alternative questions?" (McSweeney, 2002, p.105)

The scale of the IBM survey is often cited as proof of it representativeness. However, the numbers stated, 117,000 questionnaires completed by participants in over 50 countries, can be distorting. The number 117,000 is the number of questionnaires completed over both rounds of surveys, the 1968-1969 rounds and the 1971-1973 rounds, and not all of these surveys were used

in the formulation of the model (McSweeney, 2002, p.94). The number of surveys carried out in different nations varies, from large to small and even "miniscule" (McSweeney, 2002, p.94). Only responses from Belgium, France, the UK, Germany, Japan and Sweden, totaled over 1000 in both rounds of surveys (McSweeney, 2002). Response numbers totaled over 200 in 15 countries (McSweeney, 2002). In Pakistan the first round of surveys produced only 37 responses, the second round produced only 70 (McSweeney, 2002). In Singapore only one round of surveys was conducted and these were completed by only 58 respondents (McSweeney 2002, p.94). In order for these numbers of localised responses to be deemed representative of national value tendencies, one has to assume the homogeneity, not only of one's sample, but also of an entire population, something which Hofstede (1981, cited in McSweeney, 2002) appears to do.

> …. if a sample is really homogeneous with regard to the criteria under study, there is little to gain in reliability over an absolute sample size of 50 … I could therefore have done my research on 40 (countries) x 50 (respondents) x 2 (survey rounds) … and obtained almost equally reliable results."
> (Hofstede, 1981, p.65, cited in McSweeney, 2002, p.94).

Assuming the homogeneity of national cultures does not only downplay the existence of individual variations, it also ignores national cultural heterogeneities and the existence of subcultures and Diasporas.

The five dimensional model can also be criticised for assuming that cultural value dimensions are mutually exclusive. The dimensions are conceptualised as continuums and countries value orientations are represented as points on these continuums (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The positioning of a culture as individualist necessarily excludes the possibility of it being collectivist. Cultures are represented as consisting of sets of mutually exclusive, non-interactive values (McSweeney, 2002). However, ethnographic inquires appear to contradict this position. Cultures are often represented, by anthropologists, as encompassing and integrating apparently contradictory values. Lila Abu-Lughod's (1999) ethnography of *Awlad 'Ali* Bedouin society skillfully demonstrates how ideals of equality and the realities of hierarchy can co-exist, without contradiction, within a single culture.

> "*Awlad 'Ali* mediate the contradiction between the ideals of equality and the realities of hierarchy by considering relations of inequality not antagonistic, but complementary. They invest independence with responsibility and a set of obligations and dependency with the dignity of choice."
> (Abu-Lughod, 1999, p.79)

Ideals and practices often contradict each other. It is however, possible to argue that the co-existence of contradictory ideals and practices must not undermine the possibility of mutually

exclusive values, as ideals and practices are of a different order to values. Yet, the coexistence of contradictory values within a single culture does undermine the argument that value dimensions are mutually exclusive.

> "The coexistence of two discourses on sentiment, equally valued and representing different ideals to which people were committed, led me to conclude that it was impossible to reduce Bedouin 'culture' to the official social and moral ideals … Nor was it possible to reduce individual experience to the dominant cultural forms"
> (Abu-Lughod, 1999, p.xvii)

Abu-Lughod's (1999) ethnographic examination of the coexistence of contradictory sentiments of honor and modesty represented within Bedouin poetry and honor codes, contradicts, firstly, Hofstede's (1980) assumption that cultural values are mutually exclusive and secondly, the argument that individual values can be reduced to dominant cultural norms. The "mutually subtractive" representation of cultural dimensions within Hofstede's (1980; 2005) model has also been criticised by Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner (1997a).

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997a), claim that Hofstede misrepresents cultural values as static points on a linear axis. They argue that cultures are interrelated wholes, which cannot be split into sets of independent variables (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997a). "Cultures have meanings which depend upon the entire context. No one element in that context dictates meaning to the whole" (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997a, p.152). The division of cultural systems into mutually exclusive dimensions undermines the possibility that cultural values may be variable, interrelated, and simultaneously contradictory; possibilities which ethnographic inquiries, such as Abu-Lughod's (1999), appear to confirm. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997a) attribute the mutually exclusive representation of value dimensions to Hofstede's tendency, to divide the world into categories of "(a) and not (a)" whilst searching for the least number of factors that will explain the most cases (p.158). The assumption of dimensional exclusivity within the five dimensional model actually follows from another assumption that underpins Hofstede's (1980) conceptualisation of cultural values.

The representation of value dimensions, as mutually exclusive, follows from the assumption that cultural values are situationally non-specific. The five dimensional model presumes that the existence of large power-distance orientations in the work place necessarily entails the existence of large-power distance orientations in the home (McSweeney, 2002). However, the model is

based on data collected in the work-place and work-practice based questions (McSweeney, 2002). The situational, or contextual, variability of cultural values was not tested by the IBM surveys. The supposed situationally unspecific nature of the value dimensions is therefore based on the contestable assumption, that expressions of cultural values are static and unaffected by circumstance, or context. This assumption is contradicted by both Tina's account of the situational application of cultural value standards and Abu-Lughod's (1999) demonstration of the co-existence of contradictory cultural values.

The explication of the a priori assumptions, on which Hofstede's theory of national cultures is based, appears to diminish the descriptive force of the five dimensional model. The criticisms raised against Hofstede call the theoretical underpinnings, methods, and representativeness of the five dimensional model into question. According to McSweeney (2002); "Hofstede's apparently sophisticated analysis … necessarily relies on a number of profoundly flawed assumptions….Fallacious assumptions necessarily lead to inaccurate empirical descriptions regardless of the quantity of data and statistical manipulation used." (p.112). 'National' cultural classifications may result in the misrepresentation of nations as homogeneous cultural units and an under-recognition of cultural heterogeneity. The assignment of supreme value determining causality to national cultural identity disregards the influence of life experiences on the formation and adaptation of value systems. The reasoning underpinning the formation of the five dimensional model appears to be circular and the representatives of the IBM survey is questionable. The assumption, that national cultural values are equally shared, static and mutually exclusive, is fallacious. Together, these criticisms undermine the descriptive force of the five dimensional model and therefore its utility as a tool for cross-cultural training. However, it is unwise to abandon the model completely without considered evaluation of Hofstede's responses to some of these criticisms.

Hofstede's responses to criticisms of the five dimensional model

The following section summarises and evaluates Hofstede's (1996; 2002; 2005) responses to the criticisms raised against the five dimensional model. The responses, outlined below, are taken from research papers, published by Hofstede, in defense of his model and in reply to the criticisms raised by McSweeney (2002), and Trompenaars and Hampden- Turner (1997a). The following section begins by summarising "standard criticisms" of the five dimensional model, as

recognised by Hofstede (2002). The responses and anticipated responses to, these criticisms are then summarised and evaluated.

Hofstede (2002), in his reply to McSweeney's (2002) critique, acknowledges five "standard criticisms" of his approach and outlines his responses to these criticisms. The criticisms recognised by Hofstede (2002) are:

1. Surveys are not a suitable way of measuring cultural differences.
2. Nations are not the best units for studying cultures.
3. Studies of subsidiaries of one company cannot be representative of entire national cultures.
4. The IBM data is old and therefore obsolete.
5. Four or five dimensions are not enough.

(Hofstede 2002, p.2)

These criticisms, and their corresponding responses, are by no means exhaustive of the problems with the five dimensional model. However, they offer a starting point for the consideration of Hofstede's responses to his critics. Hofstede (2002) offers the following replies to these "standard criticisms":

1. Surveys should not be the only way of measuring cultural differences.
2. Nations are usually the only available units of measurement "and better than nothing".
3. The surveys measured differences between national cultures; any functionally equivalent national samples would produce the same information. Replica studies have since validated the existence of the dimensions.
4. The dimensions measure centuries old, durable, core values and have since been validated in subsequent surveys.
5. Additional dimensions must be "conceptually and statistically independent" from the five dimensions already identified.

(Hofstede 2002, p. 2)

In response to the first criticism Hofstede (2002) concedes that surveys should not be the only way of 'measuring' cultural differences. However, he does not address problems concerning the distortion inherent in the survey method. These inherent distortions arise firstly, from the appropriation of participant responses to pre-determined answers. Secondly, from the impossibility of covering the entire spectrums of possible cultural values in answer choices and thirdly, from the potentially ethnocentric nature of questions and response choices. Hofstede (2002) does not mention the affects that these confounding factors may have had on the survey

findings and formulation of the original four dimensions, despite the retrospective addition of a fifth dimension as a result of precisely these problems.

The second response, that nations are often the only feasible units for classification, must be coupled with Hofstede's (2005) argument that common practices within 'durable' nations work as forces for national cultural integration. Hofstede (2005) recognises that the concept of a common culture is better applied to organically arising societal groups, than to politically constructed nations. However, this recognition is undermined by the use of generalised labels, such as 'Arab countries' and 'West Africa', in the presentation of the dimensional indices. It is true that intercultural comparisons covering entire ranges of sub-cultures and national diversities, on the scale of the IBM study would have been impractical. However, Hofstede's (2002) defense of national classifications, on the basis of practicality and utility, misses the point of the criticism. The five dimensional model is used as a tool for the education of lay people on the facets and affects of cultural diversity. Social scientists and anthropologists may easily recognise the practical limitations of large scale comparative studies and the applicability of disclaimers. However, there is a danger that the use of national unitary classifications and sweepingly general labels could paint a false picture of national cultural homogeneity in the minds of inexperienced CCT trainees. The presentation of the dimensions and country scores in Hofstede's model does nothing to counteract this potential danger. The potential for misrepresentation is exacerbated by the use of generalised labels and the attribution of uniform cultural values to nations.

The third criticism centers on the representativeness of the IBM data. Hofstede (2002) cites replica studies as proof of the representativeness of the IBM data. "Cultures and organizations" mentions six such replica studies (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Problematically, only two of these replica studies, surveys among "elites"[4] and pilots, corroborated all of the four original dimensions. Surveys among non-IBM multinational employees, consumers, civil servants and bank employees, only ever corroborated three of the four original dimensions (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

> Four of the six replications…confirm only three out of the four dimensions - and each time the missing one is different …We assume this is because the respondents include

[4] "Elites" this group included MP's, parliamentarians, academics and artists (Hofstede, 2005, p.26). The survey took place at the Salzburg Seminar in American studies in 1984.

> people in different jobs with different relationships to power, or people without paid jobs at all, like students and housewives.
> (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.25).

The assumption that the non-replication of all the dimensions is due to the inclusion of a wider range of people undermines the argument that the value dimensions are representative of national cultural norms. These findings also demonstrate the need for wider-ranging tests of the five dimensional model, and contradict arguments that any other national samples will confirm the existence of the dimensions.

The fourth standard criticism, recognised by Hofstede (2002), centers around the question of whether data obtained in the 1970s can be considered representative of cultural values three decades later. Hofstede's (2002) response to this criticism is based on his particular conceptualisation of culture, and again on the validating nature of replica studies. As demonstrated in the previous paragraph, recourse to replica studies as validations of the dimensions is questionable. The other defense of the durability of the dimensions is based Hofstede's (2005) conceptualisation of culture as a multi-layered onion. According to Hofstede's (2005) onion conceptualisation, only the outer layers of culture, cultural practices, are dynamic and changeable. The core of the onion consists of cultural values, which are described as durable constants (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Hofstede (2005) claims that the five dimensional model only measures these durable values and the dimensions are therefore as representative today as they were in the 1970s. Hofstede's (2005) conceptualisation of culture, as an onion, allows him to represent cultures as both static and dynamic. However, nations, the units within which the five dimensional model locates cultural values, are volatile political constructs. National boundaries have shifted considerably since the creation of the model in the 1970s. It would be possible to argue that newly formed nations, like Latvia or Slovakia, retain the core national values associated with the countries of which they were a part, even after the relocation of territorial boundaries. However, this would entail denying that the socio-political upheaval and the change associated with the breakup and reformation of nations could have an affect on national values. Often the breakup and reformation of nations entails revision of the very systems which Hofstede (2005) describes as forces for value integration, specifically political systems, ideologies and religious practices. The introduction of capitalism, adoption of democracy and resurgence of religions, within the former Soviet nations, has undoubtedly influenced the value systems of individuals within these nations. If the integrating forces within nations are changeable then surely the core values, towards which these forces integrate, must also be considered changeable.

Once again Hofstede's (2002) response seems to miss the point of the criticism, which is that the five dimensional model paints a distorting, static, a-historical picture of cultural values, which is open to misinterpretation by CCT trainees.

The fifth criticism and response appear to be aimed at Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997a) accusations of "reductionist, one-dimensional thinking" (p.58). Hofstede (1996) argues that only aspects of culture which are conceptually and statistically distinct from the five IBM dimensions should be added to the five dimensional model. Hofstede (1996) attributes the finding of extra dimensions, by Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner (1997), to a confusion of conceptual categories in the minds of the researchers. Hofstede (1996) argues that the seven dimensional model is distorted by the appropriation of survey data to American sociological and anthropological theory of the 1950s and 1960s. This supposed appropriation is said to result in an "evident lack of content validity" within the seven dimensional model (Hofstede, 1996, p.197). Content validity is described by Hofstede (1996) as, "the extent to which an instrument covers the universe of relevant aspects of the phenomenon studied, in our case national culture." (p.197). Hofstede (1996) does not explain how it is that his questionnaire manages to cover all relevant aspects of national culture, or how his preliminary studies at the companies IBM and IMD managed to uncover the entire universe of potential cultural values, whereas Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) questionnaires and preliminary research did not. As the criticisms above have demonstrated it is doubtful whether any survey could cover the entire range of cultural value possibilities.

The criticism, that the five dimensional model advocates cultural determinism, is addressed in Hofstede's (2002) reply to McSweeney (2002). McSweeney (2002) claims, that Hofstede (1980) attributes supreme value determining causality to national cultures and ignores the potential influences of sub-cultures and life experiences on values. Hofstede (2002) interprets this criticism as claiming that the five dimensional model advocates a "mono-causal link between national cultures and actions within nations" (p.4). This appears to be a misinterpretation of McSweeney's (2002) critique, which claims that the "mono-causal link" presented by the model is between national cultures and values, not national cultures and individual actions. Hofstede (2002) argues that he never claims that culture is the only factor that should be taken into account in explanations of actions, and that cultural explanations may often be redundant. However,

Hofstede (2002) also argues that in cases where economic, political or institutional explanations fail, one should resort to the explanatory construct of culture. The misinterpretation of the criticism means that Hofstede (2002) fails to address the question of whether the five dimensional model attributes supreme value determining causality to culture, at the expense of a recognition of other value influencing factors, such as sub-cultures and life experiences. Hofstede (2002) does however, simultaneously claim that “values (as we measured them) are hardly changeable” (p.6) and that the rigidity of the five dimensional model “is in the eye of the beholder” (p.4). These contradictory statements demonstrate how little is done to guard against the potential for ‘rigid’ deterministic interpretations of the five dimensional model, despite Hofstede’s (2002) acknowledgements that “some people have tried to imitate my approach….for commercial purposes [and] some carry the concepts further than I consider wise.” (p.2-3). Rather than discourage deterministic, reductive misinterpretations of culture the five dimensional model appears to enable such misinterpretations. The susceptibility of the model to misinterpretation diminishes its utility as tool for cross-cultural training.

The criticism of circularity is not satisfactorily addressed in any of Hofstede’s responses to his critics. In response to McSweeney’s (2002) criticisms of his uses of survey data Hofstede (2002) answers that “What we social scientists do is called statistical inference, but McSweeney is obviously unfamiliar with it.” (p.6). Hofstede implies that as an economics scholar, and not a social scientist, McSweeney is not in a position to make judgments about his research. However, it is not necessary to have a degree in social science in order to recognise implicit assumptions and circular reasoning. It is quite possible to argue that with any research one starts with a hypothesis which one then tests. However, the a priori classification of data according to the units whose existence one is attempting to prove will distort research findings.

Hofstede’s responses to his critics fail to address the force or points of their arguments. Hofstede (2002) attributes the extensive criticisms of his work to its revolutionary nature.
“I had made a paradigm shift in cross-cultural studies, and as Kuhn (1970) has shown, paradigm shifts in any science meet with strong initial resistance” (Hofstede, 2002, p.1). This statement appears to dismiss criticisms of the model as mere resistance to change. This dismissive attitude prevents Hofstede from recognising faults within his model and results in a condescending attitude towards his critics. McSweeney (2002) is accused of not having read the material and

being unable to understand the model because he is not a social scientist (Hofstede, 2002). While Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner are accused, in the title of Hofstede's (1996) paper, of "riding the waves of commerce", tailoring their model to that which they believe the customer wants to hear (Hofstede, 1996). In fact, both Hofstede and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner have vested financial interests in the continued success of their respective models. Since the cross-cultural paradigm shift, initiated by Hall in response to the reactions of FSI participants, all CCT models of culture have been tailored to the desires of cross-cultural trainees. Rather than creating a paradigm shift, Hofstede's model simply expanded the FSI paradigm to include the dimensional quantification of national cultures. Many of the criticisms of the five dimensional model remain unaddressed and carry with them implications for the utility of this model as a tool for cross-cultural training. However, the seven dimensional model does not perform much better.

The seven dimensional model is open to many of the same criticisms as the five dimensional model. It also relies on the questionable assignment of cultures to nations, appears to result in a form of cultural determinism and is limited by ethnocentric survey methods. By conceptualising value orientations as varying in response to circumstance the seven dimensional model is less rigid than the five dimensional model. However, the ethnocentric nature of some of the 'dilemmas' used to calculate the dimensions brings their validity, as objective cultural measures, into question. In addition to these conceptual problems, a dimensional approach to cross-cultural training, whether based on the five or the seven dimensional model, carries with it a number of implications for training objectives and foci. These implications are explored in the following section.

The implications of a dimensional approach to cross-cultural training

Cross-cultural training is based on three key concepts, 'cultural misunderstandings' 'cultural sensitivity' and 'intercultural competence'. The adoption of a dimensional approach to training affects how these key concepts are defined and therefore the objectives and foci of training. CCT aims at helping trainees develop 'intercultural competence', or expertise in intercultural communication. Intercultural competence is gained through the development of 'cultural sensitivity' or 'cultural awareness'. Cultural sensitivity/awareness can be broadly defined as the ability to communicate and behave appropriately during intercultural interactions. The development of intercultural competence, through the acquisition of cultural sensitivity, enables

trainees to avoid ‘cultural misunderstandings’, which are thought to be detrimental to successful intercultural interactions. These processes beg the questions: when is a misunderstanding a cultural misunderstanding and why do cultural misunderstandings occur? The following section demonstrates the implicit answers to these questions apparent in the focus and rhetoric of the dimensional models. The definitions of cultural misunderstandings implicit within the rhetoric and theory of the dimensional models influences interpretations of the other key concepts and the objectives of dimensionally based training programs. The final section of this chapter presents some alternative definitions of ‘cultural misunderstandings’ and demonstrates the influences of these alternate definitions training objectives.

The CCT models of culture outlined in the previous chapter all focus on the explication of cultural differences. Hall’s (1959; 1969; 1977) models explains cultural differences in orientations towards time, space, and communicative contexts. The five and seven dimensional models focus on cultural differences in value orientations. By focusing on dimensions of difference all of these models are implicitly identifying cultural differences themselves as the primary causes of cultural misunderstandings and conceptualising diversity as a barrier to successful intercultural communication. Such a conceptualisation results in CCT that attempts to negate this barrier by training participants in how to recognise, understand and imitate the communicative behaviours of ‘other’ cultures.

The conceptualisation of culture as a communicative barrier is apparent in the rhetoric of the dimensional models and the conceptions of culture advocated by their authors. A frequently cited quote from Hall (1990) states that “Despite popular beliefs to the contrary the single greatest barrier to business success is the one erected by culture.” (Hall & Hall, 1990, cited in Training Booklet 4, 2009). This quotation is used by CCT companies to justify the need for their products. The quote clearly states that cultural differences themselves are barriers to successful intercultural communication. The result of such a conceptualisation is a belief in the possibility of creating formulaic guides for intercultural interaction that will help people overcome the culture barrier.

> Sometime in the future ... when culture is more completely explored, there will be the equivalent of musical scores that can be learned, for each type of man or woman in different types of jobs and relationships, for time, space, work and play.
> (Hall 1959, p.214)

The seven and five dimensional models are exactly the kind of formulaic guides to culture that Hall (1959) is talking about. The rhetoric of training products based on the dimensional models reflects the idea that cultural difference is a barrier to effective communication. Hofstede is quoted by a CCT company based on his work as stating that “Culture is more often a source of conflict than of synergy. Cultural differences are a nuisance at best and often a disaster.” (Hofstede, 2007, cited in Training Website 1). A guide to intercultural communication produced by Hofstede, Hofstede and Pederson (2002), offers a definition of cultural misunderstandings that identifies the locus of the problem of intercultural communication as lying in the existence of cultural differences; “If two people from different cultures meet and a misunderstanding arises, we call it a cultural misunderstanding” (Hofstede, Hofstede & Pedersen, 2002, p.20). This definition appears to imply that any misunderstanding that occurs between people from different cultures is to be classified as a cultural misunderstanding. This definition also implies that understanding specific cultural behaviors is the key to avoiding cultural misunderstandings.

The seven dimensional model also views the existence of cultural diversity as the cause of cultural misunderstandings. The seven dimensional model talks of reconciling “cultural dilemmas …through a case study which elicits the various problems that occur when professional people from different cultures meet.” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997, p.11). Once more the existence of cultural diversity is conceptualised as the primary cause of cultural misunderstandings. In their reply to Hofstede (1996), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997a) suggest that “…moves to integrate and reconcile values lead to superior performance.” (p.156). Here, diverse cultural values are conceptualised as detrimental to business success. The answer, to the problem of diversity, is described as lying in the appropriation of ‘other’ cultural behaviors. These models tend to identify diversity itself as the primary problematic within intercultural interactions. However, identifying diversity as the primary cause of cultural misunderstandings is not the only option available for CCT training programs, as the consideration of alternative, developmental, approaches to CCT demonstrates.

The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity, or DMIS, is an assessment framework for the analysis of people’s orientations towards cultural diversity (Bennett, 1986). The DMIS and its accompanying psychometric measure, the intercultural development inventory (IDI), present an alternative approach to cross-cultural training; one which focuses on the trainees orientations

towards diversity as the primary problematic of intercultural communication. The DMIS presents a six stage cognitive framework for understanding people's orientations towards diversity (Bennett, 1986; 1993). These six stages were outlined in the introductory chapter. The IDI is a pen and paper questionnaire used to measure people's orientations towards diversity, in accordance with the stages of the DMIS (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). Like the seven and five dimensional models, the DMIS and IDI are the basis for a multinational CCT company run by the creators of the model and its measure. The DMIS stages are indicative of particular 'worldview structures', in addition to the attitudes and behaviors typically associated with them (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003).

The underlying assumption of the DMIS is that as one's experiences of cultural diversity become more complex; one's orientations towards cultural differences tend to become more ethno-relative (Hammer & Bennett, 1998). Ethno-relative orientations towards diversity result in increased intercultural competence, therefore greater success during intercultural encounters (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). Within this model 'cultural misunderstandings' are conceptualised as resulting from ethnocentric orientations towards diversity. The primary problematic of intercultural communication is interpreted as lying in people's attitudes towards diversity, rather than in the existence of cultural differences. The result is that CCT based on the DMIS model focuses on the development of ethno-relative attitudes and adaptive behaviors in trainees rather than simply the appropriation of 'other' cultural values, or practices.

The primary focus of DMIS based training is the orientations of the trainees themselves. Such an ego-orientated focus, as opposed to the 'other' orientated foci of the dimensional models, places greater emphasis on self-awareness during intercultural interactions. The seven and five dimensional models do not ignore the necessity of self-awareness during intercultural communication; however, their primary focus is the promotion of understandings of 'other' cultures, not one's own attitudes towards diversity. In contrast, the primary focus of the DMIS is understanding oneself. The problematic of intercultural communication is understood as emanating from the trainee and their attitudes towards cultural diversity, rather than from the existence of cultural differences. Locating the 'barrier' to intercultural communication within the trainee empowers the individual to a position where the success of intercultural interactions is based on internal factors, such as personal attitudes, and therefore within individual control.

Conversely, the conceptualisation of culture as a barrier results in an orientation towards difference which construes intercultural communicative problems as the result of a detrimental external hurdle that has to be managed. The DMIS's location of the 'barrier' within the trainee, therefore, avoids negative conceptualisations of diversity as a "nuisance" or a "disaster'.

The manner in which a CCT model conceptualises the problematic of intercultural interaction affects training definitions of key CCT concepts, such as cultural misunderstandings and cultural sensitivity. Definitions of these key concepts, in turn, affect the objectives of training programs. The dimensional models of Hall, Hofstede, and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner define culture as a barrier to successful intercultural interactions. Cultural misunderstandings are therefore defined by as miscommunications that occur because of the existence of cultural differences. The dimensional models' definition of cultural misunderstandings results in a conception of cultural sensitivity as an awareness of other cultural practices, and a definition of intercultural competence as the appropriation of 'other' cultural behaviors. Dimensional approaches to training, therefore, tend to focus on formulaic teaching of 'other' values, and behaviors. Developmental models for CCT, such as the DMIS, conceptualise problems in intercultural interactions as resulting from ethnocentric attitudes and define cultural misunderstandings as miscommunications resulting from ethnocentrism. Cultural sensitivity and intercultural competence are therefore defined as the development and practicing of cultural relativism. Training based on developmental approaches therefore tends to focus on the development of self awareness, in addition to the development of adaptive behaviors.

The integration of both dimensional and developmental models into training may help provide a more balanced form of training which incorporates both 'self' based and 'other' based awareness. Singularly both models have their advantages and disadvantages. Dimensional models cater well to the desire of trainees for concrete information. However, they run the risk of encouraging reductive, deterministic or over simplified understandings of culture and encouraging negative attitudes towards diversity. Developmental approaches to training avoid the problems of disempowerment and negativity by placing the locus of the problem, and the ability for control, with reach of the individual. However, developmental approaches alone do little to impart trainees with an understanding of the concept of culture and do not provide information about specific cultural practices. Developmental models are also based on the assumption that cultural

relativism necessarily entails cultural sensitivity and intercultural competence; however, without specific cultural knowledge this may not be the case.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined some of the controversies surrounding the quantitative dimensional models of culture used in cross-cultural training, in particular Hofstede's five dimensional model. Dimensional models of culture, such as Hofstede's, are open to criticisms of reductiveness, cultural determinism and misrepresentation. The attachment of cultures to nations can paint a false picture of national homogeneity, ignoring the volatility of nations and dynamic nature of culture. Dimensional approaches to CCT often appear to attribute supreme value determining causality to the construct of national culture, at the expense of recognising other influential factors, such as sub-cultures and personal experiences. The classification of aspects of cultures into either/or categories distorts the sometimes contradictory nature of cultural values and practices, and the empirical basis of the dimensional models are at times questionable.

The nature of the models used in CCT influences the objectives of training. Dimensional models conceptualise the problematic of intercultural communication as resulting from the existence of differences. This conception results in training that focuses on formulaic descriptions of the 'other' and can lead to negative interpretations of diversity. Developmental models offer an alternative approach to training, in which the locus of the intercultural problem is perceived to lie with the individual. Such developmentally based training can be empowering for trainees, but may be lacking in specific information. A combination of approaches could enable trainers to avoid some of the problems of singular approaches. However, even a combination of dimensional and developmental models does not negate the problem that is the ethereal and contested nature of the concept of 'culture' itself. The problem of defining and understanding culture is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Anthropological Culture Theory

Introduction

'Culture' is a theoretical construct used to depict the various, collective thought patterns, values and practices of groups of people. The concept of 'culture' is central to the project of cross-cultural communication training. However, the nature, contents, limitations and descriptive force of the concept of 'culture' are contested. In 1963, the anthropologists Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn published a review of the concept, containing over 164 definitions of culture (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). Since the publication of this review, subsequent studies have produced countless additional definitions, redefining the nature, workings and boundaries of 'culture'. In recent years some scholars have begun to question the utility and descriptive force of 'culture', even calling for an abandonment of the concept altogether (Abu- Lughod, 1991; Wikan, 1999). The disputed nature of the concept of culture poses a problem for the project of cross-cultural training. If it is unclear how 'culture' is to be understood, training about the supposed nature and influences of culture will always be subject to contestation. The following chapter documents the emergence and development of the concept of culture, from its origins in the German language and enlightenment philosophy, over the development of culture theories, such as social evolutionism, functionalism, cultural relativism, structuralism and interpretivism, to its current manifestations in cognitive and post-modernist anthropology.

