
CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF LITERATURE: CULTURE

CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF LITERATURE-CULTURE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

With the increase in global activities of both domestic and multinational companies, managers need a good understanding of culture. People's cultural backgrounds influence their assumptions about how work and interactions with other people should proceed. Culture's influence, although profound, often goes unseen. The findings from the various research projects disagree about why one or more recovery initiatives (e.g., apology, empathy, compensation, explanation, pro active service recovery action) are indispensable in one situation but pointless in another. This thesis argues that they are the result of the service provider failing to account for consumers' cultural models, which form unique recovery preferences and expectations after a service failure. The customer's cultural orientation is one important contingency variable in understanding the effectiveness of service recovery as culture determines how customers think and reason. A growing body of research shows that a customer's cultural orientation influences their service consumption experiences, including service expectations, evaluations, and reactions to service failures or recovery efforts [53] [55] [56] [57]. An understanding of how customers from different cultures react to various types of failure is necessary for theoretical advancement and for more customer-focused industry practices. Research in cultural psychology supports the notion that understanding and expectations are influenced by how people frame the world [201]. This chapter discusses the literature of culture, national culture and various typologies of measuring of cultural values and norms.

3.2 CULTURE OVERVIEW

Culture is the collective programming of the human mind that distinguishes the members of one human group from those of another. Culture in this sense is a system of collectively held values. [67]. People with little understanding of cross-cultural competency tend to use the term interchangeably with race and ethnicity. Culture is a "way a group of people solve problems and reconcile dilemmas" [202]. The patterns of behavior are learned. Individuals are born into a culture, and they subsequently learn how to behave within their society [203].

Studies prior to the 1950s examined and described culture in terms of customs, patterns of behavior and habit such as dress, food, and music [204]. Culture is as “an iceberg sticking out of the ocean.” [205]. At the tip of the iceberg, which is visible above sea level, are reasonably obvious forms of culture, such as music, dance, food, clothing, language, skin color, celebrations and art. These forms are obvious and understood by people outside the culture. Then there are less obvious forms of culture, such as history, religion, customs and rituals related to birth and death. These forms may become evident to the outsider only after observation of non-verbal cues or by making formal inquiry. After this, is the huge chunk of the manifestations of culture which is not easily visible and lies deeper in the ocean. They require extensive inquiry and observation for an outsider to comprehend, such as the meaning of community, concept of space and time, logic, notions of leadership, patterns of decision making, and beliefs about health, help-seeking behavior, and notions of individualism versus collectivism, attitudes toward the elderly and approaches to problem-solving [205]. The cultural differences are susceptible to being evaluated from the cultural perspective of the observer, and this promotes barriers to a meaningful understanding of the cultural identity of others [206]. In 1960s, the study of cultures was focused on the issues relating to minority groups [206]. It focused on nationality, ethnicity and minority groups and used ethnographic research methods [206]. Ethnocentrism applies the standards of one’s own society to people outside that society [67]. This was biased as the cultural variables excluded the more universal cultural dimensions such as economics, politics and religion, and a less than holistic perspective of culture was developed [206]. From the 1970s, the studies on culture steered to a new perspective and began to examine the reflective variables and dimensions when examining cultures. Triandis (1975), [207] proposed a more integrated explanation of culture, identified two inter-related layers of culture i.e. material or concrete culture, which comprised cultural objects and artifacts, and subjective culture, which was defined as the worldview and included stereotypes, roles, norms, attitudes, ideals, and relationships between events and behaviors [207] . From this perspective, the dimensions of culture can be seen as both objective and subjective [208]. Objective cultural dimensions are “point-at-able”, culturally learned and easily identified by those within or outside a given cultural community. Subjective cultural dimensions on the other hand refer to less obvious feelings, attitudes, opinions and assumptions shared by the majority of members of a group and are not easily identified or verified yet are profoundly important to cultural identity. Leighton (1982) [209] identifies this integration of both objective and subjective views of culture. Culture according

to him was recognized by values, norms, beliefs, attitudes, folklores, behavior styles and traditions that link to form an integrated whole [209].

In this dissertation, the term “culture” is viewed from a socio-anthropological perspective. Anthropology refers to the science of man in his physical, social, and cultural variation. According to anthropological concepts, culture relates to a shared system of beliefs, attitudes, possessions, attributes, customs, and values that define group behavior. The study of culture using anthropological concepts referred by Hofstede (1991) [67] is the integrated study of human societies, in particular (although not only) conventional ones.

