HANDOUT 1 DIMENSIONS OF NATION-STATE CULTURE

Introduction

This lesson marks the beginning of the second semester for this year. It takes a comparative hands-on approach to the study of culture and communication.

You will read how nation-state cultures differ in fundamental or underlying values. Approaches that focus on nation-state identity make the assumption that cultural boundaries match up with political boundaries. Thus, to argue that nation-state is the major source of identity assumes that each nation-state represents a single cultural tradition.

You'll read about the **cultural dimensions** developed by Geert Hofstede. Hofstede initially developed his model in the 1960s and 1970s. His **intercultural theory** was one of the first that could be quantified and could be used to explain observed differences between cultures. It has become the major theory in intercultural communication research.

The handout starts with a discussion of Hofstede's research and the criticisms it received. Next, the dimensions developed by **Trompenaars** and **Hampden-Turner** will be explored. Finally, for illustration of Hofstede's model, a case study (Singapore) will be discussed.

Objectives of lesson one

1- Describe the original Hofstede dimensions

2- Identify countries considered on the extremes of each of the Hofstede dimensions

3- Describe the communication practices associated with each Hofstede dimension

4- Descuss the criticism his system received

5- Describe the Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner dimensions

6- Use the Hofstede dimensions to describe Singaporean culture

Hofstede's Research

In 1980, the **Dutch management researcher Geert Hofstede** first published the results of his study of more than 100,000 employees of the multinational corporation IBM in 40 countries (Hofstede, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2001). Hofstede was attempting to locate value dimensions across which cultures vary. He emphasized that his results apply to the national level, not to individuals.

Hofstede identified four dimensions that he labeled **individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance.** His individualism-collectivism dimension describes cultures from loosely structured to tightly integrated. The masculinity-femininity dimension describes how a culture's dominant values are assertive or nurturing. Power distance refers to the distribution of influence within a culture. And uncertainty avoidance reflects a culture's tolerance of ambiguity and acceptance of risk.

Hofstede and Bond (1984; also see Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) identified a fifth dimension, a Confucian work dynamism, also labeled **long-term orientation versus short-term orientation to life.** The Confucian work dynamism dimension describes cultures that range from short-term values with respect for tradition and reciprocity in social relations to long-term values with persistence and ordering relationships by status.

In the 2010 edition of Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov added a sixth dimension: **indulgence versus self-restraint**.

1- individualism-collectivism

This dimension relates to "the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that prevails in a given society" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 209). According to Hofstede, in collectivist cultures, people are interdependent within their in-groups (family, tribe, nation, etc.), give priority to the goals of their in-groups, and shape their behaviour primarily on the basis of in-group norms. In contrast, in individualist cultures, people tend to see themselves as autonomous and independent from their in-groups; they give priority to their personal goals over their in-group's goals. They also behave primarily on the basis of their own attitudes rather than on the norms of their in-groups.

Key differences between individualist and collectivist societies that may manifest in school settings include the following: In cultures with an individualist orientation, **identity** is based on the individual person, whereas for the collectivist, it is group identity. In people's approaches to **task completion**, for the individualist, the importance of accomplishing the task tends to take precedence over relationship building in group work situations, whereas for those of the collectivist orientation, relationship building tends to precede task completion. In addition, in individualist cultures, generally, people should strive to maintain harmony and avoid conflict. When participating in **class discussions**, students with a collectivist orientation tend to be more reluctant to speak up in class or in large groups, whereas in individualist cultures, speaking one's mind or expressing one's opinion is valued. **Individual initiatives** are discouraged in collectivist societies, whereas such initiatives are often encouraged and viewed favourably in individualist societies. Some cultures (e.g., in North America, Australia, Great Britain, Netherlands, and New Zealand) tend to accept, encourage, or reward individualism; others (e.g., in Central and South America, Taiwan, South Korea, Vietnam, Thailand, and China) tend to frown on behaviours that reflect individualism and instead stress the value of collective behaviours (See table 1 below).