The origins of 'culture'

The English term 'culture' is said to originate from the German '*Kultur*' (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). '*Kultur*' first appeared in German dictionaries in 1793, despite being widely used by German philosophers, such as Immanuel Kant, prior to the emergence of this dictionary definition (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). In its original meaning '*Kultur*' referred to processes of cultivation, "becoming cultured" (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). This original meaning is reflected in modern labels for processes of cultivation, such as 'agriculture' or 'aquaculture'. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries German scholars first equated '*Kultur*' with '*Zivilisation*' (civilisation), later scholars began to distinguish between the meanings of the two terms. '*Kultur*' came to refer to the societal practices of art, religion, and custom; '*Zivilisation*' referred to the technological and political developments of societies (Kroeber & Kluckhohn 1963, p.27). '*Kultur*' referred to an organic occurrence, whilst '*Zivilisation*' carried connotations of political and state organisation. It is from this later definition of '*Kultur*', as distinct from '*Zivilisation*',

that the term ‘culture’ in its modern anthropological sense was introduced into the English language.

The origins of the modern English term ‘culture’ are often traced to the work of the nineteenth century British anthropologist, Sir Edward Tylor (1958, orig. 1871). Tylor (1958) borrowed from the German terminology and established an English definition of culture. In one of the most frequently cited definitions produced in last 130 years Tylor (1958) describes culture as “That complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (p.1). Tylor’s (1958) definition not only introduced the term culture into the English vocabulary, it also delineated anthropological enquiry into the concept of culture for decades to come. However, the origins of the concept of culture are not as clear cut as the origins of the term.

The origins of the concept of culture have been traced to the emergence of the term ‘*Kultur*’ in the work of 19th century German scholars, such as Klemm (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). However, the foundations of the anthropological concept of culture may be much older than explicit definitions of the term. Marvin Harris (1968) traces the origins of the concept of ‘culture’ to the work of enlightenment thinkers, such as John Locke and Jacques Turgot. Harris (1968) argues that the metaphysical foundations for modern definitions of culture and understandings of enculturation can be traced to Locke’s attempts to demonstrate that morality, knowledge and understandings of the world are learned and the products of experience, rather than expressions of innate truths (Locke, 1690 cited in Harris, 1968). The idea that our values and perceptions of the world are acquired, rather than innate, is one of the cornerstones of modern anthropological conceptions of culture; as are ideas of symbolism and social heritage such as those expressed in the work of Jacques Turgot.

> Possessor of a treasure of signs which he has the faculty of multiplying to infinity, he [man] is able to assure the retention of his acquired ideas, to communicate them to other men, and to transmit them to his successors as a constantly expanding heritage.
> (Turgot 1844, p.627, original 1750, cited in Harris, 1968, p.14)

The processes of enculturation and the transmission of cultural heritages, explained by Locke and Turgot, were not described using the term ‘culture’ as the word did not exist in either the English or the French vocabularies of their times. However, the fundamentals of an anthropological understanding of culture are apparent in both of their works. In contrast, Kroeber and Kluckhohn

(1963), trace the origins of the concept of culture to the attempts of eighteenth century scholars, such as Herder, to construct histories of mankind; records of diverse cultural practices and their respective histories. A complete exploration of the origins of the concept of culture is beyond the scope of this thesis. Yet, the alternative stand-points presented here are enough to demonstrate some of the contested positions surrounding the origins of 'culture'. The remainder of this chapter shows that, not only are the origins of the concept of culture contested, the concept itself is also subject to contestation.

Social Evolutionism

Sir Edward Tylor, introduced the term 'culture' to the English language, he also adhered to the anthropological school of thought later labelled social evolutionism. Social evolutionism draws on enlightenment ideas of the progression of mankind from a 'state of nature' to civil society, in conjunction with aspects of Darwinian evolutionary theory. The resulting hypothesis argues that human society is the product of an evolutionary progression through the stages of 'savagery' to 'barbarism' and finally 'civilisation' (Tylor, 1958). According to the social evolutionist doctrine, human history is characterised by progress. Societies can be assigned an evolutionary rank on the basis of their mastery of material and intellectual culture (Tylor, 1958). Tylor's (1958) work "Primitive Culture" attempts to reconstruct the history of human culture in a project similar to Herder's history of mankind. The writers of such histories are necessarily faced with the problem of how to comprehend unwritten prehistory. Tylor (1958) solved this problem, on the basis of two principles, uniformitarianism and the concept of survivals (Moore, 2004). In conjunction, these two principles form the theoretical basis of Tylor's (1958) theory of social evolution.

The principle of uniformitarianism states that human minds are universally governed by the same laws of cognition and human existence is characterised by attempts to solve similar life problems (Moore, 2004). Cultures develop within uniform human cognitive structures, in response to similar problems, and are therefore characterised by similarities in their paths of progression. These similarities are, in turn, characterised by the progression of cultures through the stages of social evolution mentioned above. Analogous cultural traits are said to develop either because a trait has diffused, in response to intercultural contact, or as a result of parallel innovation caused by cognitive uniformity (Tylor, 1958).

The concept of survivals justified the classification of some cultures as vestiges of prehistory. Survivals are remnant traits of past cultural practices which have been maintained despite, on occasion, the loss of their original meanings or contexts (Tylor, 1958). Tylor (1958) describes 'survivals' as offering "proofs and examples of an older condition of culture out of which a newer has evolved" (p.16). The doctrine of social evolutionism states that, just as 'survivals' are reflections of prior stages of cultures, entire 'primitive' cultures reflect prior stages of human social evolution (Moore, 2004). Therefore, solving the problem of how prehistory can be known. In conjunction with Tylor's (1958) definition of culture, the principles of uniformitarianism, the concept of survivals and the resulting doctrine of social evolutionism, formed a preliminary basis for an anthropological concept of 'culture' which grew and diverged throughout the following century. Contestation of social evolutionist theory resulted in the redefinition of the culture concept. This redefinition came to be characterised by theoretical divergences in American and European approaches to culture studies.

European social anthropology

Early 20th century European social anthropology was characterised by a movement away from ideational conceptualisations of culture and a tendency towards empirical investigations of the observable systematics of social organisation. Tylor's (1958) definition emphasised ideational and intellectual aspects of culture, such as 'knowledge' and 'beliefs' (Moore, 2004). During the early 20th century, such ideational notions of 'culture' and their accompanying theoretical constructs began to lose popularity among European anthropologists. Ideational theories were dismissed as hypothetical ponderings, inferior in their explanatory force to universal laws elucidated on the basis of empirical observations of social realities. Anthropologists such as Emile Durkheim and Bronislaw Malinowski began to move away from ideational conceptualisations of culture in pursuit of theories of society which could produce general, universal, laws explaining the regularities and purposes of human social organisation.

The French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) was one of the first theorists to distinguish between ethereal, ideational, notions of 'culture' and the empirically observable realities of 'society' (Moore, 2004). Durkheim focused on analysing the differing structures, arrangements, articulations, and integrations of "basic social segments," such as kinship systems and political

institutions (Moore, 2004). Durkheim (1964, orig.1893) hypothesized that social organisation was rooted in two distinct types of social solidarity, mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. Mechanical solidarity arises from collective social experiences, which are shared by members of a society despite those members not necessarily depending on each other for survival (Durkheim, 1964). Members of such a society are united in a manner analogous to “the cohesion which unites the elements of an inanimate body” (Durkheim, 1964, p.130). Individuals are equally attached to society through the subjugation of individual values to shared normative values and the absence, or weakness of, specialised sub-divisions of labour (Moore, 2004). Conversely, societies characterised by organic solidarity are analogous to biological systems, in which the specialised physiology of each of the parts is as distinct as the unity of the organism (Durkheim, 1964). Formal institutions are used to link diverse individuals with specialised roles, into a single society and there is a greater and unequal division of labour (Moore, 2004). Durkheim’s (1964) theory of social solidarity is based on the concept of the ‘conscience collective’. The mechanisms of mechanical and organic solidarity are the social dimensions that enable an understanding of the different currents of human social existence characterised in the ‘conscience collective’.

The ‘conscience collective’ refers to both the common consciousness and the collective regulatory conscience of a society (Moore, 2004). The conscience collective is that which gives a society its common identity; it is a society’s way of knowing and also the things it knows (Moore, 2004). A society’s conscience collective is made up of common awareness, shared perceptions and shared internalised sanctions, which connect patterns of social solidarity and processes of enculturation, (Moore, 2004). The conscience collective varies between societies characterised by mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. Within societies exhibiting mechanical solidarity the individual conscience is a microcosm of the conscience collective and the conscience collective is rigid in its prescriptions for, and requirements of, the individual (Moore, 2004). Within societies characterised by organic solidarity the conscience collective is less rigid, individual conscience has greater scope for self reflection and self-determination (Moore, 2004). In contrast to the works of Tylor (1958) and Herder, Durkheim (1964) was not attempting to construct a history of culture; rather he was seeking to create an explanatory theory of the workings of social organisation. However, whilst in some senses Durkheim’s (1964) work represented a break from the past, he was still bound by the meta-narrative of racial and cultural superiority characteristic of his time.

Durkheim's (1964) theory of social solidarity exhibits the same tendency as Tylor's (1958) theory of social evolution, to rank societies as either 'primitive' or 'advanced'. Mechanical solidarity is said to be characteristic of lower, or primitive, societies and the shift from mechanical to organic solidarity is said to occur with the advancement of societies. This advancement of societies is assumed to bring with it greater concentrations of populations, in smaller areas, and therefore greater divisions of labour resulting in an increased need for integrating, regulatory structures (Moore, 2004). These assumptions demonstrate the slim empirical basis of Durkheim's theories. Yet, despite their short comings Durkheim's (1964/1893) theories of social solidarity and the 'conscience collective' were some of the first sociological theories attempting to explain the mechanics of social organisation. Durkheim's focus on the workings of 'society', as opposed to the nature of 'culture', set a trend that was to influence theory, within European anthropology, well into the middle of the twentieth century.

Malinowski's (1944) 'theory of needs' is a further example of the attempts of early 20th century European anthropologists to elucidate the general scientific laws governing human social organisation. The 'theory of needs' provides a functionalist explanation of the purposes and workings of culture. Functionalist theories attempt to explain the nature, workings, and existence of culture in terms of the functions it performs. Malinowski (1944) was concerned with how cultures function to meet the needs of the individual. Malinowski (1944) posited seven basic needs, as the default consequences of human existence. Cultural institutions are defined, by Malinowski (1944), as integrated responses to combinations of these needs (Moore, 2004). Moore (2004), in his discussion of Malinowski's work describes the seven basic needs as:

1. Metabolism
2. Reproduction
3. Bodily comforts
4. Safety or the prevention of bodily harm
5. Movement
6. Growth
7. Health

(Moore, 2004, p.140)

Social institutions and cultural forms are seen as functionally related to these needs (Malinowski, 1944). However, it is not simply a case of a particular need corresponding to a particular cultural form. Rather, that cultures and multiple cultural institutions function as integrated responses to combinations of these needs and in doing so simultaneously create new, or derived, needs

(Malinowski, 1944). These derived needs, in turn, come to be perceived as fundamental and prompt the development of new cultural responses. Malinowski (1944) perceived cultures to be utilitarian, adaptive, functionally integrated, responses to basic and derived needs. In order to understand and explain cultures it therefore becomes necessary to delineate the functions that cultural practices and institutions perform.

Malinowski's (1944) functionalism has been greatly criticised in the years since its formulation. Firstly, the functionalist conceptualisation of culture has been criticised for reducing complex cultural systems to "simplistic notions of utility" (Kuper, 1996, p.31). Secondly, as his theory is derived from his fieldwork among the Trobriand Islanders, Malinowksi can be criticised for generalising too much from the particular Trobriand case, in order to formulate a theory of human society in general. Thirdly, functionalism can be criticised for ignoring cultural disjuncture and anomalies, and over emphasising the coherent and integrated aspects of cultures (Moore, 2004). However, despite the criticisms that can be brought against Malinowski's functionalism, the theory does provide a way in which to understand the concept of culture. In addition to his functionalist explanation of culture, Malinowski formulated definitions of culture, two of which are considered below.

Two of Malinowski's definitions of culture are cited in Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1963) collection. The first definition falls under the grouping 'descriptive' (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). Descriptive definitions of culture are "broad definitions with emphasis on enumeration of content: usually influenced by Tylor." (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963, p.81). In his descriptive classification Malinowski defines culture as follows: "It [culture] obviously is the integral whole consisting of implements and consumers' goods, of constitutional character for the various social groupings, of human ideas and crafts, beliefs and customs."(Malinowski, 1944, p.36, cited in Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963, p. 83). Malinowski's (1944) descriptive definition follows Tylor's (1958) definition in its enumeration of the various aspects of social life which constitute culture. Malinowski's (1944) definition also emphasises a cumulative, or super-organic, notion of culture as "the integral whole" consisting of various interrelated practices, which together create something which is greater than the sum of its parts. The second of Malinowski's definitions, cited in Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1963) collection, falls under the grouping 'historical'; definitions which emphasise tradition or social heritage (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963, p. 89).

“This social heritage is the key concept of cultural anthropology. It is usually called culture….Culture comprises inherited artefacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, habits and values” (Malinowski, 1931, p. 621, cited in Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963, p.90). This second definition elevates a particular aspect of culture, its generational transmission or manifestation as a social heritage. The problem with over emphasising social heritage, when defining culture, is the resulting implication of constancy which reduces people to passive transmitters, rather than the creators and manipulators of dynamic and variable cultures (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). However, such historical definitions are useful in helping people to recognise a social inheritance, which exists in addition to our biological inheritance. Like the first of Malinowksi’s definitions, this second definition also enumerates aspects of culture, such as artefacts, goods, and values. The problem with such enumeration is that enumerative definitions of culture can never be exhaustive. Culture is an abstract construct and the enumeration of concrete parts confuses the concept and leaves much of that which constitutes culture out of consideration (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963).

The enumeration of concrete cultural phenomena, in both of Malinowski’s definitions, is evidence of the empirical basis for culture theory so greatly emphasised by early 20th century European anthropologists. The recognition of ideational features of culture, such as ideas and values, in both of these definitions, demonstrates that these aspects of culture were not unrecognised. However, the emphasis on the empirical functions of culture in Malinowski’s (1944) theory of the concept, demonstrates a reductionist approach to ideational aspects of culture. Functionalist theories of culture based on the concept of basic needs, such as Malinowski’s, tended to reduce the ideational facets of culture to their empirical functions. This reductionist approach was driven by the emphasis on studying the observable facts of society, characteristic of early 20th century social anthropology.

A. R Radcliffe-Brown was a contemporary of Malinowski and he also drew a strict distinction between the abstract notion of culture and the observable realities of society.

> We do not observe a ‘culture’ since that word denotes not any concrete reality but an abstraction, and as it is commonly used a vague abstraction. But direct observation does reveal to us that … human beings are connected by a complex network of social relations. I use the term ‘social structure’ to denote this network of actually existing relations. (Radcliffe-Brown, 1952, p.190)

Radcliffe-Brown used the term 'social structure' to refer to the relations of association that exist between individuals and relations between groups and larger social networks (Moore, 2004). Groups and individuals, within society, are differentiated according to their social roles. The analysis of social structure consists of the analysis of relational norms abstracted from, but taking into account, particular variations (Moore, 2004). From the analysis of social structure Radcliffe-Brown (1952) infers law-like tendencies governing human social organisation. These laws of social organisation exhibit cross-cultural regularities in their structures and functions (Radcliffe-Brown, 1952). Despite referring to himself as 'anti-functionalist' Radcliffe-Brown's (1952) theory of social structure was a functionalist theory, it attempted to explained a phenomenon, in this case social structure, by reference to the functions it performed. However, unlike Malinowski (1944), Radcliffe-Brown (1952) did not see culture as functioning to meet the needs of the individual. Rather, he argued that the function of cultural institutions was the maintenance of society and social structures (Moore, 2004). "The function of a crime, or a funeral ceremony, is the part it plays in the social life as a whole and therefore the contribution it makes to the maintenance of structural continuity" (Radcliffe-Brown 1952, p.180). Radcliffe-Brown (1952) saw cultural institutions as functioning to meet the needs of society and social unity as consisting of the functional unity of social structures. Like Malinowski's (1944) functionalism, Radcliffe-Brown's (1952) culture theory can be criticised for creating an overly static, a-historical conceptualisation of culture, which does not sufficiently acknowledge the existence of social conflict.

E. E. Evans-Pritchard (1902-1973) continued and expanded the societal functionalist vein of inquiry established by Malinowksi (1944) and Radcliffe-Brown (1952). Evans-Pritchard's early fieldwork in Africa during the 1920s and 1930s was funded by the colonial powers of the British Empire. In the interest of the facilitation of imperial control in Africa, the British Empire provided funds for Evans-Pritchard to conduct ethnographic studies among the indigenous peoples of the African colonies; firstly among the Azande of the upper Nile region and later among the Nuer of southern Sudan. Evans-Pritchard's (1976, orig. 1937) ethnography "Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande" follows clearly in the functionalist tradition. The logic of Azande witchcraft is explained, by Evans-Pritchard (1976), in terms of the social functions that witchcraft beliefs, and their ensuing practices, perform.

> Among the causes of death witchcraft is the only one that has any significance for social behaviour. The attribution of misfortune to witchcraft does not exclude what we call its real causes but is superimposed on them and gives to social events their moral value.

(Evans-Pritchard, 1976, p.25 orig. 1937)

Evans-Pritchard's (1940) ethnographic examination of political systems among the Nuer exhibits a similar tendency towards functionalist analysis. Nuer kinship systems and cultural institutions, such as the feud, are described in terms of the societal functions which they perform, functions such as the establishment and maintenance of social order (Evans-Pritchard, 1940). Evans-Pritchard's (1976; 1940) analyses of Azande and Nuer societies are open to many of the same criticisms as the functionalist analyses that came before them. Like Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, Evans-Pritchard's (1976;1940) early work can be criticised for presenting a-historical pictures of societies, in which culture is reified and the social role of the individual is diminished (Harris, 1968; Moore, 2004). However, despite the criticisms which can be raised against his functionalist approach Evans-Pritchard's early ethnographies did in some sense represent an important break with past theories.

Evans-Pritchard's (1976; 1940) early ethnographies represent one of the first tentative breaks with the meta-narrative of cultural superiority that had characterised European social anthropology throughout the C19th and early C20th centuries. Evans-Pritchard was one of the first European anthropologists to advocate the study of cultures 'in context'. Rather than dismiss Azande witchcraft beliefs and Nuer social organisation as examples of 'primitive' lifestyles or evolutionary throwbacks, Evans-Pritchard (1976) attempted to uncover the logic behind these cultural practices. This logic was a cultural logic, one that could only be understood within the specific cultural context in which it existed. Evans-Pritchard's functionalism did not consist of the explication of universal functional laws governing the relations of human society; rather, he provided an explanation of the particular functions that particular cultural beliefs and practices serve, within specific cultural contexts. As such, Evans-Pritchard's social anthropology represents one of the first tentative European recognitions of cultural-relativism. In the United States, cultural-relativism had already been established as one of the defining characteristics of American cultural anthropology.

American cultural anthropology

American cultural anthropology and the theory of cultural-relativism originated from the work of the German-American physicist, geographer, and anthropologist Franz Boas (1858-1942). Boas immigrated to America in 1887, bringing with him a strong opposition to social evolutionism, in

addition to a historical, geographical, approach to ethnology and the concept of '*Kultur*' (Kuper, 1996, p.184). Early European social anthropology, particularly the British school, had been characterised by its focus on the observable realities of 'society' and the search for law-like theories explaining social organisation. In contrast, the central tenets of American anthropology were an ideational, abstract, notion of 'culture' and a theoretical focus on the relationships between cultures, values and individuals. In a rejection of the evolutionary explanations of Tylor (1924/1871) and Durkheim (1964), Boas (1932) argued that the concept of 'culture' only becomes comprehensible through the study of specific cultures, in context. In a distinct break from the theory of European social anthropologists of the time, Boas argued that culture should be understood as a dynamic force of historical agency, rather than just a cumulative product (Kuper, 1996). Boas (1932) also argued that cultures should be understood as wholes, rather than collections of analytical parts and that the search for universal explanatory laws of culture, based on theoretical ponderings, was futile.

> Cultural phenomena are of such complexity that it seems to me doubtful whether valid cultural laws can be found. The causal conditions of cultural happenings lie always in the interaction between individual and society, and no classificatory study of societies will solve this problem.
> (Boas, 1932, p.612)

Boas (1931) was also one of the first anthropologists to openly attack, and attempt to empirically refute, the pseudo-scientific doctrine of racial determinism that had characterised 19th and early 20th century thought. As a result of his study on the cranial forms of immigrants in America, Boas concluded that "biological differences between races are small; there is no reason to believe that one race is by nature so much more intelligent, endowed with great will power, or emotionally more stable than another." (Boas, 1931, p.6). In conjunction with his arguments for understanding cultures in context, Boas (1931) anti-racialist arguments signified the beginnings of a theory of cultural relativism. Boas posited an ideational, holistic, relativist, historically dynamic conceptualisation of culture that came to shape American cultural anthropology for much of the 20th century and nowhere is the influence of Franz Boas' culture theory more apparent than in the work of some of his most well known students.

Boas' students, most notably, Ruth Benedict, Alfred Kroeber, and Edward Sapir, continued the relativist investigation into the relationship between culture and the individual initiated by their mentor. Joel Kahn (1995) refers to Boas and his students as contributing "a new language of the relativity of culture and the world as a mosaic of cultures irreducible one to another in a

civilisational or racial meta-narrative." (p. 81). This new language, of cultural relativity, came to replace the meta-narrative of cultural and racial superiority which had characterised early anthropological thought. Boas' holistic approach to culture studies and his insistence that the key to understanding cultures lies in the explication of the relations between cultures and individuals, prompted his students' investigations into the relationships between culture and personality, culture and the individual, and culture and language.

Ruth Benedict (1887-1948), a student and eventually colleague of Franz Boas, was one of founders of the American anthropological school of thought labelled 'culture and personality'. Benedict (1955, orig.1934) drew on Freudian psychoanalytic theory and Gestalt psychology in her formulation of a theory that attempted to explain the relationship between the individual and society. Benedict (1955) performed a psychoanalytic analysis of cultures; she attempted to uncover the underlying patterns of values, ideas, and mores that characterised the cultures of the Zuni, Dobu, and Kwakiutl peoples. From these patterns, Benedict (1955) formulated a general theory about the nature of culture and the relationship between cultures and personalities. Benedict's (1955) theory and analysis were based on the ideas of Gestalt psychology. The doctrine of Gestalt psychology states that human learning occurs in response to underlying patterns, as opposed to simple stimulus-response reactions (Moore, 2004). When faced with a new situation, previously learned basic patterns of thought and behaviour are called forth and appropriated to the new situation. These basic patterns of thought and behaviour act as guidelines for perceptions of, and reactions towards, new situations. Benedict (1955) applied the ideas of Gestalt psychology to the analysis of entire cultures.

Benedict (1955) posited the idea that cultures, like individuals, develop characteristic patterns and configurations of values. These value configurations represent a set of core cultural value possibilities. These configurations of core cultural values present the individual member of a culture with an "arc of possibilities" from which perceptions, reactions and personality traits are appropriated (Benedict, 1955). The patterns of values which constitute these characteristic value configurations are the defining features of a culture and thus, that which the anthropologist should seek to understand. The conclusion of Benedict's (1955) theory is that particular cultures tend to foster particular personality types. Benedict's (1955) research into Zuni, Dobu, and Kwakiutl culture prompted her to posit two psychological archetypes, Apollonian and Dionysian, as a basis

for understanding the particular cultural value configurations of these cultures. However, Benedict (1955) was not attempting to create a system for the classification of cultures. “Categories become a liability, when they are taken as inevitable and applicable alike to all civilizations and events.” (Benedict, 1955, p. 238, orig. 1934). Benedict (1955) clearly recognised that whilst most members of a culture will internalise and reflect the value configurations presented in their particular culture’s “arc of possibilities”, some individuals will not. These individuals may exhibit personality traits that lie outside their particular culture’s range of potential value configurations and such individuals are culturally defined as ‘deviants’ (Benedict, 1955). By demonstrating the variability of cultural values, Benedict (1955) showed that definitions of deviancy are culturally determined and relative. In addition, Benedict’s (1955) analysis of the strikingly different cultural value systems, and personality types, fostered by two racially synonymous groups, the Zuni and Kwakiutl, demonstrated that culture, not race, was the primary factor in determining the characteristics of a society.

In her later work, Benedict (1975, orig.1946) continued to investigation the patterns and influences of particular cultural value configurations; she was however, heavily influenced by her recruitment as a consultant during World War II. Benedict was recruited to the American office of war information, in order to research Japanese national culture. Her resulting work “The Chrysanthemum and The Sword” is an examination of the core values of Japanese society. Unable to conduct fieldwork in Japan, due to the war, Benedict had to rely on library research, the study of Japanese literature and film, interviews with Japanese people in America and an analysis of Japanese war conduct (Benedict, 1975). “The Chrysanthemum and The Sword”, not only demonstrated the possibility of studying cultures at a distance, it also epitomised notions of ‘national’ culture and ‘national’ character. However, Benedict (1955) did not claim that cultures, national or otherwise, must necessarily represent coherent, integrated systems of values. She clearly acknowledges the incoherence and internal contradictions that cultures can exhibit, stating that “lack of integration is as characteristic of some cultures as extreme integration is of others” (Benedict, 1955, p.238).

Ruth Benedict advocated the study of cultures as wholes which are more than simply the sum of their parts (Moore, 2004). Benedict (1955; 1975) posited the idea that in order to understand a culture one has to understand its particular value configurations, as it is these value configurations

that give rise to the particular ‘Gestalts’ of cultures. Benedict’s (1955) culture and personality theory has been criticised for being based on a too limited sample, for lacking explanatory force and omitting, or de-emphasising, contradictory evidence in the interest of theoretical coherence (Harris, 1968). However, despite its possible short-comings Benedict’s (1955) culture and personality theory was hugely influential, in both its promotion of cultural relativism and in its presentation of a conception culture as the expression of core societal values. Other students of Boas also investigated the relationship between the individual and culture, producing theories of the workings of culture equally as influential as Benedict’s (1955).

Alfred Kroeber (1876-1960) was also a student of Franz Boas and, like Ruth Benedict, drew on Gestalt psychology and the notion of cultural configurations to formulate a theory of culture. Kroeber (1948) conceptualised culture as the characteristic expression of patterned, internally coherent knowledge, or value, configurations. However, unlike Benedict, Kroeber advocated a strict separation of the individual and cultural levels of analysis. Kroeber (1948) conceptualised culture as a supra-individual organising force, beginning where the individual ends and existing and developing independently of the individuals belonging to it (Moore, 2004). Kroeber (1952) posited a ‘cultural element approach’ to anthropological analysis. The ‘cultural element approach’ entailed the division of cultures into minimal units which could then be quantitatively analysed. This quantitative, elemental, analysis was supposed to reveal the elemental configurations characteristic of specific cultures (Moore, 2004). These elemental configurations are the coherently patterned cumulative products of cultural histories. These cumulative patterns, of elemental cultural configurations, give cultures their distinctive characters and justify the conceptualisation of cultures as super-organic systems. This elemental approach was epitomised in Kroeber’s surveys of indigenous Californian tribes, which checked off and compared the frequency with which cultural practices, such as polyandry or cremation, occurred (Moore, 2004).

The elemental approach has been criticised for atomising culture and assuming the equivalent significance of similar practices, despite their occurrence in differing cultural contexts (Moore, 2004). In his later ‘world civilisation study’ Kroeber (1944) appears to have lost faith in the explanatory force of the comparative, elemental, approach, stating that he found “no evidence of any true law in the phenomena dealt with,…nothing cyclical, regularly repetitive or necessary” (Kroeber, 1944, p.761). Kroeber’s later review of definitions of culture, produced in conjunction

with Clyde Kluckhohn (1963), led him to conclude that anthropologists were unlikely to discover any constant units of culture. Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1963) eventually settled on the following definition of culture:

> Culture consists of patterns explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour, acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand be considered as products of actions, on the other as conditioning elements of further action.
> (Kroeber & Kluckhohn 1963, p.357)

Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1963) remained acutely aware that a definition of a term did not constitute a theory of a concept and the failure of the elemental approach led Kroeber (1963) to conclude that constant units of culture were only likely to be found in automated areas, such as language. It was within exactly this area, language, which a further student of Boas, Edward Sapir, was to base his theory of culture.