“Culture means the whole complex of traditional behavior which has been developed by the human race and is successively learned by each generation” [210]. Dawar and Parker 1994 [61] proposed against the common belief where culture is understood in terms of nation. He promulgated that culture does not only mean nations and countries. Thompson (2001)[211] opined that culture encompasses many dimensions such as nations, occupational groups, social classes, gender, races, tribes, corporations, clubs, and social movements, which should neither be led only in one direction nor be defined to a simple explanation

The essence of culture, according to most writers, is embedded in values [68] [212]. Values are defined by Hofstede (1980) [68] as assumptions about “how things ought to be” in the group. Otaki et al. 1986 [213] defined cultural values is an umbrella concept that includes such elements as shared values, beliefs, and norms that are programmed into individuals in subtle ways from an early age. These collectively discriminate particular groups of people from others . Hofstede (1980) [68] reinstates by affirming that “the core of culture is the collective programming of the mind”. This dynamics of sharing as a central element to culture is well supported by many aficionados of culture [214] [215].

3.3 NATIONAL CULTURES

A nation because of its shared history, religion and values and other environmental characteristics forms its unique culture. National culture has numerous facets and some may be relevant only for a particular society, while others for multiple, if not all, societies [216]. The models of national culture have facilitated and inhibited research on cultural differences. These models offer handy templates for comparing management processes, and business strategies across national borders. At present, there are at least six models of national cultures

that continue to be widely cited and utilized in the organizational research literature. These include models proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Hofstede, Hall, Trompenaars, Schwartz, and House and his GLOBE associates. Each model highlights different aspects of societal beliefs, norms, and/or values and, as such, convergence across the models has been seen as being very limited.

3.3.1 KLUCKHOHN AND STRODTBECK

On the basis of the initial research by Clyde Kluckhohn (1951) [217], cultural anthropologists Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck (1961) [218] recommended one of the earliest models of culture that has served as a principal foundation for several later models. They proposed a theory of culture based on value orientations. They proposed that there are a limited number of problems that are common to all human groups and for which there are a limited number of solutions, and that values in any given society are distributed in a way that creates a dominant value system. Five value orientations were presented using anthropological theories. Four of these value orientations were tested in five subcultures of the American Southwest: two Native American tribes, a Hispanic village, a Mormon village, and farming village of Anglo-American homesteaders. The five dimensions are detailed in table 3.1. Each dimension is represented on a three-point scale.

Table 3.1 Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's Cultural Dimensions

Cultural Dimension	Scale anchors		
Beliefs about the need or responsibility to control nature	Mastery: Belief that people has need or responsibility to control nature.	Harmony: Belief that people should work with nature to maintain harmony or balance.	Subjugation: Belief that individuals must submit to nature.
Relationship with People: Beliefs about social structure.	Individualistic: Belief that social structure should be arranged based on individuals	Collateral: Belief that social structure should be based on groups of individuals with relatively equal status	Lineal: Belief that social structure should be based on groups with clear and rigid hierarchical relationships
Human Activities: Beliefs about	Being: Belief that people should	Becoming: belief that individuals should	Doing: belief on striving for goals and accomplishments

appropriate goals	concentrate on living for the moment	strive to develop themselves into an integrated whole	
Relationship with Time: Extent to which past, present, and future influence decisions	Past: In making decisions, people are principally influenced by past events or traditions	Present: In making decisions, people are principally influenced by present circumstances.	Future: In making decisions, people are principally influenced by future
Human Nature: Beliefs about good, neutral or evil human nature	Good: Belief that people are inherently good.	Neutral: Belief that people are inherently neutral.	Evil: Belief that people are inherently evil

Source: Cambridge Handbook of Culture [219]