1	United States	28	Czech Republic
2	Australia	29	Austria
3	Great Britain		
4–6	Canada total	31	Slovakia
4–6	Hungary	32	Spain
4–6	Netherlands	33	India
7	New Zealand	34	Suriname
8	Belgium and the Netherlands	35–37	Argentina
9	Italy	35–37	Japan
10	Denmark	35–37	Morocco
11	Canada Quebec	38	Iran
12	Belgium (French)	39–40	Jamaica
13–14	France	39–40	Russia
13–14	Sweden	41–42	Arab countries
15–16	Ireland	41–42	Brazil
15–16	Latvia	43	Turkey
17–18	Norway	44	Uruguay
17–18	Switzerland (German)	45	Greece
19	Germany	46	Croatia
20	South Africa (White)	47	Philippines

Table 1 Individualism Rankings for 46 Countries and Regions (Adapted from: Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010, pp. 95–97).

2- Masculinity-femininity

According to Hofstede (2001), the dimension of masculinity and femininity **deals with what implications the biological differences between the sexes should have for their respective social roles (p. 279).** He labels those who strive for maximal distinction between what women and men are expected to do as "masculine' cultures (e.g., Japan, Austria, Venezuela, and Mexico). Those labelled as "feminine" cultures (e.g., Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and Denmark) permit more overlapping social roles for the two genders. Hofstede (1980) found that women's social role varied less from culture to culture than men's.

Members of highly masculine cultures (e.g., Slovakia, Japan, Austria, Venezuela, and Italy) tend to believe that men should be assertive and that women should be nurturing. Gender roles are clearly differentiated, and gender inequality is accepted as the norm. The reverse is true for **members of highly feminine cultures** (e.g., Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, and Denmark): Gender roles are less rigid and equality between the genders is the norm. The United States and Canada have been identified as countries with masculine cultures (e.g., Nelson, Brunel, Supphellen, & Manchanda, 2006). This categorization indicates a higher degree of gender role differentiation.

Gender differences and values have been extensively examined and discussed by Deborah Tannen (1992), who has shown the difference between female and male discourses in the United States. Her work has shown that each gender has its own way of thinking, feeling, speaking, and behaving. Men and women can be very different in their patterns of communication. **It is important not to use this information to stereotype gender differences**. Instead, use the information to increase your awareness of whether or how gender differences may be a factor in styles of

both verbal and non-verbal communication in order to avoid miscommunication and to work together more effectively. (See table 2 below).

1	Slovakia	31–32	Arab countries
2	Japan	31–32	Morocco
3	Hungary	33	Canada total
4	Austria	34–36	Luxembourg
5	Venezuela	34–36	Malaysia
6	Switzerland (German)	34–36	Pakistan
7	Italy	37	Brazil
8	Mexico	38	Singapore
9–10	Ireland		
9–10	Jamaica	39–40	Malta
11–13	China	41–42	Indonesia
11–13	Germany	41–42	Africa West
11–13	Great Britain	43–45	Canada Quebec
14–16	Colombia	43–45	Taiwan
14–16	Philippines	43–45	Turkey
14–16	Poland	46	Panama
17–18	South Africa (White)	47–50	Belgium Netherlands
17–18	Ecuador	47–50	France
19	United States	47–50	Iran
20	Australia	47–50	Serbia
21	Belgium (French)	51–53	Peru
22–24	New Zealand	51–53	Romania
22–24	Switzerland (French)	51–53	Spain
22–24	Trinidad	54	Africa East
25–27	Czech Republic	55–58	Bulgaria
25–27	Greece	55–58	Croatia
25–27	Hong Kong	55–58	El Salvador
28–29	Argentina	55–58	Vietnam
28–29	India	59	South Korea
30	Bangladesh	60	Uruguay
61–62	Guatemala	69	Costa Rica
61–62	Suriname	70–71	Lithuania
63	Russia	70–71	Slovenia
64	Thailand	72	Denmark
65	Portugal	73	Netherlands
66	Estonia	74	Latvia
67	Chile	75	Norway
68	Finland	76	Sweden

Source: Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010, pp. 141–143).