Edward Sapir (1884-1939) forwarded the theory that the relationship between culture and the individual is dynamically shaped by the medium of language (Moore, 2004). Sapir (1968) rejected Benedict's (1959) oppositional, dichotomous presentation of the relationship between culture and the individual, and Kroeber's (1948) supra-individual conceptualisation of culture. Sapir (1968) argued that cultures are simply constituents of individuals and that culture is merely a consensus of individual classifications, which results from shared linguistic categories. The speaking of a common language endows members of a language group with a common classificatory system, recourse to common meanings and common understandings of reality (Sapir, 1968). This classificatory consensus, imbued by language, is that which constitutes culture. According to Sapir (1968), there is no necessary opposition between individuals and culture, as cultural generalisations are always counterbalanced by the divergence of individual behaviours. Culture is not a super-organic force imposing upon the individual, rather cultures and individuals exist in an interdependent, dynamic relationship (Sapir, 1968). "A healthy national culture is never a passively accepted heritage from the past, but implies the creative participation of the members of the community." (Sapir, 1968, p. 321). Sapir's (1968) investigation into the relationship between culture, language and the construction of meaning was continued by his student Benjamin Whorf. Together, the works of Sapir and Whorf gave rise to a theory of the linguistic construction of meaning, labelled the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis posits a conceptual relationship between linguistic categories and the cognitive categories speakers of a language use to order and classify perceptions. Different languages produce differing perceptual categories, which result in differing cultural responses and behaviours (Moore, 2004). Culture is therefore codified in, and analysable by recourse to, the linguistic structuring of meaning. The categorisation of colours, by English and Tarahumara speakers, has been used to test the Sapir -Whorf hypothesis (Kay & Kempton, 1984). Tarahumara, an Aztec language, has no categorical term for the differentiation of blue from green. When Tarahumara and English speakers were asked to order colour discs according to greatest difference, Kay and Kempton (1984) found that whilst Tarahumara speakers tended to order the discs according to visual differences, English speakers tended to order discs according to the categorisations dictated by their language. These findings demonstrate that natural language categories do affect perceptual categorisations, at least with regard to nominal classifications. However, further experimentation demonstrated that the affects of language on perceptual categorisations are minimal and dependent on the salience of language categories at the time of judgement (D'Andrade, 1997). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has also been criticised for assuming that language pre-empts thought (Pinker, 2000, cited in Moore, 2004). Pinker (2000, cited in Moore, 2004) argues that in order for children to learn language and for the introduction of new terms and translation to be possible, it is necessary for thought to pre-empt language. Yet, whether or not one accepts the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis it did draw attention to the interrelationship between cultural meanings and cognitive structures.

Structuralism and Interpretivism

Claude Levi-Strauss (1963) also investigated the interrelationship between human cognitive structures and cultural meanings, in his formation of the theory of structuralism. Levi-Strauss (1963) analysed the manner in which cultural phenomena, such as myths and kinship systems, constitute expressions of the unconscious and universal structures of the human mind. Levi-Strauss (1963) argued that structure is imposed on cultural materials through the unconscious operations of the mind. Phenomena are perceived through the senses then ordered, interpreted and assigned characteristics, in accordance with the structural constraints of human cognition. The interpretation of these classificatory processes can, therefore, offer insight into the workings of the mind. In contrast to the theories of societies and social organisation formulated by his European predecessors and contemporaries, Levi-Strauss attempted to establish a theory of mind

through the analysis of cultural practices. An undesirable consequence of Levi-Strauss's structuralism is that 'native' interpretations of meaning became irrelevant to the determination of cultural structures. An alternative to the imposed assignment of meaning, that results from Levi-Strauss' structuralism, is Clifford Geertz's (1973) symbolic or interpretive approach to anthropology.

Interpretive anthropology posits a metaphor of cultures as texts, or symbolic systems, consisting of practices through which cultural meanings are created. Geertz (1973) argues that the concept of culture is semiotic and that the study of culture must therefore consist of the interpretation of the symbolic meanings of which cultural practices are symbolic. According to Geertz's (1973) interpretive approach, perceptions of cultural difference arise from "a lack of familiarity with the imaginative universe within which their [other cultures] acts are signs" (Geertz, 1973, p.9-10). Both Levi-Strauss's structuralism and Geertz's interpretive anthropology are faced with the problem that their conclusions about cultures are inherently unverifiable. Levi-Strauss' structuralism presents no way in which structuralist interpretations of cultural meanings can be validated, whilst Geertz's interpretive anthropology, renders the prospect of a correct, or verifiable, interpretation of a particular culture unachievable. A further commonality between these two approaches is the idea that cultures represent interrelated systems or structures (D'andrade, 1997). Geertz (1973) describes culture as a "multiplicity of conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another" (Geertz, 1973, p.10). Levi-Strauss' entire theory of culture is based on the idea that cultures are representative of mental structures. A major difference between Levi-Strauss' and Geertz's theories of culture is the placement of the locus of culture. Geertz (1973) argues for an external locus, in which culture consists of the public creation and interpretation of meaning, whereas Levi-Strauss' (1963) structuralism posits an internal locus, describing culture as a product of the structuring of the mind. This ontological vein of the culture debate continued throughout much of the second half of the twentieth century, accompanying the rise of investigations into the relationship between culture and cognition. The investigation into culture and cognition, initiated by theorists such as Sapir, Whorf and Levi-Strauss, and criticised by interpretivists such as Geertz, eventually gave rise to the field of cognitive anthropology.

Cognitive anthropology

Cognitive anthropology is the study of the interrelationship between culture and cognition. Cognitive anthropologists investigate the role of cognitive systems in the constraint, formation, use, translation and transition of cultural knowledge. The nature of the human psyche is not perceived as being dictated by culture, nor is culture perceived as being determined by the nature of cognitive structures. Rather the two, culture and cognitive systems, are perceived as interactional and mutually affective (D'Andrade, 1997). The investigation into cultural terminology and cognitive categorisation, prompted by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, demonstrated that language may provide a window into the cognitive organization of cultural knowledge.

Goodenough (1956) and Lounsbury's (1964) studies of kinship terms demonstrated how the study of linguistics, semantics and classificatory terminology could provide insight into the psychological organization of cultural knowledge (D'Andrade, 1997). Lounsbury (1964) and Goodenough (1956) analysed the organisation of kinship terms into 'idea units', categories and groupings of similarity assigned by members of specific cultures. The collection of these 'idea units' enabled the construction of maps of the cognitive categories speakers of a language use to discriminate between certain types of kinship relations (D'Andade, 1997). The advantage of such a semantic analysis of kinship systems, over an interpretive approach, is that semantic analysis reveals internal categorisations and the relationships between categories as perceived by members of a particular culture, rather than in accordance with classifications imposed by external observations. The semantic analysis of cultural terminology provided anthropologists with a reliable method for understanding the cognitive organisation of cultural knowledge. This method came to be known as feature analysis.

Feature analysis was initially applied to kinship terminology and then expanded to include other areas of cultural categorisation. During the late 1960s cognitive anthropologists began to expand the scope of feature analysis to include other culturally significant categorisation systems, like Tzeltal categories of firewood (Metzger & Williams, 1966). The established analytical processes of feature analysis, such as the use of kin types to elicit contrasting features of kinship terms, did not fit to the analysis cultural categorisations for which the researchers had no analogue, like firewood (D'Andrade, 1997). The adaptation of the feature model, to include wider categories of cultural meanings, led Metzger and Williams (1966) to adopt the linguistic concept of 'frames'.

Frames can be defined as the semantic, or categorical, environments in which concepts/phenomena exist (D'Andrade, 1997). The sentence "_____ is a kind of vegetable" is a frame, when the gap is filled with the correct kind of item the frame becomes a true sentence. Metzger and Williams (1966) were able to use frames, and frames formulated as queries, firstly, to establish the existence of a Tzeltal concept of firewood, analogous to the English concept, and secondly, to discover the salient, culturally specific, Tzeltal categorisations of firewood types. The query technique of frame elicitation provided anthropologists with an interpretation free method for uncovering cultural classificatory systems. Understandings of cultural classificatory systems, in turn, provided a pathway for understanding the cognitive organisation of cultural knowledge and a methodology that eliminated the possibility of the ethnographer's own conceptual frameworks confounding research results. Parallel to the development of feature analysis and frame elicitation techniques, researchers studying folk taxonomies were beginning to develop theories of cognitive prototypes.

Cognitive prototypes are psychological entities consisting of configurations of features, or attributes, which represent the basic level, most frequently occurring, or most salient characteristics of phenomena (D'Anrade, 1997). Early cognitive investigations, by ethno-botanists, into folk biological taxonomies, examined how people classified multi-feature objects into wider taxonomical categories (Hunn, 1976). Researchers found that the classification "X is a kind of Y" does not tend to be based on the individual features of X, as these are too numerous to enable instantaneous classification. Rather, folk taxonomical classifications tend to be based on the fact that X exhibits a configuration of features typical of the classificatory category Y (D'Andrade, 1997). These typical configurations of features are lumped together to form a prototypical Gestalt attribute; a collection of attributes typically found together and representative of a category within a taxonomic group. Attribute configurations are then used in the identification, and classification, of particular instantiations of a specimen. In a discussion of the attribute configurations used to classify birds Bruner, Goodnow and Austin (1956) explain the reduction of multiple attributes into prototypical configurations as follows:

> In coding or categorising the environment, one builds up an expectancy of all these features [wings, bill, feathers] being present together. It is this unitary conception that has the configurational or gestalt property of 'birdness'…When the conception is well enough established, it takes on the property of being able to serve as a discriminable and seemingly irreducible attribute of its own.
> (Bruner, Goodnow & Austin, 1956, p.47)

Berlin, Breedlove and Raven (1973; 1974) discovered that folk taxonomies tend to have five hierarchically ranked levels of classification. These levels range from rank 0, the single umbrella term for everything within the taxonomy, such as the term "plant" in English, over life form groupings such as "trees", to generics such as "oaks", and then specifics which can usually no longer be subdivided, such as "white oak" (D'Andrade, 1997). Techniques such as pile sorting, where informants are asked to sort piles of object names into 'most-like' categories, were developed, in order to determine how people from specific cultures categorised objects, initially plants and animals and later tools, vehicles, spirits and other culturally significant phenomena (D'Andrade, 1997).

The psychologist Eleanor Rosch (1978) expanded theories of attribute configurations and taxonomical classification levels and argued that basic level categorisation terms correspond to "psychologically basic level objects" or cognitive prototypes. Rosch's (1978) argument is based on the idea that human cognitive categorisation rests on the principle of gaining maximum possible information whilst using the least possible amount of cognitive effort, and that perceptions consist of structured information rather than random collections of features. Rosch (1978) recognised that it is not necessary for objects to uniformly exhibit certain attribute configurations in order for them to be categorised in accordance with these configurations. Basic correlation, or similarity, is enough for objects to be classified in accordance with certain attribute configurations. Attribute configurations represent prototypical psychological instantiations of an object and this is all that is necessary for cognitive classification. The idea that human cognition operates, not on the basis of recognising features of things, but through the reference of things to psychological prototypes is the basis of prototype theory. Prototype theory enabled an expansion of cognitive research, from an analysis of basic level features, towards an analysis of cognitive category structures. However, throughout the 1970s it became increasingly clear that cognition utilises structures more complex than prototypes and that, in order to gain a clearer understanding of human cognition, prototype theory would have to be expanded (D'Andrade, 1997). The expansion of prototype theory resulted in the development of schema theory. Schema theory explains the manner in which prototypes are utilised in cognition by recourse to schematic knowledge structures.

Schema theory posits a model of cognition in which knowledge consists of webs of specialized, neuron like, processing networks (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). These processing networks are organized into prototypical representations of events, or features, through the repeated simultaneous activation of individual units (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). These neural knowledge networks and prototypical cognitive representations are known as schemata. Schemata enable comprehension by relating, or approximating, events, concepts and perceptions to sets of learned prototypes (Casson, 1983). Schematic prototypes do not consist of exact mental copies of events, but are conceptual abstractions based on typical sets of features or attributes. Repeated concurrent experiences of certain attributes stimulate the development of cognitive prototypes. These cognitive prototypes remain in memory as generic blueprints for the mediation and understanding of further experiences (Casson, 1983). Schemata can be representational, like prototypes, but they are also processors, used in interpretation and they are influential, stimulating and mediating behavioural responses (D'andrade, 1997; Strauss & Quinn, 1994) The primary advantages of schema theory, as an explanatory framework, are its abilities firstly, to explain how people learn without explicit teaching and secondly, to accommodate flexible responses to new stimuli (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Cognitive anthropologists can use schema theory to explain some of the central features of culture, such as cultural learning, or how and why cultural knowledge is shared, durable and yet occasionally absent, or differently represented, by certain individuals. Advances in research into artificial intelligence, from the 1950s onwards, led cognitive scientists to adapt the concept of schema to a new model of cognition, based on computer processing systems, called 'connectionism'.

Connectionism posits a model of cognition roughly based around some of the basic principles of computer programming. These principles centre on the activation and connection of a series of input and output units which determine reactions. Input, or sensory, units are connected to output, or decision, units. The connections between input and output units are weighted; the firing of different input units, and combinations of input units, produces differing degrees of activation in the output units; when a certain degree of output unit activation is reached the output unit fires producing a response (D'Andrade, 1997). These networks of weighted relationships between input units, output units and responses, are termed 'connectionist networks'. Connectionist networks are basically systems for the recognition of patterns in stimuli and can be programmed to discriminate between patterns and adjust output responses, by increasing or decreasing the weighting placed on certain input units (D'Andrade, 1997). Connectionist networks are also able

to compensate for missing information. If certain input aspects of a known pattern are absent the network will compensate by filling in the missing parts with default input values that will trigger a correct response (D'Andrade, 1997). Connectionist networks are also sensitive to context, recognising that the surrounding input may change the character and weighting of particular stimuli and therefore the appropriate output responses (D'Andrade, 1997). Cognitive scientists recognised that connectionist networks provide a viable model for the explanation of how schemata function within the human brain. The processes of system configuration and reconfiguration, in response to differing patterns of stimuli, present in connectionist networks, can be used to explain the flexible, responsive and interpretive character of schemata.

> …. because the system configures itself differently according to the sum of all the numerous influences upon it, each new invocation of a schema may differ from the previous invocations. Thus, the system behaves as if there were prototypical schemas, but where the prototype is constructed anew for each occasion by combining past experience with biases and activation levels resulting from the current experience and the context in which it occurs.
> (Norman, 1986, p.356, cited in D'Andrade, 1997, p.142)

Schema and connectionist networks are not just malleable; they can also be rigid (D'Andrade, 1997). The repeated concurrent experience of certain stimuli strengthens the weighting of the connections between them, making their concurrent firing more likely even on occasions when the stimuli are not experienced together (D'Andrade, 1997). Connectionist networks are not yet able to provide exhaustive explanations for the operation of schema. However, schema theory and connectionism are still useful tools for unravelling the workings of both psychological and cultural phenomena.

Schema theory and connectionism can provide comprehensive explanations of the nature and workings of cultural knowledge. Claudia Strauss and Naomi Quinn (1994) demonstrate how schema theory and connectionism can be used to explain, not only the influence of cultural environments on individuals, but also how individuals recreate and change their cultural environments. Strauss & Quinn (1994) use the fictional example of an American women 'Paula' to demonstrate how connectionism can explain cultural knowledge being learned, internalised, motivational, flexible, yet durable and shared.

The learning and internalisation of particular cultural schema does not occur through the learning of a set of rule like statements (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Rather, particular cultural schemata arise

because repeated experiences of concurrent features eventually result in the internalisation of schematic prototypes. Paula's 'motherhood' schema, in the example given by Strauss and Quinn (1994), contains the generalisation that, at home, mothers are most likely to be found in kitchens. Repeated experiences of mothers in association with kitchens have, over time, strengthened the connections between the sets of neural 'units' Paula uses to represent mothers and kitchens (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The repeated concurrent firing of these two sets of units, in response to Paula's experiences of her own, friends and fictional mothers, in association with kitchens, has strengthened the connections between her motherhood and kitchen units to the point where this link becomes embedded in the network of associations that constitute her motherhood schema (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). In actuality the 'units', kitchen and mother will consist of vast networks of neurons firing in response to various aspects of Paula's perceptions, but for brevity it is useful to talk of these networks as if they were single neurological 'units'. The form of cultural learning described here is typically gradual and the establishment of strong connectionist networks requires repeated exposure to the relations which come to populate the schema (Strauss & Quinn, 1994).

Associations between situations, observations, feelings and response motivations are easily explainable by recourse to schema and connectionist networks. The connections in Paula's motherhood schema are not inflexible, detached observations, or recipes for perception, but flexible associations connected with emotional responses and motivations. Paula's observation that her mother did not like being stuck in the kitchen, prompted feelings of irritation in Paula (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). These feelings led to the motivation that in her household Paula would insist on a more gender neutral division of labour (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). People's differing responses to similar perceptions can be used to describe how individual differences arise, despite similarities in general cultural schema. Paula's brother also repeatedly observed instances of mothers in association with kitchens. However, he didn't connect strong feelings of irritation to these associations. Therefore, whilst Paula's brother's 'motherhood' schema also contains the connection mother-kitchen, this connection does not act as a motivating force for him (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The same cognitive process that account for the learning of shared cultural schema can also account for individuality and the presence of individual differences (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The emotional and motivational associations within cultural schema also act as forces for change and prevent cultural schema from acting as rigid prescriptions for actions. Paula's emotional associations with the connection mother-kitchen, and her resulting motivation to do

things differently, prompted her to make a conscious effort not to repeat this pattern in her own marriage, thus influencing the associations that build up within her children's 'motherhood' schema (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). However, the strength of the associations Paula learned growing up means that 'doing things differently' requires a conscious effort. "Such strong cognitive patterns cannot simply be erased and replaced with alternative patterns. These well-learned understandings supply the interpretations and behaviours that come to Paula automatically; it takes deliberate effort and thought to set up new patterns of behaviour."(Strauss & Quinn, 1994, p. 289).Cultural schema may be variously integrated, contested and manipulated by individuals; however, they are also durable.

The durability of cultural schema is a result of both the strength of the connections from which they are formed, and the assimilatory nature of schema generally (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Individuals within a given society, at a given point in history, are exposed to similar associations. Paula and her friends all grew up watching TV shows and visiting friend's houses where mothers appeared in association with kitchens (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). These similar social experiences result in shared schematic connections, even if reactions to and certain aspects of these connections differ (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The strength of Paula and her partner's mother-kitchen connections, results in them unconsciously falling into a pattern of behaviour that reinforces this connection within their own children's minds, unless they make a conscious effort to do otherwise (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The strength and shared nature of the connection mother-kitchen is enough to ensure its cultural durability, at least for a while. A second factor influencing the durability of cultural schema is their self- reinforcing nature (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Schemata and connectionist networks assimilate new experiences to previously learned patterns of associations, filling in missing, or ambiguous, parts with default input values. This assimilation, in turn, reinforces expectations that one will find concurrent instances of the associations on which the original connectionist pattern was based. Schemata therefore become self-reinforcing patterns of expected associations. Strauss and Quinn's (1994) example of Paula's 'inner city African-American males' schema demonstrates that negative social schema can result in patterns of interaction that disallow for the occurrence of contradictory experiences. Paula is white and grew up in the suburbs. Her 'inner city African-American males' schema is influenced by connections created by media exposure and she associates inner city African-American males with violence and criminality (Strauss & Quinn, 1994).

> The last time she was in a large city she was approached by a shabbily dressed African-American man. Something about the way he looked at her triggered Paula's fear-laden associations, and she turned and ran. As it happens, he had thought she looked lost and had approached her to offer directions.
> (Strauss & Quinn, 1994, p.289)

Paula's response, based on her negative social schema, prevented an interaction that would have contradicted and perhaps led to the adaptation of the associations within this particular schema. Her negative stereotype prompted a reaction that strengthened the negative associations within this schema, and the schema became self-reinforcing. The self-reinforcing nature of shared cultural schema provides a possible, and plausible, explanation for the durability of cultural values and norms. The durability of cultural values and norms for individuals, in turn, affects the historical stability of cultural traits.

The historical stability of cultural traits is a result of the generational reproduction of durable, shared cultural schema. Paula and her partner unconsciously pass on the 'mother-kitchen' connection to their children, when they do not make a conscious effort to do otherwise. However, people also intentionally pass on the cultural schemata that embody values that they, as a result of their own socialization, find important (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The emotive associations within particular schema are an important factor in influencing their likelihood of being generationally reproduced. Paula and her husband were both taught, by their parents, to be self-reliant (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). When Paula asked her parents to help her with something they often responded by saying "try and do it yourself" and rewarding Paula for independent behaviour (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The encouragement of, and reward for, exhibitions of self-reliance led Paula to associate self-reliance with an ideal of personhood (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The feeling that she was a good person and a success whenever she was self-reliant acted as an internal reward, this increased Paula's motivation to behave self-reliantly and the durability of Paula's 'self-reliance is good' schema (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The strength of Paula and her partner's positive associations, of self-reliance with ideals of personhood, lead them to actively pass on this value to their children, in much the same way as their parents had passed it on to them (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The preference for self-reliance also imbues Paula and her partner with an 'elective affinity' towards products, stories and rhetoric that exhibit, and therefore reinforce, this value (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The shared nature of cultural schema does not depend on people having the same experiences (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Paula, her partner and their children do not all have to have the same experiences in order to build up a connection between self-reliance and

positive feelings. It is the frequency of concurrence between aspects of events, not the nature of the events themselves, which are most significant in the creation of strongly weighted schematic connections (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Shared social environments ensure that people, within a society, will experience many of the same patterns of associations and therefore build up similar schematic connections, even if individual experiences differ, (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The schema 'self-reliance is good' consists of loosely associated patterns of interpretation guides, rules for applicability, and motivational responses (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). The loose associations and general nature of this schema means that it is applicable in many variable contexts (Strauss & Quinn, 1994). Sharedness, broad applicability, generational reproduction, and the resulting historical stability of cultural schemata are the foundations for descriptions of a culture's 'ethos' or 'national character' (Strauss & Quinn, 1994).

The application of schema theory and connectionism to cultural anthropology provides a framework for understanding the cognitive organisation of cultural knowledge and also the operation of some of the defining features of culture, such as sharedness, generational reproduction, individual contestation, change and durability. The development of culture theory, over the past two hundred years, has produced many variable hypotheses about the nature and workings of culture. Yet, despite conceptual and theoretical differences, there is a broad consensus, among culture theorists, about certain attributes that constitute 'culture'. Anthropologists tend to agree that culture is to some extent shared, generationally reproduced, integrated and influential. However, questions about the exact nature and workings of culture have given rise to a plethora of theories attempting to describe and define this elusive concept. The investigations of cognitive anthropologists, into the organisation of cultural knowledge, have resulted in the first comprehensive theories that can explain cultural learning and the existence of shared cultural norms, whilst simultaneously and within the same theoretical frameworks, explaining individual differences and how and why cultural norms are changeable and contested. Schema theory and connectionism can account for the historical constitution and stability of cultural knowledge, whilst avoiding rigidity or determinism and still accounting for the manner in which the interactions between individuals and social environments take place. No previous theory has been able to account for the 'whats' 'whys' and 'hows' of culture in such a consistent and comprehensive manner. However, the application of schema theory and connectionism to cultural anthropology is far from the end of the culture debate. While cognitive anthropologists were developing theories on the organisation and influence of cultural knowledge, simultaneous

developments within the field of post-modernist anthropology were leading some academics to question whether the concept of culture had any explanatory force at all.

The post-modernist culture critique

The post-modernist 'culture critique' calls into question the utility and explanatory force of the concept of culture. The basic tenet of the 'culture critique' is that the concept of culture has become a form of neo-imperialist oppression. It is argued that 'culture' has become commoditised and is being used in a deterministic fashion, similar to the concept of race (Said, 2003, orig, 1978; Abu-Lughod, 1991; Appadurai, 1996; Wikan, 1999). Edward Said's (2003) critique of western representations of 'the orient', in conjunction with Foucault's (1980) definition of discourse, provide the foundations for an examination of the imperialist connotations and hegemonic character of popular discourse on culture and diversity. Said's (2003) central argument is that the western concept of 'the orient' should not be understood as a representation of an empirical cultural reality, but as a culturally constituted discourse, deriving its descriptive force from the power relations which it implies and is implicated in (Kahn 1995, p.7). Foucault (1972; 1980) perceives of discourse as a set of regularised statements which simultaneously construct, and are constructed by, social realities and relations. Discourse, in a Foucauldian sense, consists of the construction, contestation and reconstruction of the power relations implicit in the formulation of knowledge. Discourses are therefore, either dominating and hegemonic, or resistant and counter-hegemonic (Kahn 1995, p.xi). Said (2003) applied Foucault's definition of discourse to western constructions of cultural alterity, arguing that existing discourses of 'otherness', even supposedly emancipatory ones, are not only embedded with the antipathies of imperialist superiority; but, also implicated in the recreation of such antipathies through processes of exclusivist definition, exploitation, study, and rule (Said, 2003). Abu-Lughod's (1993) application of Said's (2003) critique of orientalism to the concept of culture led her to question the utility and descriptive force of the very concept that anthropologists had spent the past two hundred years attempting to understand.

Abu-Lughod's (1993; 1999a; 1999b) application of Said's (2003) critique of 'orientalism' to 'culture' is based on the idea that the concept of culture creates a false picture of bounded homogeneity, infused with typifications and generalizations, that serves to distance and divide people from each other. Abu-Lughod (1999a) argues that the descriptive force of the modern

concept of culture is insufficient when it comes to explicating the complexities, uncertainties, and contradictory nature of human social life and individuality. According to Abu-Lughod's (1993; 1999a; 1999b) arguments modern representations of cultural difference consist of a reduction of individual differences to descriptive cultural norms. The supposedly shared and deterministic nature of culture divides people into opposing groups and encourages exclusionary processes of 'othering' (Abu-Lughod, 1999a). Arjun Appadurai's (1996) criticism of the culture concept echoes the sentiments of Abu-Lughod's (1993) critique, whilst focusing criticisms around certain usages of the noun culture.

> The noun culture appears to privilege the sort of sharing, agreeing and bounding that flies in the face of the facts of unequal knowledge and the differential prestige of lifestyles, and discourages attention to the worldviews and agencies of those who are marginalised or dominated.
> (Appadurai, 1996, p.12)

Appadurai's (1996) critique centres around the reification of 'culture'; the transformation of this theoretical construct into a physical substance apportioned with both descriptive and deterministic force. Through the reification of culture, the delineation and description of 'a culture' becomes an exercise in the reconstruction of hierarchy, in which the anthropologist is placed in the superior position of rational observer and members of the culture under observation are constructed as exotic, but bounded beings, whose lives, behaviours and motivations are determined by, and therefore reducible to, the cultural traditions in which their existence is embedded (Abu-Lughod, 1991 cited in Brumann, 1999). This critique draws attention to the vested interests the discipline of anthropology has in the perpetuation of a belief in separate and distinct cultures. The belief in separate and distinct cultural units is essential to the anthropologist's distinction between self and other. Abu-Lughod (1991, cited in Brumann 1999) argues that through the description and elaboration of cultural differences, anthropology is in turn constructing, producing and maintaining these differences. These processes of 'othering' serve to separate people through an emphasis on homogeneity that occurs at the expense of recognition of change and inconsistency (Abu-Lughod 1999a; Rosaldo, 1993 cited in Brumann, 1999). The post-modernist critique argues that the concept of culture encourages people to view others' lives as determined by their cultural identities, whilst creating a false picture of cultural realities as coherent, homogeneous, bounded and stable. The extension of this argument has led some theorists to conclude that culture has become the new concept of race (Wikan, 1999).

The argument that culture has become the new concept of race is based on the idea that popular employment of the concept has elevated it above the level of a theoretical postulation to a psychical, or metaphysical, entity with an objective existence and deterministic force (Abu-Lughod 1991; Appadurai, 1996 cited in Brumann 1999; Wikan, 1999). The popularisation of reified, essentialist notions of culture and questionable references to 'mega cultures' such as "African, Asian, Arabic or Western culture' apparent in texts such as Samuel Huntington's (1993) "The clash of civilisations?" has given rise to a form of 'cultural fundamentalism' (Stolcke, 1995 cited in Brumann, 1999). This cultural fundamentalism sees the world as divisible into a finite number of geographically determined antagonistic cultural groups (Stolcke, 1995 cited in Brumann 1999). The result is the creation of a modern rhetoric of imperialist cultural division, based on a concept of culture that has come to take the place of the earlier divisionary construct of race. Wikan (1999) argues that 'culture' is appropriated by those in power to mask self-interested policy under the guise of cultural respect, whilst in actuality this politicised notion of culture is used to deny agency and therefore fuel degradation.

> Culture has become the new concept of race in that it functions in a reductionist manner to make 'them' lesser human beings than 'us'. Whereas 'we' regard ourselves as thinking, reasoning, acting human beings with the ability to reflect and respond to changing circumstances, 'they' are portrayed as caught in the web of culture and propelled to do as culture bids……what is racism other than the degradation of persons on the basis of inborn or ethnic characteristics? A model of the human being that portrays the person as a product rather than an agent and as caught in the grip of culture is reductionist and hence racist.
> (Wikan, 1999, p.58)

These reductionist, reified notions of culture lead to the perception of some as passive carriers of a fixed, homogeneous, cultural tradition. These carriers of culture are denied the agency to behave in ways other than those which their 'culture' dictates and the difficulty of distinguishing between ethnicities leads to the assignment of cultural identity on the basis of passport nationality (Wikan, 1999).