3.3.2 HOFSTEDE'S TYPOLOGY OF CULTURAL VALUES

Hofstede [68] [66] in a study of more than 116,000 IBM employees in 66 countries, found four universal dimensions of cultural variation that are largely independent to each other. Later, Hofstede (1991) [67] added the fifth dimension – the Confucian dynamic or long-term orientation.. His premise was based on the assumption that different cultures can be distinguished based on differences in what they value. That is, some cultures place a high value on equality among individuals, while others place a high value on hierarchies or power distances between people. Likewise, some cultures value certainty in everyday life and have difficulty coping with unanticipated events, while others have a greater tolerance for ambiguity and seem to relish change. Recently, Hofstede added two more dimensions to his national cultural values model (Hofstede, n.d.). These dimensions are based on the work of Minkov (2007) [220] which delineate the values of Indulgence vs. Restraint and Monumentalism vs. Flexumility. Indulgence refers to the allowance of relatively free gratification with respect to leisure, merrymaking, spending, consumption and sex. Restraint refers to the control of such gratification, where people feel less able to enjoy their lives. Monumentalism (which is correlated with short-term orientation) occurs in societies that reward people for behaviour that embodies pride and resistance to change. Flexumility, flexibility plus humility, reflect self-effacing behaviour and have been re-labelled Self-Effacement by Hofstede in his updated dimensional model. The dimensions are illustrated in table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Cultural Dimension	Scale anchors	
Power Distance: Beliefs about the appropriate distribution of power in society.	Low power distance: Belief that effective leaders do not need to have substantial amounts of power compared to their subordinates. Examples: Austria, Israel, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, Sweden	High power distance: Belief that people in positions of authority should have considerable power compared to their subordinates. Examples: Malaysia, Mexico, Saudi Arabia
Uncertainty Avoidance: Degree of uncertainty that can be tolerated and its impact on rule making	Low uncertainty avoidance: Tolerance for ambiguity; little need for rules to constrain uncertainty. Examples: Singapore, Jamaica, Denmark, Sweden, UK	High uncertainty avoidance: Intolerance for ambiguity; need for many rules to constrain uncertainty. Examples: Greece, Portugal, Uruguay, Japan, France, Spain.
Individualism-Collectivism: Relative importance of individual vs. group interests.	Collectivism: Group interests generally take precedence over individual interests. Examples: Japan, Korea, Indonesia, Pakistan, Latin America.	Individualism: Individual interests generally take precedence over group interests. Examples: US, Australia, UK, Netherlands, Italy, Scandinavia.
Masculinity-Femininity: Assertiveness vs. passivity; material possessions vs. quality of life.	Masculinity: Values material possessions, money, and the pursuit of personal goals. Examples: Japan, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, Mexico	Femininity: Values strong social relevance, quality of life, and the welfare of others. Examples: Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Costa Rica.
Long-term vs. Short-term Orientation: Outlook on work, life, and relationships.	Short-term orientation: Past and present orientation. Values traditions and social obligations. Examples: Pakistan, Nigeria, Philippines, Russia.	Long-term orientation: Future orientation. Values dedication, hard work, and thrift. Examples: China, Korea, Japan, Brazil
Indulgence vs .Restraint	Indulgence stands for a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and	Restraint stands for a society that suppresses gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms.

	having fun.	
Monumentalism vs. Flexumility	Monumentalism is related to pride in self, national pride, making parents proud, and believing religion to be important	The Flexumility pole identifies societies valuing humility, with members seeing themselves as not having a stable, invariant self-concept, and a flexible attitude toward Truth

3.3.3 CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AS DEFINED BY SCHWARTZ

The Schwartz approach provides a cross-culturally validated instrument for measuring cultural-level values and a comprehensive, near universal set of value types for studying cultural differences. Taking a decidedly more psychological view, Shalom Schwartz (1994) [212] and his associates asserted that the essential distinction between societal values is the motivational goals they express. He identified ten universal human values that reflect needs, social motives, and social institutional demands. These values are purportedly found in all cultures and represent universal needs of human existence. The human values identified are: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. Schwartz (1994) [212] argued that individual and cultural levels of analysis are conceptually independent. Individual-level dimensions reflect the psychological dynamics that individuals experience when acting on their values in the everyday life, while cultural-level dimensions reflect the solutions that societies find to regulate human actions. At the cultural level of analysis, Schwartz identified three dimensions: conservatism and autonomy, hierarchy versus egalitarianism, and mastery versus harmony, summarized in table 3.3. Based on this model, he studied school teachers and college students in fifty-four countries. Data collected in 54 countries from approximately 44,000 subjects confirmed the theorized content and structure of the cultural-level value types. His model has been applied to basic areas of social behavior.