Table 2 Masculinity Rankings for 75 Countries and Regions

3- Power distance

The Hofstede dimension Power distance describes the way the culture deals with inequalities. Hofstede (1997) defines power distance as "the extent to which less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally" (p. 28).**While people from some cultures may value equality or strive for equal status** (i.e., small power distance), **other cultures accept and expect that power is distributed unequally or even greatly value status differentials and social hierarchies** (i.e., large power distance). In the latter cases, people tend not to communicate with those of higher status directly, and tend to accept the words and actions of individuals with higher status without question, debate, or criticism. Your view of power and status differentials may influence how you behave or communicate, or how you expect others of different rankings or statuses to behave in various communicative settings. **For instance,** how do you feel about asking questions in class? How likely are you to disagree with a professor during a discussion, when you are certain that your professor needs to be corrected? Would you openly disagree with your instructor in a seminar discussion or challenge an expert's viewpoint at a colloquium? How comfortable is it for you to address your instructor by his/her first name? How comfortable do you feel about dropping by your professor's office just to say "hello,"?

Recent research by Minkov (2018) suggests that what Hofstede describes as power distance may actually be a facet of individualism-collectivism rather than an independent dimension.Table 3 below, shows rankings for some countries. **A high ranking indicates a country where power distance is important.**

1–2	Malaysia	27–29	Hong Kong
1–2	Slovakia	27–29	Poland
3–4	Guatemala	30–31	Belgium (French)
3–4	Panama	30–31	Colombia
5	Philippines	32–33	El Salvador
6	Russia	32–33	Turkey
7	Romania	34–36	Africa East
8	Serbia	34–36	Peru
9	Suriname	34–36	Thailand
10–11	Mexico	37–38	Chile
10–11	Venezuela	37–38	Portugal
12–14	Arab countries	39–40	Belgium NL
12–14	Bangladesh	39–40	Uruguay
12–14	China	41–42	Greece
15–16	Ecuador	41–42	South Korea
15–16	Indonesia	43–44	Iran
17–18	Africa West	43–44	Taiwan
17–18	India	45–46	Czech Republic
19	Singapore	45–46	Spain
20	Croatia	47	Malta
21	Slovenia	48	Pakistan
22–25	Bulgaria	49–50	Canada Quebec
22–25	Morocco	49–50	Japan
22–25	Switzerland (French)	51	Italy
22–25	Vietnam	52–53	Argentina
26	Brazil	52–53	South Africa (White)
27–29	France	54	Trinidad
55	Hungary	65–67	Germany
56	Jamaica	65–67	Great Britain
57	Latvia	68	Finland
58	Lithuania	69–70	Norway
59–61	Estonia	69–70	Sweden
59–61	Luxembourg	71	Ireland
59–61	United States	72	Switzerland (German)
62	Canada total	73	New Zealand
63	Netherlands	74	Denmark
64	Australia		
65–67	Costa Rica	76	Austria

Source: Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010, pp. 57–59).

Table 3 Power Distance Rankings for 75 Countries and Regions.

4- Uncertainty Avoidance

Hofstede's (1980) dimension of Uncertainty avoidance **refers to the extent to which people in a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations.** Hofstede (1997) explains that this feeling of being threatened by the unknown is expressed through nervous stress and a need for predictability or a need for written and unwritten rules. In these cultures, such situations are avoided by maintaining strict codes of behaviour and a belief in absolute truths. Cultures strong in uncertainty avoidance are active, aggressive, emotional, compulsive, security seeking, and intolerant. Cultures weak in uncertainty avoidance are contemplative, less aggressive, unemotional, relaxed, accepting of personal risks, and relatively tolerant. Cultures that rank high on the list are uncertainty avoidant.

Students from cultures with high uncertainty avoidance expect their teachers to be experts who have all the answers. And in the workplace, there is an inner need to work hard and a need for rules, precision, and punctuality. Students from cultures with low uncertainty avoidance accept teachers who admit to not knowing all the answers. And in the workplace, employees work hard only when needed, there are no more rules than are necessary, and precision and punctuality have to be learned (See table 4 below).