The culture critique enabled, Wikan (1999) Appadurai (1996), Abu-Lughod (1993), and Said (2003), to draw attention to the interrelationship between culture and power. The delineation of 'others' cultures' can result in degradation and division, when based on a reified, deterministic, essentialist or reductive notion of culture. The construction of 'other' cultures can also serve to perpetuate power imbalances between members of the cultures being defined and those doing the defining. The post-modernist critique focuses on misinterpretations of 'culture'. As long as the term is perceived to refer to a bounded, homogeneous mass of shared, geographically determined

traditions, steering the lives and behaviours' of all inhabitants of a particular place, then the postmodernist criticisms must be considered valid. An acceptance of the applicability of these criticisms to specific conceptualisations of culture must lead to a consideration of whether calls for an abandonment of the concept should be heeded. If culture has become the new concept of race, then surely its descriptive force has been nullified. However, before abandoning the concept of culture altogether one must consider whether a reified, essentialist notion of culture is really what anthropology has been promoting and if not, why this reified notion of 'culture' has arisen, and whether the concept of culture can be defended.

The popular acceptance of 'culture' is simultaneously a triumph and challenge for the discipline of anthropology. The triumph resulted from the consistent and successful efforts of anthropologists, such Boas and Benedict, to dispel the myth of racial determinism and promote a popular awareness of cultural relativity. The challenge has been the communication of the descriptive boundaries of culture and the explanation of the differential distribution of cultural traits. Communication of the explanatory boundaries of culture is necessary, in order to prevent culture taking the place of race as a reductive and deterministic predictor of identity. The study of specific cultural systems at fixed points in time, forwarded by structural functionalism, the culture and personality school, structuralism and interpretivism, tended to emphasise cultural coherence, over disjuncture and individual variation (Brumann, 1999). References to Trobriand, Zuni or Japanese culture, employed for discursive brevity, did not represent non-recognition of intra-cultural heterogeneity. However, the permeation of such references into popular consciousness, in conjunction with mid twentieth century ethnographic emphasis on cultural cohesion, have resulted in a popular conceptualisation of culture as a geographically determined, all pervasive, homogeneous force, dictating values and behaviours equally to all those subject to its influence.

Popular recognition of cultural diversity as a more reliable descriptor, and predictor, of difference than race, in conjunction with increasing global mobility throughout the second half of the twentieth century, has given rise to a consumer construct of 'culture'. Joel Kahn (1995) argues that tourism and the consumption of media imagery playing on cultural exotica have fuelled a consumer passion for cultural alteriety. The resulting commoditisation of culture is implicated in the processes of 'othering', that are the subject of the post-modernist culture critique. Anthropology played a part in the popularisation of 'culture'. However, it is the consumer

demand for exotic alteriety and market responses to this demand that have resulted in the misinterpretation of the culture concept within popular consciousness. The culture critique is valid when applied to a commoditised misinterpretation of culture. The defence of culture is therefore dependent on whether the meaning of the concept can be distinguished from some of its usages.

The defence of ‘culture’ centres on whether the connotations of static, homogeneous determinism are inherent in the concept, or simply the result of misinterpretation and misappropriation (Brumann, 1999). Brumann (1999) argues that the postmodernist criticisms only apply to certain misuses of ‘culture’ and, as such, do not represent grounds for an abandonment of the concept. The examination of classic and modern anthropological definitions of culture reveals that whilst the majority of anthropologists do not explicitly deny that cultures are homogeneous, bounded, or static, they do not explicitly affirm these characteristics either (Brumann, 1999). Nor do the majority of anthropological definitions tend to reify culture, instead they talk in terms of abstract collections; a “…complex whole…,” (Tylor, 1871) or “…manifestations of social habits…” (Boas, 1930) “…not any concrete reality, but an abstraction…” (Radcliffe-Brown, 1940). Anthropological definitions and theories of culture provide ample support for Brumann’s (1999) argument that scholarly conceptions of culture are not problematic. ‘Culture’ refers to an abstract aggregate; the delineation of ‘a culture’ results from the repeated observance of co-present examples of behaviours and thought patterns, which present commonalities with past examples of thought patterns and behaviours (Brumann, 1999). The delineation of ‘a culture’ necessarily involves the abstraction of observed occurrences, in order to fit them into a derived concept. During these processes of abstraction some individual anomalies will necessarily be over looked in the interest of identifying and naming clusters. The abstract aggregate noun ‘culture’ is much like the abstract aggregate noun ‘the mind’ in the manner in which its content and boundaries are constructed through the processes of its description. Therefore, just like descriptions of ‘the mind’ descriptions of ‘cultures’ can appear more or less persuasive, depending on their supporting arguments and evidence; however, they will never be ultimately or unequivocally ‘true’. Having established the theoretical soundness of the possibility of coherently using the noun ‘culture’ the question arises as to when a cluster of behaviours, traits or perceptual tendencies are shared enough to constitute ‘a culture’. Brumann (1999) suggests the use of statistical processes, such as consensus analysis, bell curves, or schema analysis, as potential methods for identifying central and peripheral cultural traits. Such statistical processes can also emphasise the necessity of fairly

representing the differential distribution of cultural traits, and therefore aid in avoiding misinterpretation (Brumann, 1999). Brumann (1999) concedes that the recognition of internal inconsistencies within cultures may, on occasion, slightly diminish the descriptive force of the concept. However, the constraint of 'communicative economy' makes references to 'culture', 'a culture' and cultural traits, elements, or features, a necessity (Brumann, 1999).

Brumann's (1999) defence of 'culture' shows that the culture critique does not directly apply to most anthropological understandings of culture; whilst simultaneously demonstrating that the use of the abstract noun culture does not necessarily imply ignorance of intra-cultural diversity. Brumann (1999) also offers some pragmatic reasons for the retention of the culture concept, such as communicative brevity. Brumann's (1999) argument that the culture critique only applies to certain misuses of the concept, not the concept itself, is supported by Kahn's (1995) description of the commoditisation of a consumer concept of culture. However, acceptance of Brumann's (1999) and Kahn's (1995) positions would seem to imply the existence of two separate concepts of culture, one correct and one incorrect; this, in turn, begs the question of whether a concept can possess a transcendental meaning, separate from the meaning constructed for it through common discourse. Abu-Lughod (1999b), in her reply to Brumann (1999), argues that concepts cannot possess meanings separate from their usages, and that meaning is constructed through discursive use. Abu-Lughod (1999b) contends that the contexts in which a concept is brought into play reveal more about its meaning than the quotation of abstract, academic definitions. Resolution of this epistemological debate is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, the brief summarisation of this particular strand of the culture debate is enough to demonstrate that the defence of 'culture' is not unambiguous. Whichever side of the usage/meaning argument one tends towards, it appears increasingly clear that anthropology must strive towards a re-conceptualisation of popular notions of culture, in a direction that will guard against reductionism and cultural fundamentalism. Roy D'Andrade (1999) argues that increasing understanding of the role of culture in cognition could aid in just such a re-conceptualisation. Cognitive anthropology, schema theory and connectionism, could potentially aid in the reformation and refinement of popular understandings of culture. However, such reformation and refinement would require a mediating body that could translate and present these theories to a wider non-academic audience. This mediating role is a position that cross-cultural training is well placed to take on.

Conclusion

The concept of culture has a turbid and complex history. The English term 'culture' was appropriated from the German *'Kultur'* in the late 19th century. However, the origins of the concept 'culture' may be traceable to the work of enlightenment philosophers such as Locke and Tugot. Colonialism brought Western Europe into contact with radical cultural diversity. The expansion and contraction of colonial power throughout the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries prompted academic attempts to understand and explain cultural diversity. The early years of culture theory were shaped by meta-narratives of racial and cultural superiority, and theories of cultural evolution which have since been widely rejected. However, Tylor's (1958) definition of 'culture' has endured. The rejection of social evolutionism, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries saw the onset of functionalist theories on the workings culture and the development of European Social anthropology. European social anthropology was characterised by a denunciation of the ethereal notion of 'culture' in favour of the empirical concept of 'society'. Yet, the resulting theories were often still heavily influenced by attitudes of racial superiority. The study of cultures in context, advocated by Evans-Pritchard, saw European social anthropology begin to move towards a temtative appreciation of cultural relativism. By this time, cultural relativism had already become a defining feature of American Cultural anthropology, championed by Franz Boas and continued by his students.

American cultural anthropology, throughout the mid 20th century, was characterised by the relativistic and holistic study of cultures in context, and theories attempting to define the relationship between cultures and individuals. The school of culture and personality, which developed within the American tradition, put forward the idea of 'cultural configurations,' combining gestalt psychology and psychoanalysis in the formation of a theory that attempted to explain the relationship between cultural norms and individual personality traits, and demonstrate the relativity of cultural values. Simultaneous to the development of the culture and personality school, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1963) were formulating their famous collection of definitions, expounding the intricacies and contested nature of the 'culture' concept, whilst rejecting atomistic cultural analysis and concluding that a definition did not amount to a theory of a concept. Further investigation into the relationship between culture and the individual by Boa's students led to the creation of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis; a theory explaining the inter-relationship between cultural categorisation and language. Concurrently, Levi-Strauss (1963) pondered the

implications of universal human cognitive structures, and Geertz (1973) drew attention to the processes of interpretation and construction inherent in the analysis and explication of cultures. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and ideas of human psychic unity paved the way for investigations into the relationship between culture and cognition.

The work of cognitive anthropologists eventually resulted in the development of schema theory and connectionism; the first theories that could coherently and inclusively account for all the paradoxical aspects of culture. Simultaneously, post-modernist anthropology was formulating the culture critique, questioning the utility of the very concept theorists had spent the past two-hundred years attempting to understand. Since then, anthropologists have attempted to defend 'culture,' formulating holistic accounts of cultures and cultural phenomenon; mindful of the processes of construction and interpretation involved in the discipline, and aware of the positive and negative aspects of the popularisation of the concept.

This chapter has demonstrated the intricacies and contested nature of the concept of culture. A plethora of theories, on the nature and workings of culture, have been explicated and discussed. The evaluation of these theories demonstrates that the concept of culture is far from clear-cut. Misinterpretations of culture can lead to divisionary attitudes of cultural fundamentalism and racialist politics that can only be detrimental to the promotion of positive intercultural relations. However, the clarity and consistency of current cognitive theories on the workings of culture, imbues these theories with the potential to aid in the promotion of understandings of culture that guard against divisionary attitudes of cultural determinism. The differing culture theories presented in this chapter demonstrate that the concept of culture is not as unproblematic as its presentation in cross-cultural training theories may make it seem. The intricacies and contested nature of 'culture' therefore raises questions about which of these theories current cross-cultural training is adhering to and whether current CCT practice is contributing to, or contesting, misinterpretations of 'culture.' These questions are the subject of the following two chapters.

Chapter 6: Cross-cultural Training Practice and Content

Introduction

The following analysis of cross-cultural training content demonstrates how CCT models are integrated into training and some of the positives and negatives of current CCT practice. Variations in training practice, such as the use of either didactic or experiential training methods, affects participants' responses to training. However, similarities in contents and approach make it possible to discern and analyse basic tendencies within CCT. The following documentation and analysis of current CCT practice and content is based on personal participation in two cross-cultural training courses, an examination of CCT training materials, and a series of semi-structured interviews with CCT producers and consumers.

Participant observation was conducted within two CCT courses, a 5hr culture specific workshop on Indigenous cultural awareness, and a three month culture general online training course. Participation in the Indigenous cultural awareness training took place shortly prior to the commencement of this study and is therefore not directly described in the following documentation. This course participation did, however, provide important firsthand experience of a training workshop. The online training course was provided by Mind inc., a company offering virtual people skills training, intended for the international business market. The virtual training was aimed at developing cultural awareness and cross-cultural communication skills. The course focused on cross-cultural variables in business communications and managing culturally diverse workforces. The additional training materials analysed in this chapter consist of booklets provided by training companies and participants, and videos obtained through library and internet searches. Information on training content was also provided by participants during interviews.

The interviews were semi-structured, approximately 1-2 hours in duration and conducted over a period of three months, with six participants. The target groups for participation were those with experience of working with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. Experience of CCT was not an exclusive criterion for participation. Participants were recruited using a snowballing technique. Details of the study were forwarded to 86 organisations including private businesses, government departments, service providers and NGOs, both local to North Queensland and nationally, or internationally, based. Initial enquiries received 27 responses, six of which resulted in interviews. Responses from private companies were minimal. Representatives from the private

sector stated the duration of interviews and irrelevance to their "bottom line" as reasons for not wanting to participate. Positive responses were followed up with e-mail and phone contact during which personal and professional details were exchanged and further details of the study and interview process were provided. The interviews consisted of broad questions, designed to prompt narrative accounts of people's intercultural and CCT experiences. Participants were asked about their experiences of cultural diversity, cultural misunderstandings, cultural identity, culture shock and CCT. The information gained during the interviews is used in both the documentation of training practice and content, and the evaluation of training impact.

Participants' experience of CCT ranged from none, over those who had participated in workshops, to CCT trainers and one CCT guest speaker. The first participant, Ed, is a retired private sector employee of Czech origin. Ed speaks four languages and worked in many different European countries before migrating to Australia in the 1950s; he has never experienced CCT. The second participant, Kay, is Swedish. Kay worked for an NGO in Africa before migrating to Australia; she also spent five years living in Vanuatu. Kay currently works for a North Queensland accommodation centre run by an international NGO. Kay attended an Indigenous cultural awareness workshop approximately one month prior to her interview. The third participant, Tina, was born in Australia; she grew up in Papua New Guinea, before moving back to Australia as an adult, and she later married a Fijian man whilst working as an English teacher in Fiji. Tina currently works for an NGO specialising in multicultural service provision; she is also a cross-cultural trainer. The fourth participant, Vera, works in a multicultural service provision capacity for a local council department, one of her duties is the facilitation of CCT workshops. Vera is Australian by birth and has spent extensive periods of time working for NGOs in Cambodia, China, on the Thai-Burma border, in The Solomon Islands and Malaysia. Vera has also worked in remote Indigenous communities within Australia. The fifth participant, Gillian, describes herself as "an Asian migrant" she currently works in a multicultural liaison capacity for a service provider in North Queensland. Gillian regularly appears as a guest speaker at industry specific cross-cultural training workshops. The sixth participant, Adam, works in an international marketing capacity within the tertiary education sector. Adam describes himself as "Kiwi-pom". Adam's New Zealand born parents migrated to the UK when he was a child; he worked in Japan and Turkey as an English teacher, before moving to Australia. Adam attended a culture general, industry specific, CCT workshop one week prior to his interview. All participants have extensive personal experience of intercultural communication and varying experiences of CCT.

The CCT courses and training materials analysed exhibit many basic similarities in both approach and content. The training courses are primarily culture general, industry, or profession, specific and most utilise a combination of didactic and experiential training methods. Course content tends to be loosely based around the CCT models of culture developed by Hall (1959; 1969; 1977) and Hofstede (1980; 2005). The individualist-collectivist dimension is a recurring theme in most of the culture general courses, as are references to hierarchical and egalitarian cultures, and information on Hall's (1977) high/low context communication theory. Disclaimers are also a common occurrence within the training materials; these tend to take the form of warnings about the dangers of generalising and stereotyping. Many of the courses also include a unit on culture shock. The symptoms of culture shock, described in training materials, roughly correspond to the descriptions provided in psychology literature and participants' accounts of culture shock. Cultural misunderstandings are described in training through the use of both fictional and actual anecdotes. Training anecdotes exhibit some similarities with participants' accounts of cultural misunderstandings. The problematic of intercultural communication tends to be formulated as a consequence of the existence of diversity, in line with the perspectives of dimensional CCT models. Most of the courses tend to promote a conception of culture as synonymous with nationality, with the obvious exception of the Indigenous cultural awareness course. Details of these findings are outlined in the following paragraphs.

Training methods

Training programs tend to utilise a combination of didactic, lecture based and experiential, role-play based training methods. Adam and Gillian's courses both used purely didactic training methods. All other participants reported that their courses used combined approaches. The online course used a combined approach, firstly presenting materials and then demonstrating points using simulations. The majority of training materials collected also advocated combined didactic and experiential approaches. These findings reflect the findings of the DIMIA survey, in which 80.7% of informants reported attending courses utilising a combination of approaches (Bean, 2006). Vera, a trainer, mentioned that the success of experiential training approaches is often dependent on the character of the audience.

> I think it depends how dynamic your audience is... If they are really closed and you expect them to stand up and do a role-play, it just doesn't work.
> (Vera, Personal communication, 22.4.08)

Adam attended a didactic course based solely around presentations and lectures. He suggested that an experiential approach would have made the course more interesting:

> I would have included an element where participants actually did work with an international person … it would have been interesting to have seen a practical a component in the course.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Trainees that had experienced experiential training methods responded positively to them. Kay attended an Indigenous cultural awareness course which used a combined training approach. When Kay was asked about the style of training she offered the following comment:

> It was very interactive ... he put us into groups. Then suddenly "oh you're a chief now and you're this" very interactive, it was good. It was ... interesting getting a bit more information about the history ... "You're a chief or a woman, now your kids have been taken away from you." It was very in your face and that was really good, to make it feel a little bit more that it could have been you. Then ... when everybody could have a say, in the end, some of my Indigenous colleagues ... who have had those experiences themselves and in the family, they came forward, and a lot of them probably wouldn't have said anything otherwise. I think it was very emotional, healing is not the right word, but maybe that it was good for them to be able to let everybody know what happened.
> (Kay, personal communication, 16.04.08)

Kay's trainer used role-play to explain Indigenous kinship and moiety relations and illustrate the impact of Australia's colonial history on Indigenous family structure. This role-play was clearly significant for Kay, it prompted an emotional response and engagement with the material. The role-play expanded her awareness of Indigenous history and culture, and contributed to a more open relationship with her co-workers. However, the usefulness of experiential training is dependent on the points about a culture that trainers are trying to illustrate. Experiential methods within culture specific courses can be extremely useful for demonstrating the intricacies of cultural organisation. However, when experiential methods are used to pre-empt reactions they can become overly prescriptive, appearing to dictate behaviours in a deterministic manner.

The experiential sections of the online course appear prescriptive and deterministic. The course sections begin with a didactic presentation of information, and then the trainee is given a scenario and asked to choose an appropriate response. The section "recognising cultural differences" ends in a scenario and exercise based on a Japanese business meeting.

> Scenario 1: An employee [of unspecified nationality] is scheduled to make a presentation to some prospective, Japanese clients. He has arranged seating for the presentation, placing people from the same companies next to each other. The Japanese are unhappy with the seating arrangements. What has gone wrong?
> (Mind Inc. 2008)

The trainee is asked to choose one of the following options in order to identify the problem.

> Option 1: Japanese business people don't appreciate being told where to sit.
> Option 2: When working with people from other countries, Japanese like to mingle.
> Option 3: In Japan people are seated according to their rank in the organisation.
> (Mind Inc. 2008)

The correct answer is option 3; the explanation given is that, due to the hierarchical nature of Japanese culture, people should be seated in accordance with their company rank. Simulated intercultural scenarios, like this one, give trainees the opportunity to practice applying information. However, many of the simulations in this course appear to make assumptions about the inevitable reactions and behaviours of people from certain countries. Yet, the trainee is conceptualised as possessing the capacity to offer flexible reactions to intercultural situations.

A combination of didactic and experiential training methods enables trainers to impart information, whilst giving trainees practice in applying knowledge. Interactivity can also make training more interesting and enjoyable. However, the success of experiential training methods is often dependent on the responsiveness of the group being trained and the quality of the materials on which simulations are based. Purely didactic approaches to cross-cultural training may be faced with problems of relevancy and application (Bennett, 1986). Trainees may find it difficult to apply didactically imparted information during actual interactions. Such failure in application can lead trainees to question the relevance of teachings (Bennett, 1986). Experiential training methods give trainees practice in application, but their success may be hampered by problems of accuracy (Bennett, 1986). Actual intercultural interactions are confounded by variables, such as individual personalities, moods, histories and relationships. Many of these variables are impossible to incorporate into simulations, which are often based around simplified 'model' situations and prescribed 'model' reactions. Ethnocentrism has also been identified as a potential problem for CCT simulations and role-plays (Bennett, 1986). The simulations within the online course are overwhelmingly presented from an Anglo-American perspective, contrasting the subjects individualistic, egalitarian, competitive values with the collectivist, hierarchical and consensual values of 'other' cultures. Ethnocentric simulations can distort the realities of intercultural interaction and result in trainees formulating expectations based on false premises.The least prescriptive utilisation of role-plays and simulations occurs when they are used to illustrate particular aspects of cultural organisation, such as kinship relations. Within Indigenous cultural awareness training the use of role-play, to illustrate kinship and moiety relations, can help non-Indigenous trainees to understand the structure of Indigenous societies and

reveal the ongoing impacts of past colonial policies. Generally, trainees respond positively to interactive training methods, but didactic methods are often required beforehand, to impart the information on which experiential methods are based. A combined approach appears to be preferable among both trainers and trainees. However, the success and relevance of any training approach is dependent on the quality of course content

Course content

Course content, within culture general courses, tends to be loosely based around the work of intercultural theorists such as Hofstede (1980) and Hall (1959; 1969; 1977). Culture general courses tend to focus on exemplifying cultural differences and value dimensions. However, the nature and relative emphasis placed on different value dimensions varies between courses. Hofstede's (1980; 2005) individualism versus collectivism dimension and Hall's (1977) time orientation theory and high context/low context communication theories, are the most frequently mentioned value dimensions among the courses reviewed. Cultural differences are also described as manifesting in the areas of gender relations, rules of etiquette, non-verbal communication and attitudes towards education and perceptions of status. The information presented within culture specific courses is more detailed, due to their more concentrated focus.

The content of the online course is loosely based around dimensional CCT models. The dominant theme of the course is a distinction between hierarchical and egalitarian cultures. Hierarchical cultures are described as placing importance on rank, humility, deference to authority and face saving (Mind Inc, 2008). Egalitarian cultures are described as valuing equality, attributing status on the basis of merit and promoting individualism (Mind Inc, 2008). Hierarchical cultures are said to accord status on the basis of gender, race, material wealth, familial relations, education, age and corporate positions (Mind Inc, 2008). Conversely, egalitarian cultures accord status on the basis of individual achievement and resent double standards based on gender, race or family background (Mind Inc, 2008). Further cultural differences are described as occurring in people's orientations towards gender roles, religion, race, corporate hierarchies and perceptions of time. Most of these differences are described in accordance with the hierarchical/egalitarian distinction.

Hierarchical cultures are said to enforce traditional gender roles, be male dominated and favour business done by men, in "male settings" (Mind Inc. 2008). Egalitarian cultures, on the other hand, are said not to enforce 'traditional' gender roles and encourage female participation in the workforce (Mind Inc. 2008). Hierarchical cultures are described as using racial differences to reinforce existing social hierarchies; whereas, egalitarian cultures focus on individual capabilities, rather than racial differences (Mind Inc. 2008). Corporate hierarchy is a further dimension of difference described in accordance with the hierarchical/egalitarian dichotomy. Egalitarian cultures are said to create corporate hierarchies on the basis of individual capabilities, whereas hierarchical cultures use corporate hierarchy to reflect family relations or social status (Mind Inc, 2008). Orientations towards time are also described in the context of the hierarchical/ egalitarian distinction. Hierarchical cultures are said to view time as "tied in" with status, meaning that it is acceptable for a higher status person to keep a lower status person waiting. Egalitarian cultures are described simply as having "a more uniform sense of time" (Mind Inc. 2008). Distinctions between individualist and collectivist cultures are subordinated under the hierarchical/egalitarian dichotomy. Hierarchical cultures are described as tending to be collectivist, whereas egalitarian cultures are described as individualist (Mind Inc, 2008). The distinction between so called hierarchical and egalitarian cultures is a defining feature of this training program. The cultural differences described in the course are mainly presented as the results of differing attitudes towards equality and status. However, some cultural differences are described as existing outside of this dichotomy.

Cultural differences, not attributed to the hierarchical/ egalitarian distinction, are described as occurring in the areas of religion and attitudes towards foreigners. Religious differences are described as creating and reinforcing social identities. Trainees are advised to be aware of the role of religious beliefs in everyday life and "the cultural antagonism between faiths" (Mind Inc. 2008). Trainees are instructed to respect everyday rituals and avoid "contentious" conversations (Mind Inc. 2008). The other cultural variable, not ascribed to the hierarchical/ egalitarian distinction, is labelled "attitudes towards foreigners". This variable is used to prompt a discussion of ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is described as occurring when people "elevate their culture to the standard by which all other cultures should be judged" (Mind Inc. 2008). Following this definition is the statement that ethnocentric attitudes can make companies nationalistic (Mind Inc, 2008). The course follows the establishment of these cultural differences with instruction on intercultural communication.

The online course's instruction on intercultural communication includes a discussion of Hall's (1977) high/low context communication theory and information on international business protocol. The presentation of Hall's (1977) high/low context communication theory takes the form of a contrast between Japanese, high context, and American, low context, communication techniques. The discussion of international business protocol covers the importance of translators, attitudes towards gift giving, and the sharing of personal information. Gift giving is described as acceptable business practice within hierarchical cultures. The information on translators emphasises their importance; however, differing cultural perceptions of the role of translators are not mentioned. The sharing of personal information, such as salary amounts, is described as acceptable within hierarchical cultures and unacceptable in egalitarian cultures. The course also discusses the appropriateness of "masculine aggression" during negotiations. "Masculine aggression" is not explicitly described, it is merely referred to as being acceptable in egalitarian, individualistic, European countries and unacceptable in Japan, which is described as collectivist and hierarchical. The discussions of communication techniques and business protocol are supported by simulations and multiple choice questions based on the themes presented during course. The information on business protocol is followed by an introduction to four "key cultural elements" which are loosely based around Hofstede's (1980; 2005) value dimensions.

The "key cultural elements" are described as "individualism versus collectivism, power distance, values and risk avoidance." (Mind Inc, 2008). These elements are described as cultural "types" (Mind Inc, 2008). The elements are clearly lifted from Hofstede's (1980, 2005) five dimensional model: the first element corresponds to the IDV index, the second to the PDI. The third element is labelled "values" however, from the description as "things predominantly emphasised within a culture," and the dichotomous presentation of these things as either material goods, or nurturing and quality of life, it is obvious that this element is based on Hofstede's (1980; 2005) masculinity versus femininity dimension. The "risk avoidance" element is clearly based on Hofstede's (1980; 2005) UAI. However, unlike Hofstede's (1980; 2005) presentation of the dimensions there is no information on country scores or qualifying talk of continuums. Unlike Hofstede's (1980; 2005) value dimensions, the "elements" are presented as dichotomous cultural types. The 'either-or' depiction of diversity within this course fails to acknowledge the dynamic and contextually variable nature of cultural values.

Individualism versus collectivism is the most frequently mentioned cultural difference within the additional training materials analysed. The subsuming of this dimension to an egalitarian/hierarchical dichotomy is a particular characteristic of the online course. Other training materials tend to describe Individualism versus Collectivism as an independent dimension of cultural difference, existing adjacent to egalitarian, or hierarchical, orientations. Descriptions of individualist and collectivist cultures are fairly uniform and generally adhere to the definitions presented by Hofstede (1980; 2005). Hofstede (1980; 2005) describes individualist cultures as those in which the individual takes precedence over the group, where people define themselves as "I" and value self-determination and autonomy, whereas within collectivist cultures, identity is determined through group affiliations; the group takes precedence and individual well-being is achieved through group well-being (Hofstede 1980; 2005). The course materials analysed offered the following descriptions of the individualism/collectivism dimension:

> **Training booklet 1**: Individualism encourages independence, individual achievement, self expression and personal choice. Individualism encourages egalitarian relationships and can see confrontation as salutary. Individualist cultures value private property and individual ownership. Collectivism encourages interdependence and group success, promoting adherence to norms, respect for elders and consensus. People within collectivist cultures only speak up in small groups and appreciate formal harmony. Collectivist cultures encourage hierarchical roles based on gender, family background and age; they also value shared property and group ownership.
>
> **Training booklet 2**: Within collectivist cultures consensus is essential, decision making processes are more drawn out than in individualist cultures … Negotiators from collectivist societies are more likely to spend time on long term goals … Negotiators from individualist societies are more likely to focus on short-term goals.
>
> **Training booklet 3**: In individualist societies the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family. Collectivist societies integrate people, from birth onwards, into strong, cohesive in-groups, often extended families, which continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.
>
> **Training video 1**: The greatest cultural difference occurs in variations between collectivist and individualist values.
>
> They said there are such things as individualist education methodologies and collectivist ones.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Training booklets 1 and 3 include tables showing country scores from Hofstede's (1980; 2005), individualism index. Training booklet 3 also provides summaries and tables for four of Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five value dimensions. Training booklet 1 only mentions that there are five other dimensions and does not describe any of them directly. Training booklet 2 and training video 1 describe four of the other five dimensions, in each case the dimension 'long term versus short term orientations' is left out and temporal orientations are discussed with reference to Hall's (1977) time orientation theory. The video refers to individualism versus collectivism as the "greatest cultural difference," implying the same primacy of this dimension as the selective reference to it in booklet 1. Training booklet 2 does not rate cultural value dimensions; all the dimensions are described as having differing, but equally significant, affects on international business practice. None of the dimensional approaches outlined in chapter three rate certain value dimensions as more, or less, significant than others. The rating of cultural differences appears to be a specific feature of certain training courses, and is demonstrative of the amendments that can occur during the translation of theoretical models into actual training programs.