Table 3.3 Schwartz's Cultural Dimensions

Cultural Dimension	Scale anchors	
Conservatism-Autonomy: Extent to which individuals are integrated in groups.	Conservatism: refers to maintenance of the status quo, proprietary and restraint of actions that might disrupt group solidarity and traditional order (e.g., social order, respect for tradition, family security).	Autonomy: individuals are autonomous from groups, finding meaning on their own uniqueness. Two types of autonomy: Intellectual autonomy: independent ideas and the rights of the individual to pursue his/her own intellectual directions (e.g., curiosity, creativity, broad mindedness); Affective autonomy individual pursuit of affectively positive experiences (e.g., pleasure, exciting life, a varied life).
Hierarchy-Egalitarianism: Extent to which equality is valued and expected.	Hierarchy: cultures are organized hierarchically. Individuals are socialized to comply with their roles and are sanctioned if they do not. (e.g., social power, authority, humility, wealth).	Egalitarianism: Individuals are seen as moral equals who share basic interests as human beings. (e.g., equality, social justice, freedom, responsibility and honesty).
Mastery-Harmony: Extent to which people seek to change the natural and social world to advance personal or group interests.	Mastery: individuals value getting ahead through self-assertion and seek to change the natural and social world to advance personal or group interests. (e.g., ambition, success, competence).	Harmony: individuals accept the world as it is and try to preserve it rather than exploit it environment (e.g., unity with nature, protecting the environment),

Source: Cambridge Handbook of Culture [219]

3.3.4 CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AS DEFINED BY HALL

Edward T. Hall [196], a noted American cultural anthropologist, has proposed a model of culture based on his ethnographic research in several societies, notably Germany, France, the US, and Japan. He proposed a characterization of cultures in terms of what he calls silent language – the languages of time, space, material possessions, friendship patterns and agreement across culture. His research focuses primarily on how cultures vary in interpersonal communication, but also includes work on personal space and time. These three cultural

dimensions are summarized in table 3.4. Many of the terms used today in the field of cross-cultural management (e.g., monochronic polychronic) are derived from this work.

Table 3.4 Hall's Cultural Dimensions

Cultural Dimension	Scale anchors	
Context: Extent to which the context of a message is as important as the message itself.	Low context: Direct and frank communication; message itself conveys its meaning. Examples: Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden.	High context: Much of the meaning in communication is conveyed indirectly through the context surrounding a message. Examples: China, Korea, and Japan
Space: Extent to which people are comfortable sharing physical space with others.	Center of power: Territorial; need for clearly delineated personal space between themselves and others. Examples: US, Japan.	Center of community: Communal; comfortable sharing personal space with others. Examples: Latin America, Arab States.
Time: Extent to which people approach one task at a time or multiple tasks simultaneously	Monochronic: Sequential attention to individual goals; separation of work and personal life; precise concept of time. Examples: Germany, US, Scandinavia.	Polychronic: Simultaneous attention to multiple goals; integration of work and personal life; relative concept of time. Examples: France, Spain, Mexico, Brazil, Arab States.

Source: Cambridge Handbook of Culture [219]

3.3.5 TROMPENAARS CULTURAL DIMENSIONS

Fons Trompenaars [202]; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998[221] proposed a different model of culture based on his study of Shell and other managers over a ten-year period. The model is based on the early work of Harvard sociologists Parsons and Shils (1951) [222] and focuses on deviation in both values and personal relationships across cultures. It consists of seven dimensions, as shown on table 3.5. The first five dimensions focus on relationships among people, while the last two dimensions focus on time management and society's relationship with nature.