1	Greece	29–30	Colombia
2	Portugal	29–30	Croatia
3	Guatemala	31–32	Brazil
4	Uruguay	31–32	Venezuela
5	Belgium (Netherlands)	33	Italy
6	Malta	34	Czech Republic
7	Russia	35–38	Austria
8	El Salvador	35–38	Luxembourg
9–10	Belgium (French)	35–38	Pakistan
9–10	Poland	35–38	Switzerland (French)
11–13	Japan	39	Taiwan
11–13	Serbia	40–41	Arab countries
11–13	Suriname	40–41	Morocco
14	Romania	42	Ecuador
15	Slovenia	43–44	Germany
16	Peru	43–44	Lithuania
17–22	Argentina	45	Thailand
17–22	Chile	46	Latvia
17–22	Costa Rica	47–49	Bangladesh
17–22	France	47–49	Canada Quebec
17–22	Panama	47–49	Estonia
17–22	Spain	50–51	Finland
23–25	Bulgaria	50–51	Iran
23–25	South Korea	52	Switzerland (German)
23–25	Turkey	53	Trinidad
26–27	Hungary	54	Africa West
26–27	Mexico	55	Netherlands
		56	Africa East
57–58	Australia	67	Malaysia
57–58	Slovakia	68–69	Great Britain
59	Norway	68–69	Ireland
60–61	New Zealand	70–71	China
60–61	South Africa (White)	70–71	Vietnam
62–63	Canada total	72–73	Hong Kong
62–63	Indonesia	72–73	Sweden
64	United States	74	Denmark
65	Philippines	75	Jamaica
66	India	76	Singapore

Source: Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010, pp. 192–194).

Table 4 Uncertainty Avoidance Rankings for 75 Countries and Regions

5- Long-Term Versus Short-Term Orientation

In 1987, the Chinese Culture Connection, composed of **Michael H. Bond and others**, extended Hofstede's work to include a new dimension they labeled *Confucian work dynamism*, now more commonly called *Long-term orientation versus Short-term orientation to life*. This dimension includes such values as thrift, persistence, having a sense of shame, and ordering relationships. Confucian work dynamism refers to dedicated, motivated, responsible, and educated individuals with a sense of commitment and organizational identity and loyalty. Minkov (2018) reconceptualized this dimension as *flexibility-monumentalism* to explain cultural differences between East Asian Confucian societies and Latin American and African societies as well as predicting national differences in educational achievement. Countries high in Confucian work dynamism are Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore— popularly referred to as the Five Economic Dragons. **Long-term orientation** encourages thrift, savings, perseverance toward results, and a willingness to subordinate oneself for a purpose. **Short-term orientation** is consistent with spending to keep up with social pressure, less savings, preference for quick results, and a concern with face.

1	South Korea	13	Slovakia
2	Taiwan	14	Montenegro
3	Japan	15	Switzerland
4	China	16	Singapore
5	Ukraine	17	Moldova
6	Germany	18	Czech Republic
7	Estonia	19	Bosnia and Herzegovina
8	Belgium	20	Bulgaria
9	Lithuania	21	Latvia
10	Russia	22	Netherlands
11	Belarus	23	Kyrgyzstan
12	Former East Germany	24	Luxembourg

Source: Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010, p. 240).

Table 5 Long-Term Orientation Rankings for 24 Countries

6- Indulgence Versus Self-Restraint

In the 2010 edition of Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov added a sixth dimension: indulgence versus self-restraint. ***"Indulgence … [is] a tendency to allow relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun…. [R]estraint reflects a conviction that such gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by strict social norms" (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 281).*** This dimension, as it is new, does not as of yet have sufficient data accumulated to be as significant in conclusions as the other dimensions. Indulgence scores are highest in Latin America, parts of Africa, the Anglo world, and Nordic Europe; restraint is mostly found in East Asia, Eastern Europe, and the Muslim world. Table 6 below shows the countries highest in indulgence and highest in restraint.

High-Indulgence Countries	High-Restraint Countries
1. Venezuela	74. Morocco
2. Mexico	75. China
3. Puerto Rico	76. Azerbaijan
4. El Salvador	77–80. Russia
5. Nigeria	77–80. Montenegro
6. Colombia	77–80. Romania
7. Trinidad	77–80. Bangladesh
8. Sweden	81. Moldova
9. New Zealand	82. Burkina Faso
10. Ghana	83–84. Hong Kong
11. Australia	83–84. Iraq
12–13. Cyprus	85–87. Estonia
12–13. Denmark	85–87. Bulgaria
14. Great Britain	85–87. Lithuania
15–17. Canada	88–89. Belarus
15–17. Netherlands	88–89. Albania
15–17. United States	90. Ukraine
18. Iceland	91. Latvia
19–20. Switzerland	92. Egypt
19–20. Malta	93. Pakistan

Source: Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010, pp. 282–285).