The labelling of certain countries as collectivist and others as individualist is a common feature among culture general CCT courses, and perhaps a consequence of the quantitative national value ratings presented by the dimensional models. The training materials which accompanied Adam's workshop do qualify statements about individualist or collectivist cultures by explaining that no culture is entirely collectivist or entirely individualistic, and that people may exhibit both collectivist and individualistic traits. However, these qualifying statements are accompanied by references to individualistic German culture, collectivist Brazilian culture, and collectivist Asian culture. For Adam, the labelling of certain nations as individualist, and others as collectivist, led to scepticism about the truth value of this part of the workshop.

> The convenor basically just labelled that nation as collectivist and that nation as individualist and I don't know how much that would ring true.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Later in the interview, Adam, explicitly identifies the use of stereotypes and prescriptive generalisations as a problem with CCT.

> I think its pigeon holing behaviours, pigeon holing expectations as well, the whole idea of sort of boxing up behaviour as set, I think can be quite dangerous, if that person is going to use it to prescribe how he behaves and talks in certain situations.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Adam’s scepticism is most likely a consequence of his extensive personal, intercultural experience. However, among trainees with less intercultural experience the use of generalised, or prescriptive, labels may result in the reinforcement, or creation, of stereotypes.

The affect of disclaimers and qualifying statements, within CCT, is often nullified by the frequent use of generalised labels. Trainees are more likely to remember the repeated labelling of certain nations as collectivist, individualist, egalitarian or hierarchical, than brief qualifying statements or disclaimers; especially when the labels conform to widely held cultural stereotypes, such as ideas of collectivist Japanese or individualist Germans. Training’s use of generalisations, broad labels and references to national cultures, has the potential to paint a false picture of cultural homogeneity and determinism in the minds of inexperienced trainees. The use of generalisations is recognised by training companies as a potential point of contention. Many training materials therefore include a defence of the use of generalisations.

CCT training materials defend the use of generalisations primarily on the basis of brevity and utility. Training booklet 1 refers to the use of generalisations as an “unfortunate reality” necessitated by the “nature of cross-cultural training” (Training booklet 1, 2008). The booklet asks participants to note that terms such as ‘South America,’ ‘The Middle East,’ and ‘Asia’ will be used “for the purpose of simplicity” and “each country will have its own unique culture” (Training booklet 1, 2008). Training booklet 4 justifies the use of generalisations on the basis of utility, arguing that generalisations are to be viewed as a “safety net” helping trainees guard against causing offence during intercultural encounters (Training booklet 4, 2008). Training booklet 4 qualifies the use of generalisations by claiming that the descriptions given are “not definitive”, that every country has “numerous nuances”, and individuals have “personal cultures” (Training booklet 4, 2008). The generalisations used in training are referred to as “loose guidelines” intended to aid people in avoiding offence. These courses justify the use of generalisations on the basis of brevity and utility; in much the same way as Hofstede (2005) justifies the use of nations as units for cultural analysis. The workshop attended by Adam, is accompanied by training booklet 1. The training booklet clearly qualifies the use of generalisations and although this qualification did not go unnoticed by Adam, he felt that the frequent use of generalisations reduced the impact of these qualifying statements.

> It [the CCT] started off really great. It started off by saying that Latin America is a term which applies to 7 or 8 different countries and so it's rather sweeping, because within each of the Latin American countries there are number of cultures ... But once that had been explained ... we were given lots of body language examples ... and I think that they were just a little bit sweeping. I think it's very dangerous to say in that situation a Brazilian person does this or a German person does that.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Adam's intercultural experiences have made him attentive to the role of individual personalities during intercultural encounters and the existence of cultural heterogeneity. He is aware of the dangers of cultural stereotyping and this awareness resulted in a sceptical attitude towards the generalisations presented in the CCT workshop. However, among trainees with less intercultural experience the danger of generalisations resulting in prescriptive understandings of culture is much greater.

The reinforcement, or creation, of stereotypes that can occur during cross-cultural training was mention by Tina in her reply to a question about problems with training. Tina's account of a particular training experience demonstrates the lack of influence trainers have on how trainees interpret, or apply, the information presented to them.

> The other thing is often it [CCT] can set up stereotypes, new stereotypes to substitute for old ones. Also … it can actually reinforce some already pretty hard views, racist views. I've seen that. I was out west one day and there was a lady ... in the groups, and we were doing this cross-cultural training, and she was fine with everything and then we had some cultural profiles out and she turned round and said ... "as long as I don't have to have anything to do with those bastard towel heads" and that was her world, she was ... fine with everyone else, just not that group ... So cross-cultural training from her point of view was selective, and that's what happens. Each of us does what we want with the knowledge and skills that are provided. ... It's not a panacea that's for sure.
> (Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

Tina recognises that CCT can create, or reinforce, stereotypes. In the training instance Tina describes, CCT is selectively applied by the trainee and has done nothing to break down the racialist attitude this trainee holds towards a particular cultural group. Vera, the second cross-cultural trainer interviewed, also mentioned the inability to breakdown hard held prejudices as a problem with current CCT.

> The problem ... I think is definitely winning over those who aren't converted.
> (Vera, personal communication, 22.04.08)

Both trainers mentioned that the instigation of attitudinal changes is the most challenging aspect of CCT. Cross-cultural trainers will often be faced with the challenge of trying to breakdown prejudices. However, as Tina's account demonstrates, teaching about differences does little to

dislodge prejudice in situations where ethnocentric attitudes cause trainees to selectively apply teachings. Understanding differences is undoubtedly a prerequisite for imparting attitudinal change, but so is an understanding of the historical, political and social contexts informing attitudes towards diversity, and an understanding of the multifaceted nature of the concept of culture. The course content of culture general CCT courses is adept at explicating differences. However, explanations of the impacts of history, politics and social relations on attitudes towards diversity, remain underdeveloped in many culture general courses.

Culture specific courses place much greater emphasis on imparting trainees with an understanding of the influences of historical, political and social contexts on intercultural interactions, than most culture general training courses. The Indigenous cultural awareness course, attended by Kay, included a significant amount of information on the affects of past and current policy on relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. The role-play used in this workshop was designed to illustrate the impact of the past policies of protectionism and assimilation on Indigenous societies, both past and present. Firstly, by demonstrating how traditional Indigenous kinship systems work and secondly, by showing how government policies and the removal of children resulted in the breakdown of kinship systems and the mechanisms for social solidarity inherent within them. This role-play demonstrates the part that history and politics have played in contributing to the social problems faced by some Indigenous communities and individuals today. The intention of such role-plays is to break down prejudiced conceptions of Indigenous social problems, and replace these with knowledge of the culture and understandings of the impact of history on the present. In addition to imparting an understanding of the social contexts influencing intercultural relations, such role-plays indicate how the depreciation of this history can result in antagonistic attitudes among individuals from both cultural groups. Kay’s reaction to training was extremely positive, in contrast to Adam’s sceptical reaction to the culture general training he took part in. Kay felt the training had increased her knowledge of Indigenous culture and improved her relations with co-workers. She also mentions positive reactions from participants that began with less accepting attitudes towards Indigenous Australians, demonstrating that this form of culture specific training can help effect attitudinal change.

> Some of the older generation assisting us, some of them have been living out in outback Australia on the cattle stations, and it’s not that they’re racist or anything ... but, they see different now, I think ... It’s really good that they took part ... because they have a bit more understanding.

> (Kay, personal communication, 16.04.08)

Kay's account of co-trainees responses demonstrates the effectiveness of this workshop in instigating attitudinal change. Kay's responses to CCT stand in stark contrast to Adam's responses to training. When Adam was asked about the application of training materials he offered the following response:

> Well I guess I'd bear it in mind ... I wouldn't want to take any of it as gospel and allow it to influence me... If something cropped up then I might think oh, well that is what it said in here. But I don't know if I would apply it directly as opposed to just bearing it in mind. I guess ... I'd take on board some elements of this and disregard some.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Adam states that he may selectively "bear in mind" aspects of the training. Adams response to training demonstrates that the culture general workshop he attended was not as successful, at instigating attitudinal change and avoiding selective trainee application, as Kay's culture specific workshop.

Culture specific CCT workshops are not as limited by what Brumann (1999) calls "the problem of communicative economy" (p.7) as culture general workshops are. The concentrated focus of culture specific course gives trainers scope to examine the complexities and specifics of cultural practices; reducing the chances of training creating or reinforcing cultural stereotypes and enabling an exploration of the historical, political and social contexts which inform attitudes towards diversity and impact intercultural relations. The focus on difference within culture general courses appears to be less effective at instigating attitudinal change, than the culture specific courses combined presentation of cultural and contextual information. The inclusion of information on the roles of historical, political and social contexts within intercultural interactions could help culture general courses avoid selective application and become more effective at instigating attitudinal changes. The increased understandings of culture, which can result from the inclusion of contextual information, may also aid trainees in coping with intercultural problems, such as culture shock.

Culture shock

'Culture shock' is a psychological response to unfamiliar cultural environments (Ward, Bochner & Furnham, 2001). CCT courses tend to conceptualise culture shock as a negative or psychologically detrimental response to unfamiliar cultures. However, academic literature has

posited an alternative conception of 'culture shock' as "an active process of dealing with change" (Ward et al, 2001, p.270). Ward, Bochner and Furnham (2001), identify three components of the psychological process of adjustment which people experience on exposure to unfamiliar cultural environments; an affective component, a behavioural component and a cognitive component. The affective component of culture shock comprises of emotional responses to unfamiliar cultures and is most effectively counteracted by the development of emotional resilience and social support networks (Ward et al, 2001). The behavioural component consists of culturally inappropriate behaviours that result in offence and therefore alienation and increased emotional distress (Ward et al, 2001). This behavioural aspect of culture shock can be counteracted through learning culturally appropriate social skills (Ward et al, 2001). The cognitive component of culture shock results from the loss of shared meanings that occurs when someone enters a cultural environment different from that of their primary socialisation (Ward et al, 2001). This loss of shared meanings can result in anxiety and the misinterpretation of others motivations. The cultivation of cultural relativism is the most effective means of counteracting the cognitive component of culture shock (Ward et al, 2001). Reverse culture shock is also widely recognised as a psychological processes experienced by people on re-entering their home country after a sojourn (Ward et al, 2001). Reverse culture shock can take the form of stresses, anxieties or irritations resulting from the apparent unfamiliarity of someone's home culture after re-entry (Ward et al, 2001). The CCT course materials reviewed tend to provide descriptions of symptoms of culture shock, accompanied by advice on coping strategies.

CCT descriptions of culture shock tend to focus on delineating affective and behavioural symptoms, and coping strategies. Training booklet 1 describe culture shock as comprising of depression, confusion, anxiety, disorientation, loneliness, withdrawal from work or social activities and a need for more sleep. The coping strategies described are, acknowledgement that one's experiences are stemming from culture shock, keeping in touch with support networks, getting plenty of rest, food and exercise and participating in CCT simulations in order to ease the transition into a foreign culture. Training booklet 4 refers to culture shock as a stage of relocation, during which differences in behaviour and the stresses of adjustment can result in "dislike, or criticism, of the host culture" (Training booklet 4, 2009). This training manual describes the primary symptoms of culture shock as homesickness, lethargy, hostility towards the host culture, boredom and irritability. The primary coping strategies, referred to in booklet 4, are learning to recognise culture shock and learning about the host culture prior to relocation. Training video 2

makes a brief reference to culture shock describing it as consisting of a "psychological reaction" to cultural difference. This video describes prior learning, about the culture one is relocating to, as the most effective way of minimising culture shock. The online course, training booklets 2 and 3 and training video 1 make no reference to culture shock, probably because they are aimed at guiding trainees through brief intercultural encounters, such as business meetings, rather than extended sojourns. The focus on affective, or behavioural, symptoms within CCT descriptions of culture shock and the symptoms described, correspond to participants' accounts of culture shock.

Participants' descriptions of culture shock tend to focus on affective and behavioural symptoms. The symptoms of culture shock described by participants are anger, irritation, emotional instability, strange behaviours and homesickness. Surprisingly, the most frequent kind of culture shock described by participants is reverse culture shock. The primary coping strategies, described by participants, are recourse to social support networks and awareness of one's culture shock. Participants also mention adopting the practices of the host culture, self analysis, regaining a sense of control and acceptance by the host culture, as important factors in counteracting the negative effects of culture shock. When asked if they had ever experienced culture shock participants offered the following accounts:

> I don't think I did so much the first time I went out to Africa because it was so new ... I think the first culture shock that I had was when I moved to Tasmania ...I thought I could handle that well because I'd been in Africa and that is so different... The difference from moving to Tasmania and moving to Africa was that [in Africa] there were always other people that are there for 2 or 3 years, and you don't have your friends or family there, so you quickly want to make friends with the others. When I moved to Tasmania everybody had their own circle of friends it took much longer to get into that society. I also ... had a bit of a culture shock when I went to Vanuatu ... I thought it would be the same as when I went to Africa. Those years were fantastic. Then of course it didn't happen within the first week and then I was really ready to go home. So, yeah you do get a culture shock I think because you have your own expectations and it doesn't happen like that.
> (Kay, personal communication, 16.04.08)

> When I went to Fiji, I got really, really angry. At the time I didn't recognise what it was ... First with little things, then I went through a period of time where everything made me angry, everything all the smallest most pathetic things really. The buses when the engines blew up made me angry, when there was no chalk at school it made me angry, everything.
> (Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

> Even after years of travelling I still get that and I think it manifests itself in ways that you might not think. I guess it's like stress. I don't think it manifests itself as culture shock. I

> think it's things like, whereas you initially wanted to read all the Japanese magazines, suddenly you're going out and buying the Daily Express, which I wouldn't even do in England ...You suddenly find yourself behaving a little different ... your emotional pendulum swings much more strongly ...You go from being deliriously happy to being quite depressed.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

Kay, Tina and Adam all describe experiencing negative emotional responses to the unfamiliar environments. Their descriptions of culture shock correspond to some of the symptoms outlined in training materials, such as hostility or irritation towards host cultures, loneliness and homesickness. The different behaviours described by Adam, such as "buying the Daily Express" appear to be a reaction towards the loss of shared meaning that can occur when living within a foreign culture, the cognitive component of culture shock. However, rather than this resulting in anxiety or misinterpretation of others behaviours, Adam's unfamiliarity with his host culture resulted in a gravitation towards the familiar. Kay attributes her lack of culture shock, when exposed a vastly different culture, to the existence of support networks. Kay's experience of culture shock was much more extreme when these support networks were absent; despite greater similarities between home and host cultures. Kay's experiences demonstrate that culture shock is not just caused by unfamiliarity. Although unfamiliarity does play a role in prompting experiences of culture shock, as Adam and Tina's accounts demonstrate. Gillian's responses to questions about culture shock demonstrate that culture shock can be a response to unfamiliarity and lack of support networks within both unfamiliar cultural environments and new work environments.

> It was a bit of a culture shock when I started in this job. Yeah because, I'm a migrant, secondly I'm female and the profession where I work is a male dominated profession... So it was very hard to settle at first and be accepted ... but I kept going and over the years I earned respect and acceptance.
> (Gillian, personal communication, 28.03.08)

Gillian's reference to her job and the lack of support she initially received corresponds to Adams observation, that 'culture shock' can be a response to any form of unfamiliarity with ones social environment and is not exclusively a response to cultural difference. The argument that culture shock is not only a response to unfamiliarity is supported by the frequency with which participants referred to experiences of reverse culture shock.

> Then when I came back to Australia and we landed at the airport and we saw all the food, I became very angry at just disgusting, disgusting food everywhere. I became irate.
> (Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

> You also get a culture shock moving back to your home country. I mean I got a culture shock moving back to Sweden after two and a half years in Africa and then immediately moving back to Australia from Vanuatu as well.
> (Kay, personal communication, 16.04.08)

> I used to work in a language centre in New Zealand that had exit and entry orientation. So they'd have an entry orientation saying ... "...when you go to another country to learn a language and you learn so much more than just the language. You're a different person when you come back. You've seen different things, different experiences, so ... you may find yourselves negatively judging your own countrymen, because your using a different template to judge them by."
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

> I've probably experienced more culture shock coming back to Australia ... I'd been back 10 minutes from Cambodia and I was on a tram in Melbourne and two girls got on and sat behind ... for about twenty minutes they did nothing but discuss the colour of nail polish and lipstick ... I could feel myself swelling up with anger that this is so superficial. I have just been with people whose lives have been torn apart by landmines, health services no longer operate, if they do it's at the end of a shot gun and they're worrying about their lipstick ... That is always one incident that just stays in my head ... just so superficial, but also taken for granted ... I just had to take a deep breath and just go calm down.
> (Vera, personal communication, 22.04.08)

Participants' experiences of reverse culture shock are often the result of new standards of judgement which they have developed as a result their time abroad. The re-entry orientation described by Adam mentioned these adjustments of judgement standards, and was therefore adept at drawing attention to the existence and causes of reverse culture shock. Awareness of culture shock, within oneself and as something that may be affecting sojourners around you, is the most frequently mentioned coping strategy among participants.

> I think it's just that you should be aware that it will probably come and you have to just tough it out…. and try to find ways of getting used to it, try to get engaged.
> (Kay, personal communication, 16.04.08)

> I probably could have done with someone to talk ... I suppose I just analysed it and ... recognised what was happening. It still doesn't stop you from having those sorts of feelings, but at least it gives you a way of sort of talking yourself into some sort of self control.
> (Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

> I think in terms of cultural awareness that it [culture shock] is quite an important thing to consider, not so much where [someone] comes from, but the fact they are from somewhere different to here, which can make them seem grumpy, or surly, or rude. And it might just be the fact that they are somewhere new as opposed to where they come from.

(Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

The coping strategies described by participants roughly correspond to the coping strategies described by the CCT courses, such as self-awareness and the utilisation of support networks. CCT can help peoples cope with culture shock by raising trainees' awareness of the readjustments necessary for coping with extended sojourns. The participants' frequent accounts of reverse culture shock indicate that culture shock is not simply a reaction to difference, but also the result of clashes between people's judgement standards and the realities around them. The adjustments in participants' judgement templates, that are the causes of reverse culture shock, also demonstrate the lifelong malleability of judgement standards. The standards by which we judge others are not invariably determined by the cultural standards of the countries of our primary socialisation. If our cultural judgement standards were rigidly fixed the whole project of imparting cultural awareness and sensitivity would be impossible. However, despite the assumption that value judgement standards must be malleable, many CCT course still present images of a cultural 'other' that appear fixed and predetermined. Some of the anecdotes used in training reinforce this image of a culturally determined inflexible 'other.'

Cultural misunderstandings

Anecdotes, actual and fictional, are frequently used within CCT as a means of illustrating cultural differences and the nature of 'cultural misunderstandings'. The online course uses fictional anecdotes to illustrate how cultural misunderstandings can occur as a result of dimensional value differences. One such anecdote outlines strained negotiation processes between an American negotiator and his Japanese counterparts.

> After two days of negotiation the American businessmen believe they have come to an agreement, only to find that the Japanese business people want to take a break in negotiations in order to confer with their superiors. It takes a further two days for the Japanese representatives to return to negotiations, at which point a decision is made (Mind Inc, 2008).

This anecdote is described as, illustrating the hurdles of negotiating between low power-distance cultures, like the US, and high power-distance cultures, like Japan (Mind Inc, 2008). The trainee is advised to be aware of the delays that can occur when negotiating in high-power-distance cultures (Mind Inc, 2008). Adam also describes the use of an anecdote during training.

> There was an example of an English teacher, who had an Islamic student who kept looking at her chest. She looked into why this is happening and his answer was "in my country we don't like eye contact" so he would look down as opposed to left or right ... or whatever. The advice that the teacher was given was not to confront that person directly, because that's not what they do in his country... but actually refer it to a male colleague

> who would then report back to the student saying, not that his colleague felt uncomfortable, but that the male colleague himself had observed the action and was commenting on it. Whereby removing the female from the entire interaction.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

This anecdote is used to illustrate cultural differences in body language and 'saving face'. Training booklet 5 presents an anecdotal account of an international acquisition, in which a French company takes over the running of an American company.

> The French company sends representatives into the American office; these representatives are required to report back on office activities to the head office in France. The American employees are suspicious of the report, presented in French to their new bosses. This suspicion results in the American employees viewing their French counterparts as spies, an attitude which results in a drop in productivity
> (Training booklet 5, 2007).

This anecdote is described as illustrating differing orientations towards hierarchy. France is subsequently described as a hierarchical culture and America is described as an egalitarian culture (Training booklet 5, 2007). The advice given in the booklet is that the American employees should be offered cultural awareness training, in order to develop employee understandings of the hierarchical-egalitarian, or power-distance, dimension of cultural difference. The provision of cultural awareness training for the French employees is described as unfeasible because, "hoping the French would change their behaviour was not realistic" (Training booklet 5, 2007). This final statement expresses the idea that people from some cultures are capable of adapting to intercultural encounters, whereas people from other cultures are not. Such selectively deterministic statements may reinforce the kind of misinterpretations of culture and 'the other' that are the subject of the culture critique. Anecdotal accounts of cultural misunderstandings, within CCT, overwhelmingly conceptualise cultural differences as the causes of misunderstandings. The claim that difference is the root cause of cultural misunderstandings corresponds to the interpretation of cultural misunderstandings presented in dimensional CCT models. In contrast, participants' descriptions of culture misunderstandings place much more emphasis on the causal role of people's attitudes towards diversity.

Participants' descriptions of cultural misunderstandings exhibit greater recognition of the role that attitudes towards diversity can play in confounding intercultural encounters. Participants recognise that misinterpretations of behaviours may prompt cultural misunderstandings. However, most feel that negative or impatient attitudes towards differences are the primary causes of cultural misunderstandings. Participants were asked whether they had ever experienced or had to negotiate a cultural misunderstanding, they offered the following responses;

> There was a colleague who didn’t understand someone, and also just didn’t take the time to try and understand ... So it was really a case of just sitting down with both of them and ... going right, you’re question was this, then talking to [the colleague] and saying “why did you react” and [the colleague] saying “oh I couldn’t understand him” and “I didn’t have time”. You have to make time.
> (Vera, personal communication, 22.04.08)

> Yes, in my dealings there have been a lot of misunderstandings involving culture, especially in dealing with refugees, and Middle Eastern clients ... It’s the lack of awareness about how people behave and talk in another culture. When a Caucasian person talks to these people they will find it hard and some of them, in order to get away from the situation, will say “the person doesn’t speak English” or “I didn’t understand”... if a person has an accent and the other person can’t live with that, they weren’t happy to talk with you because of a lack of patience
> (Gillian, personal communication, 28.03.08)

> There was something within work in Lesotho. We had people, who came up, and ... the way they were dealing with the local people, they were a bit ... domineering ... and wouldn’t listen. [The NGO] is really trying to work together with the people ... and they weren’t really doing that. So we had to talk with them and with the people, and the villages where they worked and we tried to sort it out.
> (Kay, personal communication, 16.04.08)

Vera, Gillian and Kay all describe situations in which people’s attitudes towards ‘others’ exacerbate misunderstandings or communicative breakdowns. Adam’s description of a cultural misunderstanding, below, involves the mistaken expectations that can occur from belief in cultural stereotypes.

> I was teaching a bunch of Koreans and Japanese and this Korean guy new a bit of Japanese. And the only phrase he knew ... was “your mother is a dog” and he said it out loud to the Japanese person. At which point [the Japanese student] jumped across the desk and started fighting with him ... to me that was obviously offensive. The bloke knew exactly what he was saying, but didn’t expect that sort of reply or violent reaction, from somebody from the Japanese culture.
> (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

The misunderstanding in Adam’s example occurred because the Korean student’s stereotypical understanding of Japanese culture led to a false expectation regarding the Japanese student’s response to his insult. This misunderstanding was caused by a misconceived attitude towards a cultural ‘other’ and exemplifies the role attitudes towards diversity play in prompting cultural misunderstandings. Tina is the only participant that offered an example of a cultural misunderstanding that involved the misinterpretation of another’s behaviour.

> A worker came into the room and said “it’s very glary in here” ... I didn’t realise what she really wanted was for me to close the blinds. Instead of asking directly she was using her own form of communication. That form of communication still within our own workplace ... is a major area of potential conflict.

(Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

The cultural misunderstanding in Tina's example occurred as a result of differences in high and low context communication. Tina is a CCT trainer and is used to providing anecdotal accounts of cultural misunderstandings in training. It is therefore unsurprising that her account of a cultural misunderstanding corresponds to Hall's (1977) contextual communication theory. The examples of cultural misunderstandings provided by participants demonstrate that the existence of cultural differences is not the only cause of cultural misunderstandings. Cultural misunderstandings can also be prompted by negative attitudes towards difference and beliefs in cultural stereotypes. Yet, training references to the causal role of negative attitudes towards diversity and the consequences of cultural stereotypes are minimal. Instead, training anecdotes tend to focus on cultural differences as the primary causes of cultural misunderstandings, in much the same way as the dimensional models. The conception of cultural differences as the primary, or singular, causes of cultural misunderstandings can lead some trainees to expect that formulaic learning of cultural behaviours can nullify intercultural communicative problems.

The expectation that cross cultural training can provide an infallible formula for intercultural communicative success is a primary problem for CCT, and a problem that is perpetuated by an adherence to dimensional models of cultural difference. Tina's discussion of problems with CCT included the comment that trainees expect to be provided with a formula for correct intercultural interaction.

> Well one of the big issues is that some people think there's a formula ... we just talk and hint, but some people see it as a formula: First you do this and then you do this ... like there's one kind of formula.
> (Tina, personal communication, 27.04.08)

Tina experience of trainees expecting a formula for successful interaction is reminiscent of the documentation of Hall's experiences of early cross-cultural training at the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Moon, 1996). The FSI trainees' desire for pragmatic, goal orientated training prompted Hall's reformulation of the training program, and the creation of the FSI paradigm. Tina's account demonstrates that some trainees' still expect CCT to provide formulaic guidance for intercultural interactions. Hall (1959) eventually emulated this expectation in his statement that researchers will find "the equivalent of musical scores that can be learned, for each type of man or woman" (Hall, 1959, p.214). Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five dimensional model and Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) seven dimensional model provide such formulas, and dimensional approaches to training perpetuate the idea that successful cross-

cultural communication can be achieved through the formulaic learning of CCT guides. However, as the previous chapter demonstrated, understanding culture and the relationship between cultural norms and individuals is far more complex than the presentation of these concepts in dimensional CCT. Some trainees do desire formulaic guides to intercultural interactions and these desires can put pressure on trainers to conform to trainee expectations and offer such guides. However, in cases such as Adam's, where trainees already have a basic understanding of the nuanced and variable influences of culture, the presentation of formulaic guides can result in trainees dismissing training as overly prescriptive and inaccurate.

> I think what it [CCT] does is it underestimates the adaptability of humans completely. I think it tries to pigeon hole things to the point where it's almost like a program, it's like a sort of skinneresque behaviourist programming, as opposed to people using ... their own judgemental ability to decide what they do and what they don't do in certain situations. (Adam, personal communication, 19.06.08)

The formulaic approach of Adam's workshop prompted him to question the utility of the training. As a result, Adam was doubtful about whether he would attend CCT in the future. Conversely, trainees with little personal intercultural experience may use CCT guides to try and pre-empt others behaviours; a practice that can result in actions equally as misguided as behaviours based on a lack of cultural knowledge. The expectation, that CCT can provide formulaic guides for behaviours, is a result of dimensionally based CCT's focus on difference. Participants' accounts of cultural misunderstandings demonstrate that attitudes towards diversity have as great an influence on the success of intercultural interactions as knowledge of differences. This conclusion is supported by the position of developmental models for CCT such as the DMIS (Bennett, 1986; 1993). By increasing training's focus on the role of attitudes in intercultural interactions trainers may be able to diminish the false expectation that there is a correct and learnable formula for intercultural success.