Table 3.5 Trompenaars' Cultural Dimensions

Cultural Dimension	Scale anchors	
Universalism-Particularism: Relative importance of applying standardized rules and policies across societal members; role of exceptions in rule enforcement.	Universalism: dependence on formal rules and policies that are applied equally to everyone. Examples: Austria, Germany, Switzerland, US.	Particularism: Rules must be tempered by the nature of the situation and the people involved. Examples: China, Venezuela, Indonesia, Korea
Individualism-Collectivism: Extent to which people derive their identity from within themselves or their group.	Individualism: Focus on personal achievement and independence. Examples: US, Nigeria, Mexico, Argentina.	Collectivism: Focus on group achievement and welfare. Examples: Singapore, Thailand, Japan.
Specific-Diffuse: Extent to which people's various roles are segregated or integrated.	Specific: Clear parting of a person's various roles. Examples: Sweden, Germany, Canada, UK, US.	Diffuse: Clear integration of a person's various roles. Examples: China, Venezuela, Mexico, Japan, Spain
Neutral-Affective: Extent to which people are free to express their emotions in public.	Neutral: desist from showing emotions; hide feelings. Examples: Japan, Singapore, UK.	Affective: Emotional expressions acceptable or encouraged. Examples: Mexico, Brazil, Italy.
Achievement-Ascription: Manner in which social status respect and respect are accorded to people.	Achievement: Respect for earned accomplishments. Examples: Austria, US, Switzerland.	Ascription: Respect for ascribed or inherited status. Examples: Egypt, Indonesia, Korea, Hungary.
Time Perspective: Relative focus on the past or the future in daily activities.	Past/present oriented: stress on past events and glory. Examples: France, Spain, Portugal, Arab countries.	Future oriented: stress on planning and future possibilities. Examples: China, Japan, Korea, Sweden, US.
Relationship with Environment: Extent to which people believe they control the environment or it controls them.	Inner-directed: Focus on controlling the environment. Examples: Australia, US, UK.	Outer-directed: Focus on living in harmony with nature. Examples: China, India; Sweden, Egypt, Korea.

Source: Cambridge Handbook of Culture [219]

3.3.6 GLOBE

Robert House led an international team of researchers that focused primarily on understanding the influence of cultural differences on leadership processes [223]. Their investigation was called the “GLOBE study” for Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness. In their research, the GLOBE researchers identified nine cultural dimensions, as summarized in table 3.6.

Though many of these dimensions have been identified previously (e.g., individualism-collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance), some are unique (e.g., gender egalitarianism and performance orientation). The GLOBE researchers collected data in sixty-two countries and compared the results. Differences were found in leader behavior across the cultures. For instance, a leader who listens carefully to his or her subordinates is more valued in the US .Participatory leadership styles that are often accepted in the individualistic cultures in the western countries are not so effective more collectivistic eastern countries. Asians emphasize on paternalistic leadership and group maintenance activities. Charismatic leaders may be highly assertive in some cultures and passive in others but are found in most cultures. Chinese and Malaysian leaders are expected to behave in a manner that is humble, dignified, and modest. Indians prefer leaders who are assertive, morally principled, ideological, bold, and proactive. Family and tribal norms support highly autocratic leaders in many Arabian countries [223].

Table 3.6 Globe’s Cultural Dimensions

Cultural Dimension	Scale anchors	
Power Distance: Degree to which people expect power to be distributed equally	High: Society divided into classes; power bases are stable and scarce; power is seen as providing social order; limited upward mobility.	Low: Society has large middle class; power bases are transient and sharable; power often seen as a source of corruption, coercion, and dominance; high upward mobility.
Uncertainty Avoidance: Extent to which people rely on norms, rules, and procedures to reduce the unpredictability of future	High: Tendency to formalize social interactions; document agreements in legal contracts; be orderly and maintain meticulous records;	Low: Tendency to be more informal in social interactions; reliance on word of people they trust; less concerned with orderliness and record-keeping; rely on informal norms of behavior.

events	rely on rules and formal policies	
Humane Orientation: Extent to which people reward fairness, altruism, and generosity.	High: Interests of others important; values altruism, benevolence, kindness, and generosity; high need for belonging and affiliation; fewer psychological and pathological problems.	Low: Self-interest important; values pleasure, comfort, and self-enjoyment; high need for power and possessions; more psychological and pathological problems.
Institutional Collectivism: Extent to which society encourages collective distribution of resources and collective action.	High: Individuals integrated into strong cohesive groups; self viewed as interdependent with groups; societal goals often take precedence over individual goals	Low: Individuals largely responsible for themselves; self viewed as autonomous; individual goals often take precedence over societal or group goals.
In-Group Collectivism: Extent to which individuals express pride, loyalty, express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations and families.	High: Members assume they are interdependent and seek to make important personal contributions to group or organization; long-term employer-employee relationships; organizations assume major responsibility of employee welfare; important decisions made by groups.	Low: Members assume they are independent of the organization and seek to stand out by making individual contributions; short-term employer-employee relationships; organizations primarily interested in the work performed by employees over their personal welfare.
Assertiveness: Degree to which people are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in relationships with others.	High: Value assertiveness, dominance, and tough behavior for all members of society; sympathy for the strong; value competition; belief in success through hard work; values direct and unambiguous	Low: Prefers modesty and tenderness to assertiveness; sympathy for the weak; values cooperation; often associates competition with defeat and punishment; values face saving in communication and action