Table 6 Indulgence Versus Self-Restraint

In ***indulgent cultures,*** there tends to be a higher percentage of very happy people, greater importance placed on leisure and having friends, more extroverted personalities, and lower death rates from cardiovascular diseases. In private life, there is more satisfying family life, more involvement in sports, and loosely prescribed gender roles. Indulgent cultures encourage enjoying life and having fun.

In ***restrained cultures,*** there tends to be a lower percentage of very happy people, a perception of helplessness, cynicism, more neurotic personalities, more pessimism, and higher death rates from cardiovascular diseases. Private life is characterized by family life being less satisfying, less involvement in sports, more strictly prescribed gender roles, and priority given to maintaining order in the nation. Restrained cultures tend to enforce strict norms regulating gratification of human desires.

CRITICISMS OF HOFSTEDE'S RESEARCH

Hofstede has not gone without critics (McSweeney, 2002a, 2002b). Typical of the criticisms are the following:

- Nations are not the best units for studying cultures. Hofstede (2002) himself agrees, arguing that nations are the only kind of units available for comparison. However, Ladegaard (2007) demonstrated that in a large global corporation employing some 8,500 people in nearly 40 countries, employees perceive their nation-states as the frame of reference or identity.
- Hofstede's survey data are based on a small sample. Hofstede actually combined the results from two separate surveys from 1968 to 1969 and 1971 to 1973. The total of 117,000 questionnaires is the combined number for both surveys. Of that total, data from only 40 countries were used, and for only 6 of the included countries did the number of respondents exceed 1,000. In 15 countries, the number was less than 200.
- Hofstede's survey data are old and outdated. As Charles W. L. Hill (1998) points out, "Cultures do not stand still, they evolve over time, albeit slowly. What was a reasonable characterisation in the 1960s and 1970s may not be so reasonable today" (p. 89).
- Hofstede (2002) responds that the dimensions are assumed to have centuries-old roots, that recent replications show no changes, and that the dimensions have been validated against other measures.
- Hofstede's data are drawn from subsidiaries of only one company, which cannot provide information about entire national cultures. Hofstede (2002) responds that the dimensions are based on the differences between nations and that using the IBM data provides unusually well-matched samples from a large number of countries.

Despite such criticisms, Hofstede's work has become the dominant paradigm and framework for subsequent studies (Chapman, 1997).

THE TROMPENAARS AND HAMPDEN-TURNER DIMENSIONS

There have been attempts to validate and revise the Hofstede dimensions as well as attempts to establish alternative models. Another such attempt to identify cultural dimensions has been made by Alfonsus (Fons) Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner. Fons Trompenaars worked with Shell in nine countries, including 7 years as the director of human resources. Taking the example of Geert Hofstede, Trompenaars worked with Charles Hampden-Turner to research the values of 46,000 managers in 40 countries. From their research, they concluded that people from diverse cultures differ from one another in seven dimensions **(Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012).** Some of these value orientations are nearly identical to Hofstede's dimensions. Others offer a new perspective. Compare the Trompenaars dimensions to the Hofstede dimensions as follows.

1- Universalism versus particularism (rules versus relationships)

In *universalist cultures*, people place importance on laws, rules, values, and obligations. To treat people fairly, one follows the accepted rules. Universalist cultures include the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, Scandinavia, New Zealand, Australia, and Switzerland. In *particularist cultures*, people follow the dictates of each circumstance and relationship. Particularist cultures include Russia, countries in Latin America, and China.

2- Individualism versus communitarianism (the individual versus the group)

In *individualist cultures*, people believe they take care of themselves and make decisions for themselves. Freedom and personal achievement are values. Individualist cultures include the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, New Zealand, Australia, and Switzerland. *Communitarianist cultures* believe the group comes before the individual, as the group is more important than the individual. The group provides safety and security for individuals. Communitarianist cultures include Japan and countries in Latin America and Africa.