Conclusion

CCT varies in its focus, aims, quality and success, but CCT also exhibits some significant similarities with regard to the information which is presented and the problems which training faces. Training tends to utilise a combination of experiential and didactic methods. However, the methods used may vary in accordance with the character of the audience being trained. There are advantages and disadvantages inherent in both methods; these may be overcome or exacerbated by combining approaches. Participants responded positively to experiential methods. However, the experiential sections of the online course appeared overly prescriptive. Participants' responses

to didactic methods were less positive and didactic CCT can be faced with problems of relevancy. However, didactic training is often a necessary precursor to experiential methods.

The degree of detail provided in courses varies between culture specific and culture general training programs. Culture general courses tend to adhere to the teachings of dimensional models more closely than culture specific courses. Value dimensions are often presented as dichotomous, or ranked according to the degree of influence they are perceived as exerting. The prominence accorded to the different dimensions varies between courses. However, the most frequently mentioned dimension appears to be Hofstede's (1980; 2005) individualism versus collectivism dimension. The rating of dimensions is a specific feature of CCT and is demonstrative of how the dimensional models have been adapted for training purposes.

The culture general courses analysed all use nationality as the primary unit of analysis. The equivocation of nationality with cultural identity is justified on the basis of utility and necessity. Most courses and training materials attempt to qualify the use of nations and cultural types with disclaimers. However, the use of disclaimers and qualifying statements did not appear to have as much salience, with participants, as the use of generalised labels. The reinforcement, or recreation, of stereotypes was recognised by trainers as a problem with CCT, as was the selective application of training materials. Culture specific courses are less limited by time constraints, than culture general courses, and are therefore able to offer more detail on the impacts of politics and history on intercultural relations. This broader focus results in greater success in facilitating attitudinal change and fewer problems with selective application. The inclusion of more contextual information and a reduced emphasis on difference as a barrier could help CCT avoid the creation of stereotypes and solve the problem of selective application. Inclusion of more contextual information could also aid training in imparting attitudinal change.

The information on culture shock, provided within training materials, roughly corresponded to academic research and participants' accounts of culture shock. Reverse culture shock was the only aspect of this phenomenon that received more frequent reference from participants than it did in CCT training materials. This is most likely a consequence of the particular aims and target audiences of the courses analysed. Courses aimed at sojourners are more likely to include units on

reverse culture shock than courses aimed at multicultural service provision or intercultural business.

Anecdotal accounts of cultural misunderstandings are common within CCT. Anecdotes are predominantly used to illustrate how value dimensions affect communication. CCT anecdotes tend to conceptualise difference as the primary cause of cultural misunderstandings. Conversely, participants tended to conceptualise cultural misunderstandings as resulting from detrimental attitudes towards diversity. The focus on difference, within CCT, appears to be a consequence of the interplay between influential dimensional models and trainee expectations. CCT's focus on difference plays on and perpetuates trainees' expectations that cross-cultural training can provide a formula for successful intercultural interaction. However, among those with extensive personal intercultural experience the presentation of dimensionally based formulaic guides can result in trainees questioning the accuracy, or necessity, of training.

Culture general cross-cultural training courses appear to have inherited many of the problems of the dimensional models on which they tend to be based. The prescriptive and deterministic nature of the dimensional models is exacerbated by the dichotomous presentation of value dimensions, that occurs in training. The problems of culture general CCT are apparent in participants' reactions to training. Participants, like Adam, with extensive intercultural experience, may be dismissive about the accuracy and utility of CCT. Trainees with less intercultural experience may selectively apply CCT concepts, or use them to reinforce stereotypes. Reactions to culture specific courses appear more positive, indicating that culture specific courses may be more successful at imparting attitudinal change than dimensionally based culture general training. The above analysis of CCT content demonstrates the positives and negatives of current CCT practice and the impact that training content has on participants' reactions to training. The following chapter examines how CCT courses conceptualise culture and the relationship between CCT conceptualisations of culture, CCT models, anthropological culture theory and participants' understandings of culture.

Chapter 7: CCT Conceptions of Culture and the Influences of Training

Introduction

Culture is a contested concept, as the review of anthropological culture theory in chapter five demonstrates; the manner in which CCT courses conceptualise culture determines whether CCT is open to the criticisms of the post-modernist culture critique. The following chapter draws on the information presented in the previous six chapters, in conjunction with the interview findings, in order to provide an analysis of CCT conceptions of culture. The analysis demonstrates the relationship between CCT conceptions of culture and anthropological culture theory and the influences of CCT on participants' orientations towards diversity. The first section of this chapter examines the relationship between conceptions of culture within the dimensional models and anthropological culture theory. The second section explores the connections between the dimensional models and representations of culture within training by means of critical discourse analysis. The discourse analysis explicates training definitions of culture and examines patterns of expression and rhetoric within training materials. The construction of values, identities and agencies, within training materials are analysed in conjunction with an examination of the motivations behind CCT and the development of CCT discourse. The analysis of CCT discourse reveals how culture is conceptualised within training, and also how the culture critique applies to CCT. The third section of this chapter examines participants' understandings of culture. Participants' understandings of culture are grouped in accordance with the orientations towards diversity outlined in Bennett's (1986; 1993) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS). The grouping of participants' orientations towards diversity, in accordance with the stages of the DMIS, enables conclusions to be drawn about the relative influences of CCT on participants' conceptions of diversity. The final section of this chapter explores the possibility of integrating cognitive anthropology and CCT.

CCT theory and anthropological culture theory

The relationship between CCT models of culture and anthropological culture theory is apparent in the enumerative definitions of culture offered by the creators of the dimensional models. Hall (1977) describes culture as learned, shared, patterned, pervasive and subconsciously influential. Hofstede (2005) describes culture as "patterns of thinking, feeling, and potential acting … learned through a lifetime" (p.2). Hofstede (2005) also describe collectivity and geographical determination as defining features of culture. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) place

even greater emphasis on the geographical location of culture, defining culture as subconscious, directive, learned, conventionalized, historically and geographically constituted, variable and functional. These definitions all enumerate certain features of culture, in much the same way as Tylor's (1958) definition. The culture-onion analogy, used by Hofstede (2005), also enumerates specific features of culture; its manifestations in material objects, practices, beliefs and values. The dimensional models themselves also constitute enumerative definitions, as they all seek to explicate certain features of culture. These enumerative definitions of culture are open to the same criticisms as enumerative anthropological definitions. The enumerations of aspects of culture, presented by the dimensional models, represent attempts to delineate concrete features of an abstract concept. The dimensional models' conceptions of culture will therefore invariably leave out much of that which constitutes culture and be faced with the problem of reification. The dimensional model's focus on specific dimensions of culture limits the interpretive possibilities one can employ, when attempting to interpret cultural behaviours. The limitations of enumerative definitions of culture are as much of a problem for CCT theory as they are for anthropological theories of culture. However, the transference of concepts, and problems, from anthropology to CCT does not end with enumeration. The influence of anthropological culture theory is also evident in the dimensional models starting points.

Functionalist theories of culture, of the kind posited by Malinowski (1944) and Radcliffe-Brown (1952), are apparent in the theoretical foundations of both the five and the seven dimensional models. Both Hofstede (1980, 2005) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) describe culture as a functional response to a set of basic, universal, problems of the human condition, in an understanding reminiscent of Malinowski's (1944) theory of needs. Hofstede (2005) also conceptualises societal responses to these problems in terms of law-like tendencies which exhibit cross-cultural regularity, in a manner similar to Radcliffe-Brown's (1952) theory of social structure. The functionalist understandings of culture posited by Hofstede (2005) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) leave their models open to many of the same criticisms as functionalist anthropological theories. The dimensional models, like Malinowski's (1944) theory of needs, reduce complex cultural systems to "simplistic notions of utility" (Kuper, 1996, p.31). Cultural anomalies are ignored, whilst cultural coherence and integration are exaggerated. The result is an overly static, a-historical, conceptualisation of culture which fails to adequately recognise the existence of social conflict and culture dynamism. The dimensional model's adherence to functionalist conceptions of culture creates the same problems for CCT

theories as it did for early social anthropologists and this is not the only similarity between CCT theory and European social anthropology.

European social anthropology and CCT theory both emphasise the delineation of concrete social phenomena. However, whilst social anthropologists avoided the conceptual problems of culture by concentrating on the observable realities of society, the dimensional models focus on attempts to describe culture. The strict separation of the concepts of society and culture allowed European social anthropologists to avoid the reification that occurs when concrete characteristics are attributed to an abstract concept. Radcliffe-Brown (1952) recognised that without the separation of the concepts of society and culture, the project of delineating concrete social phenomena would be fallacious and futile, “We do not observe a ‘culture’ since that word denotes not any concrete reality but an abstraction” (p.190). CCT theory exhibits the same emphasis on the delineation of concrete societal characteristics as European social anthropology. However, the dimensional models do not separate society and culture and therefore end up attributing concrete, observable, features to an abstract concept. The emphasis on observable realities within CCT is a result of the pragmatic approach to intercultural study introduced by Hall’s (1959) FSI training program. The impact of the pragmatic FSI paradigm is clearly evident in the dimensional model’s focus on the influence of cultural values on behaviours. However, the emphasis on concrete cultural phenomena, within the dimensional models, reduces culture to a finite number of empirical functions. Such reductionist conceptions of culture, like enumerative definitions, invariably leave out much of that which constitutes culture, thus limiting the explanatory force of the dimensional models. European social anthropology has clearly had a significant influence on CCT theory, but American cultural anthropology has been equally as influential in the formulation of the dimensional models.

The influence of American cultural anthropology on CCT theory is evident in Hall’s (1977) definitions of culture, the dimensional models focus on national cultural values and Hofstede’s (2005) separation of individual and cultural levels of analysis. Hall’s (1977) definitions of culture, as outlined in Chapter Three, emphasise cultural patterns and the influence of culture on personalities. These ideas are reflective of the American anthropological school of thought labelled culture and personality. Ruth Benedict (1955), a founder of the culture and personality school, argues that cultures can be understood through the particular patterns of value

configurations which they exemplify. The delineation of cultures, through reference to value configurations, is evident in Hall's (1977) definition of culture as "patterns [which]…make life meaningful and differentiate one group from another." (p.14). Hofstede's (2005) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's (1997) dimensional models also describe cultures in terms of the exhibition of configurations of core values. However, the dimensional models appear to assume the equivalence of values despite their occurrence in different cultural contexts. Benedict (1995 orig. 1934), on the other hand, explicitly acknowledges that, "categories become a liability, when they are taken as inevitable and applicable alike to all civilizations and events" (p. 238). Benedict's (1955; 1975) influence on CCT theory is also apparent in the model's attribution of cultures to nations. The notion of 'national character' exemplified in Benedict's (1975) work "The Chrysanthemum and the Sword' is reflected in the national focus of the dimensional models. The influence of American cultural anthropology, on CCT theory, also extends to the separation of the individual and cultural levels of analysis and the elemental approach to cultural investigation, advocated by Hofstede (1980). The separation of individual and cultural levels of analysis and a conception of culture as a supra-individual organising force were first advocated by Alfred Kroeber. Kroeber (1944) also posited an elemental approach to culture studies which entailed the division of cultures into minimal analytical units (Moore, 2004). Kroeber was eventually forced to abandon the elemental method, as he found nothing regulatory or universally equivalent in the data he had collected. Within CCT theory, the drive for concrete and comparable data on national cultures, led to a revival of the elemental approach and the apparent discovery of the equivalent categories that Kroeber had been unable to find. The influence of American cultural anthropology is evident in the dimensional model's emphasis on value configurations, national cultures, the separation of cultural and individual levels of analysis and their elemental approach. However, the models fail to address some of the more critical areas of American anthropology.

CCT theory does not reflect the holistic approach to culture studies, characteristic of American cultural anthropology since the time of Boas. Boas (1932) advocated the study of cultures in context, arguing that culture is a dynamic force of historical agency and that cultures must be analysed as wholes, rather than just collections of analytical parts (Kuper, 1996). Boas (1932), like Kroeber (1952), was doubtful about the possibility of classificatory studies identifying valid cultural laws (Moore, 2004). This scepticism was reflected in the holistic approaches taken by Boas' students. Benedict (1955) advocated the study of cultures as wholes, which consisted of

more than just the sum of their parts. Kroeber (1944; 1952) attempted and then abandoned an atomistic approach to cultural study and Sapir (1968) emphasised the dynamic nature of culture and the formative role of individual agency. American cultural anthropologists have tended to qualify classificatory studies of culture with recognition of the localised applicability and limitations of categories (Benedict, 1955). The dimensional models conceptualise their cultural categories as universally applicable; the models assume the equivalent significance of values despite their occurrence in different cultural contexts. The lack of acknowledgement of the role of context in determining the character and interpretation of values leaves CCT theory open to the same criticisms as Levi-Strauss' (1963) structuralism.

Levi-Strauss' (1963) structuralism can be criticised for rendering 'native' interpretations of the meaning of cultural practices irrelevant. Structuralist analyses of cultures subordinate the descriptive role of cultural contexts by attributing explanatory primacy to universal mental structures. Comparatively, dimensional models subordinate the descriptive role of context, by attributing causal primacy to a finite number of universal value tendencies. Dimensional models attempt to describe cultures by recourse to values, which are described as prompting similar behaviours and perceptual tendencies irrespective of the cultural contexts in which they occur. Like structuralism, the dimensional model's subordination of particular contexts, to a universally applicable framework, renders native interpretations of cultural practices and meanings irrelevant. However, opposing theories, which attribute explanatory primacy to context, like Geertz's (1973) interpretivism, are incapable of providing the concrete information necessary for cross-cultural training.

Interpretivists, like Geertz (1973), emphasise the explanatory role of context in deciphering the meaning of cultural practices. Geertz (1973) argued that the study of cultures must consist of the interpretation of the symbolic meaning of particular practices and this can only be done by recourse to the symbolic, culturally specific, contexts in which particular practices act as signs. Interpretive theory is adept at describing perceptions of cultural differences. Geertz (1973) argues that unfamiliarity with a culture's symbolic language and the meanings attributed to specific contexts, can give rise to perceptions of cultural difference. However, if understanding a culture is a matter of interpretation and interpretations can be multiple the project of consistently providing training on the nature and manifestations of culture becomes impossible. Hall's (1959)

experiences at the FSI and Tina's negative experiences of trainers teaching anthropological theory indicate that the ethereal nature of interpretivist conceptions of culture is not compatible with the needs and desires of CCT trainees. Yet, catering to the desires of CCT trainees has resulted in a conception of culture that is open to the criticisms of the post-modernist culture critique.

The post-modernist culture critique claims that anthropological conceptions of culture have created a false picture of bounded, geographically determined, cultural homogeneity which ignores the complexities of human social life (Abu-Lughod, 1993). The applicability of this critique to both traditional and contemporary anthropological conceptions of culture is debateable. However, the a-historical attribution of cultures to nations, in conjunction with a subordination of context to a descriptive framework that consists of a finite number of universally applicable values, renders dimensional CCT models open to these criticisms. The models reduce individual differences to descriptive cultural norms and reify culture by attributing deterministic force to cultural values. These processes of 'othering' emphasise homogeneity at the expense of recognising cultural change and intra-cultural inconsistencies. Nation states are conflated with cultures and the world is divided into a finite number of bounded, geographically determined, antagonistic groups. This perceived cultural antagonism is exacerbated by the representation of diversity as divisionary. Wikan (1999) argues that such processes of 'othering' elevate some to the level of reasoning, reflecting human beings, capable of adapting to changing circumstances, whilst others "are portrayed as caught in the web of culture and propelled to do as culture bids." (p.58). The dimensional models grant trainees a capacity for adaptability, whereas the behaviours of others are conceptualised as pre-determined by their cultural identities. As Wikan (1999) argues, "A model of the human being that portrays the person as a product rather than an agent and as caught in the grip of culture is reductionist and hence racist." (p.58). If Brumann (1999) is correct in arguing that the culture critique only applies to certain misrepresentations of culture, then it is logical to conclude that the conceptions of culture presented by dimensional CCT models constitute such a misrepresentation. The extent to which these misrepresentations carry through to CCT content is explored below.

Conceptions of culture within training materials

The following section explores conceptions of culture within training content, in order to determine the extent to which misrepresentations of culture manifest within training materials.

The following analysis of CCT discourse begins by presenting definitions and understandings of culture, as identified within the training materials analysed in Chapter Six. Patterns of expression and rhetoric are examined as to how they represent culture, identities and agency. The constructions of culture, identity and agency, identified within training materials, are then compared to representations of these constructs within CCT theory. The motivations behind CCT practice are discussed, in conjunction with an exploration of the contexts in which CCT discourses on culture exist. Finally, the applicability of the culture critique, to training representations of culture is examined. These processes of discourse analysis demonstrate not only how CCT courses conceptualise culture, but also whether the misrepresentations of culture, identified within the dimensional models, are present in training materials.

The online course offers no explicit definition of culture. However, it is possible to determine how this course conceptualises culture through an examination of its content. The course focuses on the description of dichotomous values, in conjunction with information on behavioural and perceptual norms. These discussions suggest that dichotomous values, and perceptual or behavioural norms, must be integral features of culture. The terminology used throughout the training also provides clues as to how culture is being conceptualised. There are frequent references to national cultures indicating that 'cultures' are understood as synonymous with 'nations'. The interchangeable use of 'culture' and 'nation' implies that cultures are territorially delineated and that cultural identities are geographically determined. This course also contains frequent and explicit contrasts between 'western cultures' and 'other cultures'. The divisionary nature of these questionable references to mega cultural units is exemplified in the training statement; "Often western cultures are anxious to sign off on negotiations, whereas other cultures need to build relationships before they can trust and negotiate" (Mind Inc, 2008). Such statements invariably divide the world's cultural variety into oppositional camps of 'us' and 'them' whilst making assumptions about the trainee's cultural identity. These processes of 'othering' grant the trainee a behavioural adaptability which is denied to those defined as 'other'. The problematic of intercultural communication is conceptualised as a consequence of the existence of diversity; culture is described as a barrier to effective communication (Mind Inc, 2008). The location of intercultural communicative barriers as a consequence of diversity results in training which is characterised by formulaic guides to 'others' behaviours, and an under-emphasis of the importance of self-awareness. The contrasting of 'western' and 'other' values, in conjunction with a conceptualisation of diversity as a barrier and the conflation of cultures with nations,

creates an image of the world as divided into antagonistic, geographically determined cultural groups. The course is void of disclaimers and cautionary statements about the dangers of cultural stereotyping or the existence of cultural heterogeneity. The result is a reified, essentialist, notion of culture which confirms the applicability of the culture critique to the conceptions of culture presented in this course.

Training booklet 1, like the online course, offers no explicit definition of culture. However, the content and rhetoric of the booklet provide clues as to how culture is being conceptualised. The booklet describes culture as influencing perceptions, interpretations and behaviours. Cultural differences are described as existing in the areas of; language use, eating habits, manners, responses to conflict, perceptions of appropriate topics of conversation, body language, bathroom habits, expectations of others, collectivist or individualist orientations, gender roles and perceptions of time. The delineation of specific manifestations of difference indicates an adherence to an enumerative definition of culture. Enumerative definitions of culture can never be exhaustive and are invariably exclusionary (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1963). The problem of intercultural communication is, again, conceptualised as resulting from the existence of diversity. However, unlike the online course, booklet 1 does contain information on the dynamic nature of culture. The booklet states that "cultures are always progressively changing" (Training booklet 1, 2008). Yet, this recognition, of the dynamic nature of culture, is limited by the description of cultural change as a consequence of "westernisation, globalisation and mass media" (Training booklet 1, 2008). Cultural dynamism is not purely a result of globalisation or westernisation; culture is a dynamic adaptation and cultures have been changing and developing since the dawn of human existence. The representation of cultural change as the result of "westernisation, globalisation and mass media" ignores the dynamism of 'western' cultures and implies a conception of cultures as static prior to, and except for, the influence of these forces. The division between 'west' and 'other' implicit in this description also arises in other areas of the training booklet. The discussion of differences begins with the statement; "Many international students may already be acquainted with western customs. However, many of their own customs and traditions are so inbuilt that they are difficult, if not impossible, to change" (Training booklet 1, 2008). This statement reinforces the division of 'west' and 'other,' and also places the capacity of adaptability with the trainee, whilst denying the adaptability of the subject. In addition to the division between 'western' and 'other', this training booklet frequently equates cultural identity with nationality in an apparently deterministic manner. German students are described as

"feel[ing] it is their duty to be honest" Brazilian students are described as "always looking for a loophole" (Training booklet 1, 2008). "Gulf Arabs" are described as maintaining direct eye contact and "South Americans" are described as "unpunctual" (Training Booklet 1, 2008). The attribution of traits to national cultures and mega-cultural units is qualified within this course. However, brief qualifications are overshadowed by the frequent attribution of traits to nations throughout the booklet. The prescriptive conceptions of culture and processes of othering apparent in this booklet leave it open to the criticisms of misrepresentation raised by the culture critique

Training video 1 explicitly defines culture as "A pattern of learned and shared human behaviour, embedded in thought, speech and action, transmitted to succeeding generations through the use of tools, language and abstract thought." (Training video, 1, 2005). This definition is enumerative; however, it also emphasises generational transmission. Video 1 also describes culture as an "evolutionary tool for human social survival" and as a perceptually mediating tool which determines a person's "point of view" (Training video 1, 2005). This video goes on to describe culture as influencing a person's values, attitudes and beliefs. "Cultural patterns" are described as repetitive, systematic, modes of behaviours that provide acceptance and security within a given society (Training video 1, 2005). Cultural misunderstandings are described as occurring when a person from one culture produces a message, for consumption by a person of another culture, and the perceptual differences between the two people are such that they alter the communication event (Training video 1, 2005). The video goes on to describe four factors which influence the possibility of a cultural misunderstanding occurring. These factors are described as, genetic race, ethnic background, religious persuasion and gender (Training video 1, 2005). It is unclear whether the inclusion of race in this list constitutes an attachment of cultural differences to racial characteristics, or refers to attitudes towards racial differences. Attitudes towards race may influence the likelihood of misunderstandings occurring, but racial differences alone will not. The video then goes on to describe differences in "cultural worldviews" through an explication of Hofstede's (1980) value dimensions model and Hall's (1977) high/low context communication theory. There is no information on the dynamic nature of culture or the existence of cultural heterogeneity. However, in contrast to training booklet 1 and the online course, training video 1 does discuss the impact of attitudes towards diversity on intercultural encounters. Ethnocentricity, prejudice, and stereotyping, are described as the greatest detriments to successful intercultural

communication. By discussing the influence of attitudes towards diversity, on the success of intercultural encounters, this video avoids conceptualising the problems of cross-cultural communication as purely a consequence of differences, and the formulaic understandings of intercultural interaction that can result from such negative conceptions of diversity. Despite a recognition of the negative impact of ethnocentrism, the video ends with the statement; "there is one thing which transcends culture and is of universal appeal, making money" (Training video 1, 2005). The trainee is advised that in order to gain acceptance in a foreign culture they should "help them to develop their economy" (Training video 1, 2005). These final statements are not only an example of 'othering', but also of ethnocentrism, as a specific cultural perspective is described as universal.

Training video 2 does not offer an explicit definition of culture, but it is once more possible to infer the conceptions of culture adhered to in this video through an examination of its content. The video begins by describing two forms of socialisation; primary socialisation and anticipatory socialisation. Primary socialisation is the learning of appropriate cultural attitudes, values and actions. Anticipatory socialisation is described as the rehearsal of appropriate attitudes, values and actions for use in future social relationships (Training video 2, 2004). CCT is described as an anticipatory socialisation method. The video describes cultural differences as existing in people's values, in the social norms of behaviour which people adhere to and in belief systems (Training video 2, 2004). The video then describes dimensions of cultural difference with reference to Hall's (1977) temporal orientations theory and contextual communication theory. In a questionable association of cultural identity with biological race, polychromatic time orientations are described as also being called "coloured people time" (Training video 2, 2004). There is no talk of continuums or degrees of differences, polychromatic/monochromatic and high/low context communication orientations are presented as dichotomous alternatives. Effective cross-cultural communication is described as resulting from recognition of specific cultural attitudes (Training video 2, 2004). There is no further mention of value dimensions. The video refers to stereotyping as a "barrier to cross-cultural understanding" (Training video 2, 2004). Like video 1, this training tool recognises the impact of attitudes towards diversity on the success of intercultural interactions. Trainees are advised to recognise that people operate from different logical standpoints. Cultural logic systems are categorised as either: mythic, rational or magic. There is no description of the contents of these categories or reference to the cultures which are included

in them. The contents of this training video are indicative of the conceptions of culture which it adheres to.

Training video 2 presents an understanding of culture as learned, influential and classifiable. Cultural values are presented as malleable, yet consisting of dichotomous alternatives and discernable in accordance with racial characteristics. Intercultural communicative problems are described as resulting from negative attitudes towards diversity. The information on primary socialisation within this video contains a tacit definition of culture, as learned. The information on anticipatory socialisation suggests a conception of cultural attitudes as malleable and is indicative of the perspective that successful intercultural interactions result from the appropriation of 'other' cultural behaviours. The discussion of dimensions of differences indicates an enumerative conception of culture and the presentation of dimensions as either/or alternatives is demonstrative of a dichotomous conception of cultural values. The presentation of value dimensions as dichotomous exacerbates the problem of exclusion, faced by enumerative definitions of culture, by further limiting these definitions' descriptive range. In contrast to the online training and booklet 1, this video does not make reference to national cultures. However, the reference to "coloured people time" suggests a questionable association of cultural identity with race. A discussion of the detrimental impact of stereotyping indicates that this training tool recognises the influence of attitudes towards diversity on intercultural encounters. Yet, the discussion of anticipatory socialisation, and emphasis on understanding 'other' cultural logics, indicates that intercultural communicative problems are also conceptualised as resulting from the existence of differences. The dichotomous presentation of value dimensions and 'mythical, rational, magic' categorisations, suggest a conception of cultures as classifiable into types. Classificatory conceptions of culture, like enumerative conceptions, limit the interpretive possibilities a definition can encompass. The understandings of culture presented in this training video once more exhibit a tendency towards an enumerative, classificatory, conception of culture and the association of culture with race raises doubts about the quality of this training tool.

Training booklet 2 explicitly defines culture as "values, assumptions and perceptions that are instilled early on in life and are expressed in the way we behave and interact" (Training booklet 2, 2007). Culture is described as "conditioning" attitudes and behaviours, and influencing "everything we do" in an "instinctive" manner (Training Booklet 2, 2007). The booklet then lists

the areas of interaction affected by culture as: posture, language, expression, conflict resolution, decision making and attitudes towards authority. There are also descriptions of four of Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five value dimensions. The value dimensions are presented as dichotomous and cultural differences are described in accordance with the value dimensions. Training booklet 2 describes intercultural communicative problems as consequences of cultural difference. This conception is demonstrated in the following statement; "Since these differences are so deep and intuitive, they can lead to substantial misunderstanding and miscommunication" (Training booklet 2, 2007). This divisionary conception of diversity is reinforced by frequent reference to "the culture barrier" and the conceptualisation of intercultural communicative competence as resulting from knowledge of cultural differences. The intercultural scenarios outlined throughout the booklet refer to the "Saudi team," "the Paris office" "the Korean staff," and the "Japanese firm," the scenarios are then resolved with information on the expectations and behaviours associated with employees from each of these different countries (Training booklet 2, 2007). The association of behaviours with national labels once more conflates nationality with cultural identity. This conflation is reinforced by sweeping statements like, "The French do not appreciate personal questions" and "Individuals in Korean society gain their identity and sense of importance through the prestige of the group they belong to" (Training booklet 2, 2007). These statements create an image of cultures as homogeneous and the lack of information on cultural change, within this booklet, suggests a static conception of culture. Booklet 2, like the online course and booklet 1, encourages 'othering' by explicitly and repeatedly contrasting 'western' and 'other' cultures. Cultural sensitivity is conceptualised as the appropriation of 'other' cultural behaviours and there is no reference to the impact of attitudes towards diversity on the success of intercultural interactions. Adaptability is granted to the trainee, but the 'other' is presented as acting in a predetermined manner, in accordance with their "cultural conditioning". The references to "cultural conditioning" within this booklet suggest a deterministic understanding of culture.

Training booklet 3 begins with a discussion of the money and time that companies waste due to misunderstandings caused by cultural differences (Training booklet 3, 1999). This initial discussion conceptualises culture as a barrier to effective communication. There is little specific information offered within this booklet. The booklets main purpose is to provide trainees with a copy of the company's "culture abacus". The culture abacus is a diagram with labels for dimensions of difference on either side of each abacus bar. The abacus is described as a tool for

the “diagnosis” of cultures (Training booklet 3, 1999). Cultural diagnosis is described as an important step in the reconciliation of cultural differences. The abacus has five bars representing value dimension continuums. The first bar is labelled linear time on one side and flexible time on the other side, and corresponds to Hall’s (1977) temporal orientations theory. The second bar is labelled “preference for rules versus preference for relationships” and corresponds to Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) dimension “universalism versus particularism”. The third abacus bar is labelled “status from who you are, versus, status from what you do” and corresponds to the hierarchical/egalitarian distinction within Hofstede’s (1980) “power-distance” dimension. The fourth bar is labelled “individual versus group” and corresponds to both Hofstede’s (1980) “individualism versus collectivism” dimension, and Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1997) “individualism versus communitarianism” dimension. The final bar of the abacus is labelled “direct communication versus indirect communication” and corresponds to Hall’s (1977) high/low context communication theory. The abacus tool strongly adheres to the understandings of culture posited by the dimensional models. The definition of culture adhered to is enumerative; culture is represented as consisting of a finite number of variable yet interculturally equivalent values. Individuals are portrayed as carriers of these values, which determine behaviours, perceptions and reactions. The trainee is conceived of as adaptable whereas the ‘other’ is represented as inflexible. Culture is conceptualised as static and cultures are represented as homogeneous.