	communication.	
Gender Egalitarianism: Degree to which gender differences are minimized.	High: High participation of women in the workforce; more women in positions of authority; women accorded equal status in society.	Low: Low participation of women in the workforce; fewer women in positions of authority; women not accorded equal status in society.
Future Orientation: Extent to which people engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing, and delayed gratification.	High: Greater emphasis on economic success; propensity to save for the future; values intrinsic motivation; organizations tend to be flexible and adaptive.	Low: Less emphasis on economic success; propensity for instant gratification; values extrinsic motivation; organizations tend to be bureaucratic and inflexible.
Performance Orientation: Degree to which high performance is encouraged and rewarded	High: Belief that individuals are in control of their destiny; values assertiveness, competitiveness, and materialism; emphasizes performance over people.	Low: Values harmony with environment over control; emphasizes seniority, loyalty, social relationships, and belongingness; values who people are more than what they do

Source: Cambridge Handbook of Culture [219]

3.4 NATIONAL HETEROGENEITY

National boundaries do not always coincide with culturally homogeneous societies [61] [62]. The non-national cultures and non-cultural forces operate within nations then national uniformity cannot be presumed. Extensive literature promulgates national diversity [224] [225] [226]. Philip Bock states 'we must conclude that the uniformity assumption is false' [224]

The boundaries of 'Nations' are blurring. The dissolution of USSR led to the birth of fifteen new countries and Yugoslavia dissolved in 1990's into five independent countries. South Sudan peacefully seceded from Sudan in 2011. Besides these examples of fissure a recent example of integration is that of Hong Kong which integrated into the People's Republic of China. When nations dissolve how we give the culture characterization of the each new nation formed. On the same hand when countries integrate, for example, Hongkong. The cultural characterization of Hong Kong would be similar to UK or the culture characterization of

entire China will be similar to Hong Kong. Thus the term culture is not equivalent to the term country even though in many cross-cultural studies country has been used as a surrogate for culture. [61] [62]. Thus culture is border free, and one cannot easily conclude that the people within a culture are homogenous. Equating country and culture raises some serious problems because within-country heterogeneity may be as sizeable as between-culture heterogeneity [68]. When the cultural heterogeneity within a country is large, for example as in India the terms national culture improperly describe the true cultural characteristics of the individuals in the country due to wide exceptions to the national character.

3.5 MEASURING CULTURE AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

This research aims to examine the impact of culture on perceived relative importance of the service recovery dimensions. This study captures the cultural orientation of the individual as the unit of analysis. National generalizations are unable to explain individual behaviors because, similar to stereotypes, they cannot be applied to all individuals [69]. Farley and Lehman (1994) [63] have proposed that the dissimilarity in behaviour is not due to mechanical or controllable factors, but due to the life experiences of people from within those cultures. Yoo, Donthu, and Lenartowicz [69] propagate that when the cultural heterogeneity within a country is big, the terms national culture inappropriately describe the true cultural characteristics of the individuals in the country due to wide difference and exceptions to the national character [69].

To avoid stereotyping, the cultural values should be captured at an individual level. The Hofstede's typology of culture also called as "a watershed conceptual foundation for many subsequent cross-national research endeavors" [227] was the most preferred choice because of the following three reasons:

Hofstede's works have been established empirically through replication [228] and has been heavily cited [229] and is regarded as the most important and popular theory of culture types [230].

Huge bodies of researchers have successfully and consistently adopted Hofstede typology of culture in cross-cultural and international studies [53] [54] [55] [80] [81]. His cultural dimensions are highly relevant to explaining cross-cultural behaviour on service recovery attributes.

Lastly Hofstede's framework is an all-inclusive and shows meaningful relationships with major demographic, geographic, economic, and political indicators of a society [231].

3.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter gives a review of the relevant literature concerning culture and the impact of cultural values on consumer behavior. It also discusses the new school of thought i.e national heterogeneity. The next chapter will introduce a conceptual framework based on the literature review in chapter 2 and 3.