3- Specific versus diffuse

In *specific cultures*, people keep their personal lives separate from their work lives. Additionally, there is the belief that relationships at work don't have a major impact on work and that people can work together without having a good relationship with each other. Specific cultures include the United States, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Germany, Scandinavia, and the Netherlands. In *diffuse cultures*, people see work and personal lives overlapping. Businesspeople socialize with colleagues and clients. Diffuse cultures include Argentina, Spain, Russia, India, and China.

4- Neutral versus emotional

In *neutral cultures*, people take great care to control their emotions. Reason is valued over feelings. *Neutral cultures* include the United Kingdom, Sweden, the Netherlands, Finland, and Germany. In emotional cultures, spontaneous emotional expressions are accepted and welcomed. Emotional cultures include Poland, Italy, France, Spain, and countries in Latin America.

5- Achievement versus ascription

In *achievement-oriented cultures*, people believe you are what you do. An individual is judged accordingly. Performance is valued over identity. Achievement-oriented cultures include the United States, Canada, Australia, and Scandinavia. In *ascription-oriented cultures*, title, position, and power influence how others view you. Your value is determined by who you are. Ascription-oriented cultures include France, Italy, Japan, and Saudi Arabia.

6- Sequential time versus synchronous time

In *sequential time cultures*, people place a value on planning and staying on schedule. Punctuality and meeting deadlines are valued. Events should happen in the planned order. Sequential time cultures include Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In *synchronous time cultures*, people work on multiple projects at once. Commitments and plans are viewed as flexible. Synchronous time cultures include Japan, Argentina, and Mexico.

7- Internal direction versus outer direction

This dimension is also known as having an internal or external locus of control. In *internally directed cultures*, people believe they can control their environment and nature in order to achieve their goals.

Internally directed cultures include Israel, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. In *outer-directed cultures*, people believe they are highly influenced by their environment and must work with the environment to achieve their goals. People in outer-directed cultures tend to avoid conflict with others. Outer-directed cultures include China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia.

The Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner dimension of communitarianism-individualism seems to be virtually identical to Hofstede's collectivism-individualism. Their achievement-ascription value orientation appears to be somewhat related to Hofstede's power distance dimension; Hofstede's dimension is broader in that it includes how status is accorded but also how the culture accepts power distance. Their universalism-particularism dimension, which describes a preference for rules, could overlap with Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance dimension and the collectivism-individualism dimension. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's other dimensions don't have a clear relationship to Hofstede's.

Hofstede's cultural dimensions on the ground

Singapore: A Case Study

Singapore is an island nation of 697 square kilometers, the smallest but one of the most prosperous countries in Southeast Asia. Various groups of people have migrated to Singapore. Its population of 6 million is 74% Chinese. Today, Singapore is a multiracial, multicultural society with a dynamic economy. Its government has been strict and paternalistic, steadily building the country into an economic and trade powerhouse that has education and income levels comparable to those in the United States. The island nation is clean, efficient, and law abiding.

Singapore ranks at approximately 60th on Hofstede's ranking of **individualism-collectivism** indicating a more collectivist society. How can a collectivist culture be competitive, or *kiasu? (pronounced kee-ah-sue: embodies competitiveness, greed, selfishness, and inconsiderate behavior, which has come to identify Singapore).* A survey by the Institute of Policy Studies found that Singaporeans perceived their society to be kiasu more than any other trait (Pierson, 2019). Yu and Yang (1994) posited two forms of achievement motivation in Chinese societies: individual-oriented achievement motivation, which focuses on individual success, and social-oriented achievement motivation, which focuses on performance related to comparison to others and social recognition. Bedford and Chua (2018), then, hypothesize that *kiasu* is a form of social-oriented achievement motivation consistent with Confucian values related to identity and face. Thus, individuals in a collectivist society may exhibit competitiveness.

Resources used in this lesson

1- Fred. E, Jandt. (2021). An introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a global community. TENTH EDITION. SAGE Publishing- California State University, San Bernardino.

2- Li-Shih Huang. (2010). Academic Communication Skills. Conversation Strategies for International Graduate Students.