Training booklet 4 describes culture as “a thin veneer” which influences “history, politics, customs, taboos, values and basic etiquettes” (Training booklet 4, 2009). This booklet only contains a brief outline of the course it accompanies. There is no specific information on the training tools used or the specific nature of the cultural differences the course focuses on. The booklet does however contain a quote from Edward Hall which states that “…the single greatest barrier to business success is the one erected by culture.” (Hall & Hall, 1990, cited in Training booklet 4, 2009). This quote and statements referring to culture as “a minefield” with the potential for destroying relationships, indicates a negative conceptualisation of diversity. The booklet describes cultural competence as “the learning of simple cultural do’s and don’ts” (Training booklet 4, 2009). This advice suggests a formulaic approach to cross-cultural training in which trainees are advised on how to appropriate, or imitate, other cultural behaviours. A reference to “ethnic minorities” indicates an appreciation of national cultural heterogeneity, which is lacking in the other culture general training booklets. The limited scope of this booklet

renders the drawing of definitive conclusions, about this course's conception of culture, impossible. However, it is possible to determine that this course conceptualises culture as a barrier to communication.

The expression, formulation and rhetoric of the culture general training materials reviewed, tends to suggest an enumerative, elemental, static, homogeneous, divisionary conception of culture. Culture is frequently defined, implicitly and explicitly, in terms of its manifestations in concrete attributes, such as values and behavioural tendencies. These enumerative definitions of culture are subject to the problems of reification and exclusion. Values and behavioural tendencies tend to be classified into a finite number of interculturally equivalent alternatives, which are either presented as continuums or dichotomy. These classifications are indicative of an elemental approach to cultural analysis. Elemental approaches to culture studies inevitably atomise culture and assume the equivalence of behaviours and values, despite their occurrence in different cultural contexts (Moore, 2004). The description of cultures in terms of a finite number of equivalent and constant values creates a static conception of culture. References to the dynamic nature of culture, within the training materials, are minimal and acknowledgements of cultural change tend to be distortive or incomplete. The representation of cultures as static combined with references to national cultures, paints a false picture of national cultural homogeneity. This image, in association with a lack of information on individual contestation or variation, results in a deterministic, prescriptive, conception of the individual and a denial of agency. Many training materials describe culture as a barrier and the cause of cultural misunderstandings. However, some do discuss the impact of individual attitudes on the success of intercultural communication. The problem, with conceptualising culture as a communicative barrier is that it can result in training which simply highlights differences, and an understanding of cultural sensitivity as the appropriation of 'other' cultural behaviours. Training focused on the explication of differences may fail to take into account the importance of self-awareness and cultural relativism, within intercultural interactions. Conceptions of culture as an interpersonal barrier and difference focused training can also result in a conception of the trainee as possessing the capacity for adaptability, whereas, the 'other' is portrayed as simply carrier of cultural norms. Awareness of specific manifestations of difference is an important part of cultural sensitivity. However, over emphasis on difference can encourage processes of 'othering' and create divisionary understandings of diversity. CCT discourse on the nature of culture does tend to encourage the misinterpretation of culture as a static, homogeneous, geographically determined, divisionary and prescriptive force. This misrepresentation is partly the

result of the enumerative definitions of culture and elemental approach promoted by the dimensional models. However, the misrepresentation of culture is also a consequence of the historical contexts within which the CCT industry developed.

CCT emerged on the global marketplace as a tool for international corporate success. Throughout the 1980s International management discourse increasingly conceptualised cultural understanding as providing companies with a competitive edge (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). CCT theorists, private sector funders and training companies, combined in the perpetuation of a construction of diversity as potentially detrimental for a company's productivity and competitiveness (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999). CCT became "an institutionalised, organisational, and corporate response to the cultural exigencies of international and intercultural management" (Jack & Lorbiecki, 1999, p.7). The corporate conception of diversity, as detrimental to international business interests, translated into the divisionary conceptions of culture found within CCT today. The impetus for pragmatic solutions to the 'problem' of diversity that gave rise to the FSI training paradigm was revived during the 1980s and 1990s in response to the corporate search for a competitive edge on the global market. This revival prompted the formulation of dimensional models which constructed cultures as stable, objectively delineable and therefore, manageable. The conception of culture as a barrier came to be emphasised as a selling point within the CCT industry. This selling point is evident in the rhetoric of training materials, which warn that; "one wrong movement or basic misunderstanding could ruin or delay months of work" (Training booklet 4, 2009) and that "misunderstandings based on culture can make or break lucrative business deals" (Training booklet 2, 2007). Negative and divisionary understandings of diversity legitimised conceptions of cultural difference as necessary areas for management control. The need for management control, in turn necessitated a conception of culture as objectively delineable and classifiable. The problems with current CCT conceptions of culture are, in part, a consequence of the historical circumstances which influenced the development and expansion of the industry. These problematic conceptions of culture and divisionary representations of diversity are now finding expression within the contemporary Australian culture general CCT industry. This expression is occurring despite a shift in the primary consumer group, from private industry on the international stage, to NGOs and government in the Australian context (Bean, 2006). The lack of a shift in CCT expression and content, despite a shift in consumer demographics, is a consequence of a lack of alternative training models and persistent trainee desires for simple pragmatic training. In effect, contemporary cross-cultural training remains wedded to certain

conceptions of culture and it is these conceptions of culture that leave CCT open to the attacks of the culture critique.

The culture critique can be applied to representations of culture within CCT training materials. The misrepresentations of culture identified within the dimensional models are carried through to training content, and on occasion exacerbated by the presentation of value dimensions as dichotomous. Culture is almost invariably defined in terms of a finite number of constant, universally equivalent features or attributes. These enumerative and elemental conceptions reify culture, whilst downplaying the diversity of human social existence and negating the impacts of individual agency on behaviours. The dynamic nature of culture is either ignored, in favour of the constant representations provided by dimensional models, or misrepresented as a consequence of 'westernisation,' an image which reinforces the power laden construction of the non-west as static carriers of tradition. Values tend to constructed as deterministic; this deterministic force is then attached to the construct of nationality creating an image of cultures as homogeneous, bounded and geographically determined. Within this image, some individuals are conceptualised as agents, whereas others are constructed as passive carriers of cultural norms. Trainees are granted the capacity for adaptability, whereas those defined as 'other' are not. This disproportionate representation of agency results in a conception of culture which is open to the accusations of essentialism raised by Wikan (1999). Culture is also frequently conceptualised as a barrier; this conception divides the world into antagonistic groups, in a divisionary process of 'othering', which subjects CCT to the criticisms Abu-Lughod (1993) raised against anthropological conceptions of culture. The misrepresentations of culture present within CCT training materials are partly due to the historical constitution of the industry and partly due to an adherence to dimensional models of culture. CCT can certainly be interpreted as 'selling' certain conceptions of culture and the industry is therefore demonstrative of Kahn's (1995) argument that the culture critique is applicable to a commoditised conception of culture. The impact of this commoditised conception of culture on participant's orientations towards diversity is the subject of the following section.

Participants' understandings of culture

Participants' understandings of culture vary from equations of culture with nationality to enumerative, holistic and even critical perspectives. The following overview of participants'

understandings of culture, not only provides insight into how culture is understood in popular consciousness, but also how exposure to CCT can influence people's understandings of culture and orientations towards diversity. Participants were asked what they understand culture to be. Responses to this question and narrative accounts of participants' experiences of cross-cultural communication were then compared to the six orientations towards diversity outlined in Bennett's (1986; 1993) 'developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS).The DMIS is based on the assumption that as a person's intercultural experiences increase their orientations towards cultural diversity become more ethno-relative, resulting in increased cultural sensitivity and therefore greater success in intercultural relations (Bennett, 1986; 1993). If CCT is contributing to greater cultural sensitivity, it is reasonable to assume that participants' orientations towards diversity will become more ethno-relative as their exposure to CCT increases. In actuality it is almost impossible to disentangle the impact of life experiences from the impact of CCT. However, the impact of CCT is, in some cases, discernable in the manner in which participants interpret their intercultural experiences. The results of the interviews indicate that whilst extensive exposure to CCT may influence the manner in which people identify manifestations of cultural differences, these identifications tend to be retrospective rather than pre-emptive. The analysis also shows that overly essentialist conceptions within training materials can result in participants developing critical understandings of culture.

The six DMIS orientations are labelled, denial, defence, minimisation, acceptance, adaptation, and integration (Bennett, 1993). The first three orientations are classified as ethnocentric; the second three orientations are classified as ethno-relative. None of the participants made statements characteristic of the orientation denial, which entails an ignorance, or non-recognition, of cultural diversity (Bennett, 1993). The second ethnocentric orientation "defence" describes a perception of diversity as threatening, the attitude that one's own culture is superior and a derogatory, or critical, attitude towards other cultures (Bennett, 1993). Statements illustrative of the orientation defence did occur on two occasions and both statements were made by participants of European origin, in reference to their opinions of Australian culture.

> That was something they had no idea about, Europe life, culture, or opera, or concerts or nothing.
> (Ed, Personal communication, 27.03.08)

> I can see how much far behind the thinking here is compared to Sweden … and you know it's probably 5 years ... I think deep down I'm probably very much Swedish.
> (Kay, Personal communication, 16.04.08)

The orientation "defence" entails a polarisation of the world into categories of 'us' and 'them' (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). This orientation can therefore be construed as descriptive of the processes of 'othering' found in some CCT training materials. In the case of the two participants, defence orientated statements were not the result of CCT exposure, one had only attended Indigenous cultural awareness training and the other had never attended CCT. However Kay, who had attended a CCT course made more ethno-relative statements than Ed, whose orientation towards diversity appears fixed at the ethnocentric end of the DMIS scale. Yet, this difference may be generational, rather than attributable to CCT. Kay is in her mid forties, whereas Ed is over seventy. The third ethnocentric orientation "minimisation" describes a state in which diversity is recognised, but aspects of one's own value system are deemed to be universals (Bennett, 1993). Statements corresponding to "minimisation" occurred slightly more frequently than statements corresponding to the orientation "defence".

> We're all basically the same.
> (Ed, Personal communication, 27.03.08)

> You sort of feel that for most people family is the most important thing.
> (Kay, Personal communication, 16.04.08)

Participant's statements, most frequently corresponded to the orientation "acceptance", which entails a recognition and acceptance of the validity of a multiplicity of cultural values (Bennett, 1993).

> You know because I could not use my own beliefs to intervene. I still have to respect other people.
> (Gillian, Personal communication, 28.03.08)

> Many of the communities that we work within ... have such a wide range of ways of caring and deciding who's accountable, and who has rights to make decisions.
> (Tina, Personal communication, 27.04.08)

> Culture is not just singing and dancing and food. That is part of it, but it's more the values that you take on board ... and ... immerse yourself in.
> (Vera, Personal communication, 22.04.08)

> I think if you generally tolerate whatever you see and make a mental note of it. So that if it does occur again then ... you might even think well that's how it happened last time so that's maybe why it happened again.
> (Adam, Personal communication, 19.06.08)

The frequency of "acceptance" statements did not directly reflect the extent of participants' exposure to CCT. However, both trainers made fewer statements corresponding to minimisation and more statements corresponding to the ethno-relative end of the scale, than the other

participants. Tina made statements corresponding to the orientations “adaptation” and “integration”. “Adaptation” describes the expansion of one’s cultural worldview to include cultural perceptions, attitudes and behaviours beyond those of one’s own culture (Bennett, 1993). “Integration” describes the incorporation of multiple cultural worldviews into one’s understanding of oneself (Bennett, 1993).

> I’m pretty Anglo in the way I speak ... but I often think of PNG as home ... and when talking to my family in Fiji I move culturally. I move my way of thinking, like things that I won’t accept from my Australian side of the family, I absolutely accept from the other side of the family.
> (Tina, Personal communication, 27.04.08)

Tina is a CCT trainer; however, her expression of the orientations “adaptation” and “integration” appears to be reflective of her status as a “third culture kid”. “Third culture kids” are children who have grown up being exposed to one culture at home and another within the wider community, usually because their parents have migrated or undergone extended sojourns (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994). Tina grew up within a community whose culture was different to her parents’ home culture. Tina therefore had to adapt to differing cultural perspectives when she moved between interactions at home and interactions within the wider community. These experiences are reflected in her switching between cultural perspectives and her expressions of adaptive and integrative understandings of diversity. The statements made by both trainers tend to be consistently at the ethno-relative end of the DMIS scale, whereas the orientations of most other participants fluctuated between acceptance and minimisation. Ed, the only participant with no experience of CCT, tended to express a more ethnocentric orientation towards diversity, but this may be a generational difference as Ed is significantly older than the other participants. The influence of CCT is difficult to detect through an examination of DMIS orientations. The more ethno-relative orientations of trainers may have be a result of their CCT training. However, these orientations may also be the result of the trainer’s more frequent exposure to different cultures. Further insights into participants’ orientations towards diversity and popular conceptions of culture are provided within participants’ explicit definitions of culture.

Participants were asked what they understand culture to be and most emphasised the influences of culture on people’s values. Participants’ provided the following definitions of culture:

> I met Frenchmen, which I don’t like, and I met Hungarians, hundreds maybe thousands of Hungarians, only one of them is my friend. Sarkozy, he’s a bastard. I don’t like Frenchmen and I don’t like Hungarians, but we’re all basically the same.
> (Ed, Personal communication, 27.03.08)

> Family values ... are culturally different, especially parenting. Like, if I have to deal with domestic violence incidents, where the people involved are Muslims, they have their way of define[ing] husband and wife and cop[ing] with other things like that ... To me if I am married to a person I don't have to be submissive to that person. But if I have to deal with an incident when a man is flogging his wife and in the culture it is normal ... I do not just say that what you're doing is wrong, because in the culture that is an everyday scenario.
> (Gillian, Personal communication, 28.03.08)

> I think it's the way people are living in a country. However, I think also that culture is a living thing, it develops all the time, it's like languages and languages develop all the time. And you can see that when you work in developing countries that slowly, slowly the thinking is changing … If you look at democracy, as such, in Europe it has developed over hundreds of years while [in Africa] we want them to change in very few years, and to be able to be transparent with no corruption and all. So culture is ... how people live together and the rules and regulations of that will change slowly ..., sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse.
> (Kay, Personal communication, 16.04.08)

> I guess it's … the values that you're brought up with and those values have parameters which kind of encompass things like how you eat your food, how you wash, and what you do in certain interactive situations. So, I would just basically say it would be your values, and I really don't think culture belongs to nations. I think within a nation you might find the north of a country has different values to the south of a country. I know that in Germany they look at each other differently from north to south, they speak differently, they've different histories, different music, different food, and I think that impacts on the whole ... culture thing. But I think that "culture" ... is a massively sweeping term that can be used to cover any number of situations. For me I think it's just your own values, collective values maybe.
> (Adam, Personal communication, 19.06.08)

> Culture to me it's what makes you, *you.* It certainly is the parents, it's the nurturing, it's the values that are placed on you, the way we learn, that whole value statement, because culture is not just singing and dancing and food. I mean that's part of it, but it's more the values that you take on board and you accept and you immerse yourself in.
> (Vera, personal communication, 22.04.08)

> Culture is your way of seeing the world, your way of being in the world ... But, equally language, behaviour, values, attitudes, relationships, family relationships, and how you conceptualise work, family, how you behave in the work place, it's everything, it's who we are.
> (Tina, Personal communication, 27.04.08)

Each participant offered a slightly different understanding of culture, yet almost all emphasised the role of culture in the formation of values. Kay emphasised the dynamic nature of culture, whilst Adam emphasised a distinction between culture and nationality. Both trainers, Vera and Tina, emphasised the pervasive nature of culture and the impact of culture on perceptions. The trainers were both able to provide more definite definitions; this commonality is most likely a

consequence of their involvement with CCT. Ed equates culture with nationality and nationalities with certain personality types. However, elsewhere during the interview, Ed expressed a personal awareness that his nationality has little to do with his cultural identity. This personal awareness is a result of the manner in which Ed feels he has been perceived by others and the fact that his nation of birth, Czechoslovakia, as such, no longer exists.

> My country is not a country today.
> (Ed, Personal communication, 27.03.08)

> As a Czech, when I arrived in Germany, I was "*verflüchte Czeche*" [damn Czech], when I arrived in France they called me "*Le boche*" [German enemy]. Well you know, when I arrived to Australia I was already used to it, they called me "wog".
> (Ed, Personal communication, 27.03.08)

Ed's experiences and narratives appear to contradict his explicit definition of culture. This contradiction is demonstrative of the disparities that can occur between people's explicit understandings and implicit perceptions. Kay and Gillian both offer fairly holistic definitions of culture, but both expressed quite prescriptive understandings of the influences of cultural identity on behaviours. The influence of CCT is apparent in the ease with which both trainers were able to define culture. However, attendance at CCT courses does not appear to have influenced the trainees' understandings of culture. Adam was quick to contradict the equation of culture with nationality that had occurred in the course he attended, and neither Gillian nor Kay expressed understandings of culture which reflected the teachings of the courses they participated in. The understandings of culture provided by participants, unsurprisingly, indicate that life experiences have a much greater influence on how people understand culture and diversity than participation in CCT. Kay's experiences of cultural change in Africa prompted her recognition of the dynamic nature of culture. Gillian's experiences of negotiating domestic violence cases, within Islamic households, have prompted a prescriptive understanding of Islamic cultural norms. In Adam's case, scepticism regarding CCT teachings has reinforced his conviction that cultural identity is not determined by nationality and his recognition of national cultural heterogeneity. Adam's scepticism about CCT also prompted a critical approach to the concept of culture. This critical conception of culture is evident in Adams reference to culture as a "massively sweeping term" and his general discomfort with the concept, as expressed in the following statement:

> I think a lot of it is common sense ... I hate referring back to this word culture, ... even within your own ... social circle you have people that stand close to you and even if they're from the same background you might feel that it's a little bit too close. So labelling it as a cultural difference is not necessarily that true because they're from the same background.
> (Adam, Personal communication, 19.06.08)

Adams experiences of CCT prompted him to critically analyse the concept of culture and the term's popular usage. The only interview finding that directly indicates CCT's influence on a participants understanding of culture is Tina's account of a cultural misunderstanding and her reference to high/low context communication differences, as described in the previous chapter. Yet, even in Tina's case, and despite her familiarity with the concepts of CCT, the attribution of this misunderstanding to a cultural difference was retrospective rather than immediate. Retrospective application of CCT will not result in the immediate avoidance of cultural misunderstandings, but it may help people avoid negative interpretations of events. However, generally participants did not appear to apply CCT teachings to their understandings of culture or interpretations of events, only in Tina's case was there explicit evidence of CCT influencing her interpretation of an intercultural occurrence and this is most likely due to the extent of her familiarity with CCT concepts.

The conceptions of culture expressed by participants are less indicative of misinterpretations of culture than the understandings presented in training materials. The lack of correlation between problematic training concepts and participants' personal understandings indicates that misinterpretations of culture may be a consequence of commoditisation, rather than a reflection of popular consciousness as Kahn's (1995) arguments suggest. Cross-cultural training does not appear to have overtly influenced the manner in which most participants understand culture or interpret intercultural experiences. However, participants with greater CCT experience, such as trainers, do demonstrate more consistent ethno-relative orientations towards diversity than those with little or no CCT experience. In most cases participants' life experiences have had a much greater impact on their understandings of culture than their brief exposure to CCT. In Adam's case, the problematic representations of culture within the training workshop prompted a critical understanding of the concept of culture and a sceptical attitude towards the potential utility of CCT. Adam's dismissal of CCT teachings demonstrates one of the potentially negative impacts of misrepresentations of culture within training. Tina's retrospective evaluation of a misunderstanding, in terms of CCT constructs, demonstrates that CCT can be useful in aiding interpretations of events. However, this evaluation was only possible because of Tina's familiarity with the concepts, which arises from her status as a trainer.

The problematic conceptions of culture identified in the training materials do not appear to have had any great influence on how these participants understand culture. However, it is possible that negative conceptions of culture may have more impact on people with less personal experience of cultural diversity. The minimal impact of training raises questions about the utility of current training programs. In order to positively influence people's orientations towards diversity, training must influence people's understandings of culture, in a manner that encourages ethnorelativism. Current training programs are unable to provide such positive change and this is partly due to their problematic conceptualisations of culture. These problematic conceptions of culture also leave CCT open to the criticisms of the culture critique. Chapter five demonstrated how cognitive anthropological theory could be employed to counter the criticisms of the culture critique. The final section of this chapter, examines whether or not cognitive anthropological theory could also be employed to improve CCT teachings.

Cognitive anthropology and cross-cultural training

Cognitive anthropological explanations of culture are able to avoid the misinterpretations of culture, highlighted by the culture critique. The previous paragraphs demonstrated that CCT theory and conceptualisations of culture within training materials are subject to the criticisms of postmodernist anthropologists, due to their conflation of culture with nationality and the depiction of cultures as overtly static and homogeneous. Cognitive anthropology is able to defend 'culture' through the provision of a theoretical framework that can consistently account for generational transmission, the existence of cultural norms, individual variation and cultural change. Strauss and Quinn (1994) demonstrate how schema theory and connectionism can plausibly be applied to the analysis of cognitive cultural knowledge systems on both an individual and a societal level. Chapter Five demonstrated the possibility of employing Strauss and Quinn's (1994) arguments to defend the concept of culture against the criticisms of the culture critique. The following paragraphs examine the possibility of employing the same cognitive arguments to salvage CCT conceptions of culture.

CCT understandings of culture currently tend to be defended using arguments based on utility, similar to those Brumann (1999) employed in his response to postmodernist anthropologists. However, the application of this defence to CCT does not address the conceptual problems inherent in the dimensional models and training materials. Brumann (1999) is able to cite

examples of anthropological conceptions of culture which contradict the representations of culture described by the culture critics. The citation of CCT conceptions of culture only reinforces the strength of the criticisms of misrepresentations that can be brought against training materials. The defence, of misrepresentations of culture, on the basis of utility and brevity is simply a rationalisation of the short comings of the theoretical constructs on which current CCT teachings are based. The refutation of the culture critique, as it applies to CCT, requires a complete reformation of representations culture, agency and diversity within this industry. Prior research has attempted to extend the concepts of cognitive anthropology to the practice of cross-cultural training (Beamer, 1995). However, up until now the suggested applications of approaches like schema theory to CCT have been limited to the explanation of trainee conceptions of ‘other’ cultures.

Linda Beamer (1995) suggests a “schemata model for intercultural communication” which interprets intercultural communication and miscommunications in terms of the contradictions that exist between a person’s schematic representation of another culture and the realities of that culture. In accordance with this schematic model, correlation between someone’s schematic representation of culture (A) and culture (A) reality, equates to a greater chance of success during interactions with people from culture (A) (Beamer, 1995). Beamer’s (1995) model uses schema theory to explain intercultural sensitivity and some of the factors influencing intercultural success. However, the model does not attempt to integrate schema theory into CCT teaching practices.

The integration of CCT and anthropological theory tends to be avoided, due to concerns about relevancy, clarity and complexity. It was these concerns and negative trainee reactions to anthropology that prompted Hall (1959) to revise the FSI curriculum, and consequently set the pragmatic, goal orientated, training paradigm which is still reflected in CCT programs today. The incompatibility of traditional anthropological culture theory and CCT is as apparent today as it was for Hall sixty years ago. Tina’s account of the anthropologist trainer in chapter two demonstrates how problems of relevancy, clarity and complexity can thwart the attempts of trainers to integrate anthropology and CCT. The complexity and abstract nature of anthropological conceptualisations of culture make them extremely difficult to communicate to an audience of inexperienced trainees in a short period of time. Trainees often desire practical

advice on how to comprehend and successfully cope with intercultural encounters. The pragmatic focus of the dimensional models makes them well equipped to cater to the desires of trainees. However, the prescriptive conceptions of culture, which result from the dimensional models, opens CCT up to the criticisms of misrepresentation as raised by the culture critique. Cognitive anthropological theory could potentially reform CCT conceptions of culture, protecting CCT from the criticisms of the culture critique, whilst avoiding the problems of relevancy, clarity and complexity faced by traditional anthropological culture theory.

Schema theory and connectionism are able to account for the shared, continuous and influential nature of cultural value systems, whilst still explaining individual variation and the dynamic nature of culture. Strauss and Quinn (1994) are able to explain the nature of culture and the workings of schema and connectionist networks, using the simple and comprehensible example of 'Paula'. The ease of explaining schema theory and connectionism, through the use of examples, means that training based on these theories could avoid the clarity and complexity problems faced by traditional anthropological CCT. Examples of actual cultural differences could be built into examples of the workings of schemata, thus fulfilling trainees' desires for practical information and circumventing the problem of relevancy. Illustrations of the variable nature of cultural schema would enable training based on these cognitive theories to avoid the problems of static and homogeneous representations of culture faced by current training models. Cognitive anthropology could therefore aid CCT in providing holistic and more accurate education on the nature and influences of culture.

Conclusion

CCT conceptions of culture have been influenced by both anthropological culture theory and dimensional models of culture. The dimensional models draw on both European and American anthropological culture theory. Yet, the adaptation of these theories for the purpose of training has resulted in the misrepresentation of cultures as static and homogeneous. These misrepresentations of culture encourage processes of 'othering', granting agency to some and denying it to others. The misrepresentation of culture within both training models and training materials opens CCT up to the criticisms of the culture critique and can lead to sceptical evaluations of training by trainees. The influence of CCT on trainees' conceptions of culture is minimal and as such, CCT is unlikely to have the desired effect of increasing cultural sensitivity. Anthropological conceptions of culture can refute the culture critique by recourse to cognitive

theories like schema theory and connectionism. CCT conceptions of culture could also be salvaged through the integration of cognitive theory into training programs. The ease with which cognitive models of culture can be illustrated using examples makes these theories perfect candidates for incorporation into cross-cultural training courses. The explanatory capacity of cognitive theory could aid the development of CCT conceptions of culture in a direction that would reduce misrepresentations and therefore diminish the force of criticisms against CCT. The holistic representation of culture within schema theory could help CCT guard against stereotyping and determinism, whilst avoiding the problems of 'othering' which can result from current dimensional models. Further research is required in order to develop and test cognitive cross-cultural training models. However, as they stand, schema theory and connectionism have the potential to aid the development of CCT in a direction that would increase the capacity of training to promote cultural sensitivity and positive intercultural relations.

Chapter 8: Thesis Conclusions

Cross-cultural training is intended to help develop "the awareness knowledge and skills needed to interact appropriately with culturally diverse customers and co-workers." (Bean, 2006, p. 2). The format and content of contemporary CCT has been greatly influenced by the paradigm set by Edward T. Hall during his experiences of training at the American Foreign Service Institute (FSI). Globalisation, international corporate expansion, diversifying workforces and increased population mobility, over the past thirty years, has encouraged the worldwide expansion of the CCT industry. Corporate demand for CCT prompted the development of models of culture specifically tailored to the requirements of cross-cultural training. These models followed the pragmatic, goal orientated, training paradigm set by Hall's experiences at the FSI. The models also expanded this paradigm to include the dimensional quantification of cultural value systems. Tensions between abstract anthropological conceptions of culture and the practical constraints of cross-cultural training led to the widespread rejection of anthropological culture theory by training companies. Instead, training companies tend to focus on the concise pragmatically based conceptions of culture posited by dimensional CCT models. Aspects of both European and American anthropological schools of thought are apparent in the theoretical orientations of CCT's dimensional models. However, contemporary developments in anthropological culture theory have not yet been incorporated into cross-cultural training content. The utility of CCT is invariably dependent on the manner in which courses conceptualise culture. Application of the arguments of postmodernist anthropology to CCT teachings demonstrates that there are considerable conceptual problems inherent in the understandings of culture promoted by both dimensional models and training courses. These problems may be responsible for the minimal affects CCT appears to have on trainees' understandings of culture and orientations towards diversity. Problematic conceptions of culture have also been shown to be responsible for the rejection of CCT teachings by some trainees. In the case of anthropology, cognitive culture theory can be used to refute the criticisms of the post-modernist culture critique. The integration of cognitive culture theory into CCT teachings could aid the development of CCT, in a direction that would enable trainers to avoid the criticisms of essentialism and 'othering' that can be raised against current training programs. This thesis demonstrates not only how CCT courses conceptualise culture, but also how these conceptions developed, the influence of CCT and the relationship between CCT understandings of culture and anthropological culture theory. The findings of the previous seven chapters show that further development is needed if CCT is to effectively contribute to the widespread promotion of intercultural understanding. This final

chapter outlines the main findings of the previous seven chapters, finalising the case for a cognitive reformation of CCT teachings.

Prior research into cross-cultural training has tended to focus on the delineation and assessment of CCT practices (Bean, 2006; Fantini & Smith, 1997; Milhouse, 1996). In addition to the development of training models (Hall, 1977; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997), and documentation of the history of the industry (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Moon, 1996). McSweeney (2002) and Jack and Lorbiecki (1999) have carried out critical examinations of the dimensional models and CCT practice. However, there has been no prior investigation into how CCT courses conceptualise culture, or the impact CCT has on consumers' orientations towards diversity. Culture is an abstract concept with multiple definitions and variable interpretations. This thesis set out to determine which of these multiple definitions and theories of culture current CCT courses were adhering to and the impact of CCT on participants' understandings of culture.

This study collated the findings of literature reviews, interviews and reviews of training materials in a critical analysis of conceptions of culture within the CCT industry. Literature on training practice was reviewed, in order to gain an overview of the industry. Subsequently, conceptions of culture within CCT theory were explicated and analysed. Anthropological culture theory was also reviewed, in order to determine the relationship between anthropological conceptions of culture and CCT conceptions of culture. Information on training content was obtained through personal participation in two CCT courses and a series of semi-structured interview with CCT producers and consumers. Training materials were examined as to how they conceptualised culture, intercultural relations and the concepts of agency, identity and 'the other'. The interview findings also provided information on the influence of CCT on participants' understandings of culture and potential problems with current training programs. Finally, CCT training models and training programs were subjected to a critical discourse analysis which compared constructions of culture and agency within CCT to anthropological conceptions of culture and participants understandings of culture. These analytical processes revealed the character, content and influence of cross-cultural training.

The Modern CCT industry developed out of Edward T. Hall's teachings at the FSI (Moon, 1996; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990). The FSI trainees' negative reactions towards the anthropological conceptions of culture taught by Hall resulted in a revision of the FSI training program. This revised, pragmatic, training program focused on explicating the specific influences of culture on behaviour. The new training program had a dyadic, micro-analytical focus; it concentrated on the comparison of cultural norms and values, especially within the areas of body language, spatial and temporal orientations and tone of voice (Moon, 1996; Rogers, Hart & Mike, 2002). The revised FSI training program set a paradigm for cross-cultural training that is still apparent in contemporary training programs. Globalisation and international corporate expansion throughout the 1970s and 1980s resulted in increased demand for CCT and the development of the international CCT industry. This training industry was based around the pragmatic, micro-analytical, comparative training paradigm set by Hall. The practices of the contemporary Australian CCT industry still reflect this paradigm. However, the main consumer group within Australia has shifted from the corporate sphere towards the public sector.

The contemporary Australian CCT Industry is characterised by a consumer group which is primary positioned within the public sector. Bean (2006) provides the most comprehensive review of the Australian CCT industry to date. An examination of this review enabled the formulation of a profile of the Australian CCT industry. The profile indicated that the most frequently utilised form of CCT, within Australia, is culture general CCT and the most popular presentation method is through day long workshops (Bean, 2006). Attendance at CCT workshops tends to be voluntary, however some organisation do provide compulsory staff training (Bean, 2006). Training is predominantly provided by nationally based CCT companies and many CCT consumers source trainers internally within their own companies or organisations (Bean, 2006). The average cost of a CCT workshop is between $1750AUD and $3000AUD (Bean, 2006). The majority of trainers are female with an average age of 48 and although there is no national accreditation system for CCT trainers, most trainers have attended some form of professional development or 'train the trainer' course (Bean 2006). The majority of CCT courses, within Australia, utilise a combination of didactic and experiential training methods; combining the lecture based impartation of information with interactive role plays and simulations (Bean 2006). Dimensional models of culture are some of the most frequently used training tools for the provision of information on cultural differences (SEITAR, 2004, cited in Bean, 2006). Workshops vary in their methods, content and objectives. Trainer idiosyncrasies and audience

makeup also affect the content, success and character of training programmes. However, it is possible to discern general tendencies among CCT courses and identify trends in the manner in which courses conceptualise culture. These trends are heavily influenced by the widespread adherence to dimensional models of culture.

Dimensional models of culture were developed in response to a growing corporate demand for uniform information on cultural variables, which catered to the objectives of cross-cultural training. Some of the most frequently utilised models are Hall's (1959; 1966; 1977) temporal, spatial and contextual communications theories, Hofstede's (1980, 2005) five dimensional model of culture, and Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) seven dimensional model (Fantini & Smith, 1997). Hofstede's (1980; 2005) five dimensional model is demonstrative of the pragmatic, micro-analytic, dyadic training paradigm set by Hall (1959). However, the five dimensional model also extended the FSI training paradigm to include the dimensional quantification of cultural value systems. Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turner's (1997) seven dimensional model demonstrates this extension of the FSI paradigm, through the quantification of cultural values systems into a finite number of supposedly universally equivalent dimensions. The presentation of culture within the dimensional models is simple, pragmatic and orientated towards the requirements of cross-cultural training. This pragmatic character reflects the dictum of the FSI paradigm and caters well to the desires of CCT trainees for practical advice on how to cope with intercultural encounters. However, there are a number of conceptual problems with the dimensional models' representations of culture. These conceptual problems diminish the descriptive force of the models and raise questions about the utility and accuracy of dimensionally based training programs.

The conceptual problems found within the dimensional models arise from their elemental approach to cultural analysis and the conflation of cultures with nations. The elemental approach of the dimensional models entails the division of cultures into a finite number of universally equivalent value groupings. Elemental analyses of culture are limited by their concentrated focus. Descriptions of culture that focus on only a few features will invariably exclude much of that which constitutes cultural diversity. The descriptive force of elemental analysis is also diminished by the assumption that cultural elements, or dimensions, are universally equivalent irrespective of context. The dimensional models can also be criticised for conflating cultures with nations

(McSweeney, 2002). The attachment of cultures to nations, within the dimensional models, results in an under-recognition of national cultural heterogeneity and encourages the fallacious equation of cultural identity with nationality. The representation of cultural value dimensions as mutually exclusive, within some dimensional models, also diminishes their descriptive force; as this assumption is contradicted by anthropological investigations which have shown that cultures can simultaneously exhibit contradictory values (Abu-Lughod, 1999). The dimensional models' also assume that value dimensions are primarily influential in determining the behavior of some, whereas others are conceptualised as possessing the capacity to adapt their behaviors and reactions. These assumptions downplay individual variations and grant agency to some whilst denying it to others. The representativeness of the surveys on which the dimensional models are based is also questionable (McSweeney, 2002). Survey questions are confounded by their ethnocentricity and inevitably require participants to appropriate their answers to a fixed set of responses; this set of responses could never encompass the entire range of cultural value possibilities, so the findings of cultural value surveys will inevitably be incomplete. The presentation of value dimensions as constant ignores the dynamic nature of culture and conceptualises diversity as consisting of a homogeneous set of a-historical cultural norms. The result is a conception of cultures as static, homogeneous, deterministic, bounded and geographically determinable. The review of anthropological culture theory demonstrated why such a conception of culture is problematic.

The review of anthropological culture theory in chapter five demonstrated the contested nature of the concept of culture. The existence of multiple interpretations of culture has profound implications for the project of cross-cultural training. The absence of a universally accepted definition of culture means that the understandings of culture posited in CCT courses will almost certainly be subjected to contestation. Anthropological theories of culture diverge over questions of whether cultural inquiry should be approached from empirical or interpretivist perspectives. Debate also exits over whether theories of culture should be based on elemental or holistic analysis, and whether cultures consist of integrated wholes or collections of parts. Over the past thirty years dissenting and critical perspectives have arisen, and some anthropologists have begun to question the utility of the concept of culture. These critical perspectives drew attention to the power relations implicit in the construction of cultures and others, and resulted in a disciplinary crisis of confidence which produced equations of culture with race, calls for the abandonment of the concept and also defences of culture. Yet despite these theoretical divergences, the majority of

anthropologists do tend to agree that cultural knowledge is generationally reproduced, dynamic and yet historically constituted, and influential on both societal and individual levels. However, prior to the development of cognitive theory, no anthropological school of thought had been able to consistently account for all these paradoxical manifestations of 'culture'. The application of cognitive theory to the construct of culture prompted the development of a theoretical framework which could consistently account for all the paradoxical manifestations of culture and simultaneously avoid the accusations of essentialism raised by the culture critique. Cognitive explanations of culture enable the refutation of the postmodernist culture critique, as it applies to anthropological culture theory. However, the postmodernist critique and its replies do raise important points about the commoditisation and misrepresentation of culture within the public domain. Together, anthropological debates, criticisms and defenses of culture, provided a benchmark for the analysis of CCT conceptions of culture.

The analysis of CCT conceptions of culture began with a review of CCT content. The review of CCT content in chapter six was based on personal participation in two CCT courses, a collection of training materials and the findings of six semi-structured interviews with CCT producers and consumers. The review showed how training combines didactic and experiential approaches and that trainees preferred combined approaches. The adherence to dimensional models within culture general training materials was found to have resulted in the transference of conceptual problems, from the models, to training programs. The conceptual problems of the models are, in some cases, exacerbated by training representations of value dimensions as dichotomous. The representation of value dimensions as dichotomous further limits the interpretive possibilities one can employ when deciphering the meanings of actions and behaviors. The application of dichotomous conceptions of cultural values could result in trainees having to construe 'others' behaviors as either individualist or collectivist, and the representation of cultures as homogeneous could result in the extension of such judgments from singular occurrences to perceptions of entire cultures. The inability of dimensional models to account for cultural dynamism and heterogeneity is exacerbated by the frequent use of national labels and descriptions of culturally determined behaviors, within training programs. The use of generalised labels within training tended to be qualified by disclaimers which drew attention to the necessity of using general labels for the purpose of brevity. However, trainee accounts demonstrated that the affects of disclaimers and qualify statements are eclipsed by the emphasis placed on depicting the characteristics of 'national cultures'. Trainee reactions demonstrated how the attribution of characteristics to

nations can result in the selective application of CCT teachings. Selective application was identified by trainers as one of the potential shortcomings of current CCT practice. Trainers also identified the reinforcement of stereotypes and promotion of formulaic understandings culture as potential problems with current CCT teachings. Culture specific CCT seemed less prone to the creation of stereotypes and formulaic understandings of culture, than culture general training; perhaps because of the more concentrated focus and the greater amount of information culture specific workshops are able to incorporate. Training courses tended to supplement information of differences with information on specific problems of intercultural communication, such as culture shock and cultural misunderstandings. The descriptions of culture shock, within training, were roughly in line with academic information on culture shock and participants' accounts of personal experiences. There were greater discrepancies between participants' accounts of cultural misunderstandings and the information on cultural misunderstandings provided within training materials. Participants' accounts of cultural misunderstandings tended to emphasise the role of attitudes, whereas training accounts tended to describe cultural misunderstandings as resulting from the existence of differences. The location of the problem of intercultural communication as result of the existence of diversity was a common feature among courses and is a further example of how concepts from the dimensional models are integrated into training programs. The transference of concepts, from the dimensional models to training content, was also apparent in the explicit and implicit CCT conceptions of culture which were examined in chapter seven.

Chapter seven investigated the relationship between CCT conceptions of culture, anthropological conceptions of culture and participants' understandings of culture, by means of critical discourse analysis. The conceptualisations of culture identified within the dimensional models were compared with the anthropological theories of culture reviewed in Chapter Five. These comparisons demonstrated the relative influences of European and American anthropological schools of thought on the formation of the dimensional models. The pragmatic FSI paradigm was shown to have resulted in the adoption of empirically focused functionalist theories of culture, by the creators of the dimensional models. The dimensional models adherence to functionalist conceptions of culture means that the models, like functionalist theories, can be criticised for producing a-historical understandings of culture and being unable to adequately account for social change and cultural disjuncture. The influence of American cultural anthropology is evident in the dimensional models' emphasis on cultures fostering personality types, the models' analysis of 'national culture' and attempts at cultural classification. However, unlike American

anthropological analysis, the classifications within the dimensional models appeared to assume the equivalence of cultural categories despite their occurrence in different cultural contexts. This adherence to a supposed uniformity and disregard for context, in conjunction with a static and a-historical attachment of cultures to nations, opens the dimensional models up to the criticisms of the culture critique. The review and analysis of constructions of cultures, individuals and the concept of agency, within training materials, demonstrates that these problems are not limited to representations within the dimensional models, but extend to conceptions of culture with CCT training materials more generally.

The analysis of conceptions of culture within training materials demonstrated that the culture critique also applies to representations of culture within culture general training materials. Culture general training materials, like the dimensional models, tend to adhere to enumerative definitions of culture and are therefore limited in their descriptive force and subject to the problem of reification. Training materials were also found to frequently misrepresent cultures as static and homogeneous, or downplay the existence of cultural change. This misrepresentation results in depictions of the trainees as adaptable, whereas 'others' behaviors are depicted as determined by their cultural identity. Cultural identity was frequently conflated with nationality and on occasion even with genetic race. These misrepresentations open CCT conceptions of culture up to the criticisms of the culture critique. The misrepresentations of culture identified within training materials are partially the result of an adherence to dimensional models of culture and partially a consequence of the historical constitution of the CCT industry. The corporate impetus, which prompted the development of the CCT industry, encouraged the commoditisation of culture and the conceptualisation of culture as a barrier to international corporate success. The search for a solution to the 'problem' of workforce diversity prompted the revival of the pragmatic FSI training paradigm and the development of training programs which conceptualised cultures as stable, objectively delineable and therefore, manageable. This conception of culture, as a barrier, became a selling point within the CCT industry and is evident in both the rhetoric and content of training programs. Misrepresentations of culture within training materials were shown to have the potential to prompt critical or skeptical reactions to training among certain participants. More generally, the influence of CCT on participants' understandings of culture and orientations towards diversity appears to have been minimal.

Participants' orientations towards diversity were analysed in accordance with the six orientations of Bennett's (1986; 1993) "developmental model of intercultural sensitivity" (DMIS). CCT trainers' orientations towards diversity were shown to be more ethno-relative than the orientations of trainees. Trainers' conceptions of culture also exhibited more similarities with CCT teachings than the understandings of the other participants; indicating that extensive exposure to CCT may influence peoples' understandings of culture and interpretations of intercultural encounters. The influence of CCT on trainees' orientations towards diversity and conceptions of culture was indistinguishable from the impact of life experiences, indicating that the influence of brief workshops is minimal. In Adam's case, CCT's misrepresentation of culture prompted a skeptical reaction towards training and a critical evaluation the concept of culture. Adam's case demonstrates some of the potentially negative consequences of misrepresentations of culture within CCT. More generally the reactions of participants demonstrate that whilst extensive exposure to CCT may influence a person's understanding of culture, the limited exposure experienced by most workshop participants has minimal affect on their understandings of culture. The minimal, or potentially negative, impact of current training programs raises questions about the utility of current CCT practice. The misrepresentations of culture, discovered within training materials, reduce CCT's ability to encourage ethno-relative orientations towards diversity. The integration of cognitive culture theory into CCT teachings could help trainers avoid the conceptual problems of current training models and also help increase the positive influence of cross-cultural training.

The integration of cognitive culture theory into CCT teachings could increase the positive impact of CCT and enable trainers to avoid misrepresentations of culture and the incompatibility problems faced by previous combinations of anthropology and CCT. Current conceptions of culture, within culture general CCT, tend to conflate culture with nationality and can be criticised for being static, prescriptive, creating a false picture of cultural homogeneity, encouraging processes of 'othering' and denying individual agency. Chapter Five demonstrated how cognitive cultural theory can be used to refute the criticisms of the culture critique, as they apply to anthropological conceptions of culture. Cognitive theories, specifically schema theory and connectionism, were shown to be able to account for all the paradoxical aspects of culture within one coherent explanatory framework. Traditionally cross-cultural trainers have avoided integrating anthropological culture theory into training, due to concerns about clarity and complexity. Hall abandoned teaching anthropological culture theory at the FSI due the negative

reactions of trainees (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Moon, 1996). The negative consequences of integrating anthropological theory and CCT were reiterated in Tina's account of the problems faced by an anthropologist trainer. Trainees tend to find anthropological culture theory irrelevant, difficult to understand and impossible to apply to their individual situations. The pragmatic focus of the dimensional models caters well to trainees' desires for concrete information and advice. However, the conceptual problems of the dimensional models diminishes their descriptive force and leaves them open to accusations of misrepresentation. The integration of schema theory and connectionism into CCT teaching could, not only help trainers avoid these conceptual problems, but also avoid the problems of relevancy, clarity and complexity faced by traditional anthropological culture theory. The workings of cultural schemata can easily be explained through the use of examples, as Strauss and Quinn's (1994) account of Paula demonstrates. The ease with which schema can be explained using examples means that CCT based on schema theory could avoid the problems of clarity and complexity. Information on specific cultural practices and values could easily be integrated into examples of the workings of cultural schemata; therefore, catering to trainees' desires for specific information and thus avoiding the problem of relevancy. The ability of schema theory and connectionism to account for the shared, continuous and influential nature of cultural value systems, whilst still explaining individual variation and the dynamic nature of culture, means that training based on these theories could avoid promoting deterministic misrepresentations of culture and the negative trainee reactions that can result from these misrepresentations. The integration of cognitive culture theory into cross-cultural training could aid CCT in providing holistic and more accurate education on the nature and influences of culture; therefore, increasing the potential for CCT to aid in the development of relativistic orientations towards culture and the promotion of positive intercultural relations.

This thesis set out to determine how CCT courses conceptualise culture, the relationship between anthropological conceptions of culture and CCT conceptions of culture and the influences of CCT on participants' orientations towards diversity. The methods employed within this study included literature reviews, semi-structured interviews, reviews of training materials and participation in cross-cultural training. The findings of the literature reviews, interviews and training material reviews were subjected to a critical analysis which examined conceptions of culture, constructions of agency and theoretical adherences within training programs. The training materials and interview findings were subjected to a comparative analysis which compared

anthropological theory with CCT and examined relationships between interview findings and CCT teachings. Initial literature reviews of historical and current CCT practice enabled the presentation of an overview of the origins and cotemporary character of the CCT industry. Contemporary CCT was shown to still be heavily influenced by the pragmatic nationally focused paradigm set by Edward Hall's experiences of training at the FSI. These initial reviews also indicated that the theoretical perspectives of current training programs are heavily influenced by the dimensional models of culture developed by practitioners such as Hall (1959; 1969; 1977), Hofstede (1980; 2005) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997). These dimensional models were presented and then evaluated. The evaluation in conjunction with a review of anthropological culture theory demonstrated that conceptual problems within the dimensional models make them susceptible to the criticisms of the post-modernist culture critique, as raised by anthropologists such as Abu-Lughod (1999), Wikan (1999) and Appadurai (1996). The review and analysis of training materials demonstrated that conceptual problems inherent within the dimensional models are being transferred to training programs. The interview findings showed that whilst teaching methods are generally favorably received, both trainers and trainees were concerned about the creation of stereotypes, the encouragement of 'othering' and impartation of formulaic understandings of intercultural encounters which training programs appeared to be encouraging. Dimensional models of culture were found to exhibit an adherence to functionalist theories of culture, of the kind posited by Malinowski (1944) and Radcliffe-Brown (1952). This functionalist adherence results in the promotion of an a-historical representation of culture, which cannot account for cultural heterogeneity or change. As a result the models conceptualise cultures as static and homogeneous. Within the dimensional models and training courses, these misrepresentations of culture are exacerbated by the conflation of cultures with nations. The interview findings demonstrate that whilst extensive exposure to CCT may result in a clearer understanding of the nature and influences of culture, the minimal exposure to CCT, experienced by most workshop participants, has little affect on how people understand culture or interpret intercultural encounters. Misrepresentations of culture can lead CCT participants to question the accuracy and utility of training and in those with little intercultural experience these misrepresentations may encourage formulaic understandings of diversity, reinforce stereotypes, or encourage processes of 'othering'. Cognitive theory has the potential to help reform CCT teachings and enable trainers to avoid the conceptual problems which arise from training based on dimensional models.

The results of this investigation into CCT's conceptualisations of culture demonstrate a need for the reformation of the culture theory on which CCT is based. Current training, based on dimensional models of culture, is lacking in influence and subject to the criticisms of essentialism and 'othering' as raised by post-modernist anthropologists. Cognitive culture theory has the potential to aid in the reformation of CCT teachings in such a way as to avoid the problems of relevancy and clarity faced by integrations of traditional anthropological culture theory and CCT. Schema theory and connectionism are able to account for individual variation, cultural disjuncture and change, and yet still explain the existence of cultural norms and continuity. The adaptation of schema theory and connectionism, for use in CCT, could therefore, help trainers avoid the creation of formulaic understandings of culture and decrease the potential of training encouraging divisionary processes of 'othering'. This thesis has demonstrated the need for a reformation of CCT teachings and a possible direction which this reformation could take. The improvement and augmented accuracy of cross-cultural training courses will increase the capacity of CCT to promote intercultural understanding and positive intercultural relations within today's multicultural societies.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (1991) Writing Against Culture. In G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present* (pp 137-162). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

(1993) *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin stories.* Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

(1999a) *Veiled Sentiments: Honour and Poetry in Bedouin Society* (3rd ed.). Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

(1999b). Comments. in Writing for Culture: Why a Successful Concept Should not be Abandoned., Brumann, C. (1999). *Current Anthropology 40:supplement,* 13-15.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2007). Census Tables: Australia, (Data File) Retrieved 27. 1. 2008 from: http//www.abs.gov.au.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalisation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Beamer, L. (1995). A schemata model for intercultural study and case study: The emperor and the envoy. *The Journal of Business Communication, 32:2*, 141-161

Bean, R. (2006). *The effectiveness of cross-cultural training in the Australian context*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs. Retrieved November 28, 2007, from http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/research/cross cultural/index

Benedict, R. (1955). *Patterns of culture* (6th ed.) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

(1975). The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (27th ed.). Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Bennett, J, M. (1986). Modes of Cross-cultural Training: Conceptualizing Cross-cultural Training as Education. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10:2*, 117-134.

(1993) Towards Ethno-relativism: A Developmental model for Intercultural Sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed), *Education for the Intercultural Experience* (pp21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, J, M & Bennett, M, J. (2001). *Developing Intercultural Sensitivity: An Integrative Approach to Global and Domestic Diversity*. The Diversity Symposium, 2001.

Berlin, B., Breedlove, D. & Raven, P. (1973). General Principles of Classification and Nomenclature in Folk Biology. *American Anthropologist, 75,* 214-242.

(1974). *Principles of Tzeltal Plant Classification.* New York: Academic Press.

Boas, F. (1931). Race and Progress. *Science, 74,* 1-8.

(1932). The Aims of Anthropological research. In, *Race Language and Culture* (pp243-259). New York: Macmillan.

Brislin, R. & Yoshida, T. (1994). *Intercultural communication training: An introduction.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Brumann, C. (1999). Writing for Culture: Why a Successful Concept Should not be Abandoned. *Current Anthropology 40: supplement,* 1-27.

Bruner, J, S., Goodnow, J. & Austin, G. (1956). *A Study of Thinking*. New York: John Wiley.

Casson, R.W, (1983). Schemata in cognitive anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 12*, 429-462

D'Andrade, R. (1995). *The Development of Cognitive Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Durkheim, E. (1964). *The Division of Labour in Society*. (G. Simpson. Trans.) New York: The Free Press. (Original work published, 1893).

Evans-Pritchard, E, E. (1976). *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande*. (Abridged Ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

(1940) The Nuer of the Southern Sudan. In M.Fortes & E, E. Evans-Pritchard (Ed.) *African Political Systems (pp272-296).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fantini, A.E. & Smith, E. M (1997). A survey of intercultural communication courses. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21;1*, 125-148.

Foucault, M (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.

(1980). *Power/Knowledge*. (C. Gordan Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Goodenough, (1956). Componential Analysis and the Study of Meaning. *Language, 32:1,* 195-216.

Hall E, T. (1959). *The Silent Language*. New York: Doubleday.

(1969). *The Hidden Dimension*. New York: Doubleday.

(1977) *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor-Doubleday.

Hall, E, T. & Hall, M, R. (1990) *Hidden Differences: Doing Business with the Japanese*. New York: Anchor-Doubleday.

Hammer, M, R. & Bennett, M. J, (1998). *The Intercultural Development Inventory*. Portland OR: The IDI Corporation.

Hammer, M, R., Bennett, M. J, & Wiseman, R. (2003) Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27:4*, 421-433.

Harris, M. (1968). *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

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

(1996) Riding the waves of commerce: A test of Trompenaars' "model" of national culture differences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20:2*, 189-198.

(2002). Dimensions do not exist: A reply to Brendan McSweeney. *Human Relations, 55:11*, 1-8.

Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* (2nd Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G, J. & Pedersen, P, B. (2002). *Exploring Culture: Exercises, Stories and Synthetic Cultures.* Yarmouth ME: Intercultural Press

Hunn, E. (1976). Toward a Perceptual Model of Folk Biological Classification. *American Ethnologist, 3:3,* 309-327.

Huntington, S, P. (1993). The Clash of Civilisations? *Foreign Affairs, 72:3*, 22-49.

Jack, G. & Lorbiecki, A. (1999). The Cross-cultural Training Industry: Well Intentioned Service Provider or Technology of Anglo-American Neo-imperialism? *Presented at the critical management studies conference, Globalisation Stream*, July14-16 Manchester, UK.

Kahn, J. (1995). *Culture, Multiculture, Postculture*. London:Thousand oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Kay, P, D. & Kempton, W. (1984). What is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis? *American Anthropologist, 86*:*1* 65-79.

Kluckhohn, F, R. & Strodtbeck, F, L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston ILL: Row, Peterson and Co.

Kroeber, A, L. (1944). *Configurations of Culture Growth*. Berkley: University of California Press.

(1952) *The Nature of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kroeber, A. L & Kluckhohn (1963). *Culture: A Critical review of Concepts and Definitions*. New York: Vintage Books.

Kuper, A. (1996). *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School* (3rd Ed.). London & New York: Routledge.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1990). Notes in the History of Intercultural Communication: The Foreign Service Institute and the Mandate for Intercultural Training. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76:3, 262-281

Levi-Strauss, C. (1963) *Structural Anthropology.* (C. Jacobson & B. Grundfest Schoepf, Trans). New York: Basic Books.

Lounsbury, F. (1964). *A Formal Account of the Crow- and Omaha- Type Kinship Terminologies* (W.H. Goodenough Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Malinowski, B. (1944). *A Scientific Theory of Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

McSweeney, B. (2002), Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – A failure of analysis. *Human Relations, 55;1,* 89-117.

Metzger, D. & Williams, G. (1966). Some procedures and Results in the Study of Native Catagories: Tzeltal "Firewood". *American Anthropologist, 68:2,* 389-407.

Milhouse, V, M. (1996) Intercultural Communication Education and Training Goals Content and Method. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20:1*, 69-95

Moon, D. (1996). Concepts of culture: Implications for intercultural communication research. *Communication Quarterly, 44:1*, 70-80

Moore, J, D. (2004) *Visions of Culture: An Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists.* California: Altamira Press.

Peacock J, L. (2001). *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light, Soft Focus* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pruegger, V, J. & Rogers, T, B. (1994). Cross-cultural Sensitivity Training: Methods and Assessment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18:3*, 369-387.

Radcliffe-Brown, A, R. (1952) *Structure and Function in Primative Societies*. Glencoe Illinois: The Free Press.

Rogers, E, M., Hart, W. B, & Mike, Y. (2002). Edward T. Hall and the History of Intercultural Communication: The United States and Japan. *Keio Communication Review, 24,* 3-26

Said, E, W. (2003). *Orientalism* (5th Ed.) London: Penguin Books.

Samovar, L, A. & Porter, R, E. (2004) Communication between cultures (5th Ed.). Belmont CA: Thompson-Wadsworth.

Sapir, E. (1968). *Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Strauss, C. & Quinn, N (1994). A cognitive/cultural anthropology. In R. Borofsky Ed. *Assessing Cultural Anthropology* (pp. 284-300). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997) *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business* (2nd ed.) London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing Ltd.

(1997a). Response to Geert Hofstede. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21:1*, 149-159.

Tylor, E.B. (1958). *Primitive culture.* (original, 1871). New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Ward, C., Bochner, S. & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock* (2nd Ed.) London: Routledge

Wikan, U. (1999). Culture: A New Concept of Race. *Social Anthropology, 7:1*, 57-64.