National Cultures at the Dinner Table: An Exploratory Inquiry into Measurability of Hofstede's Dimensions in Everyday Settings.

Zhanyl Kylzhyrova

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partialfulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master
of
Business Administration

Eastern Mediterranean University
February, 2015
Gazimagusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduation Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçioğlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tumer
Chair, Department of Business Administration

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

_____
Asst. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Islamoglu
Supervisor

Examining Committee
_____

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. İlhan Dalci   _____

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tumer   _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Islamoglu   _____

ABSTRACT

Hofstede's cultural dimensions are considered as a benchmark for measurement of culture differences between several nations. Yet, the sole method of measuring such cultural differences until now has been through survey data that have been collected and reconfirmed by various studies over the past decades. Compared to the self-reported, formal, survey-based method of data collection where participants are aware that they are being measured, a non-invasive and discreet method of measuring cultural values in natural settings would be far more appropriate. Realizing this need and inspired by game-theory studies in economics and cognitive studies in psychology, this study explores whether similar simulations can be designed to measure cultural dimension values in actual or designed real-life settings. The setting in our study was the behaviors of family members at dinner table and the comparisons were made between Turkish and Nigerian cultures. By using semi structured interview techniques, data was collected from Nigerian and Turkish students within the university campus and Turkish people living in North Cyprus. Findings confirm the literature on power distance, individualism, and masculinity, and deviate from the literature on uncertainty avoidance. Most importantly, the exploratory study process reveals that trying to observe cultural differences at every day settings require far more detailed observations along a much longer time period and more sophisticated analysis than a master's thesis allows. The divergence of behaviours do indicate the potential benefits of using such natural setting experiments especially for human resource field.

Keywords: Hofstede, cultural dimensions, table manners, comparative culture.

ÖZ

Hofstede'nin kültürel boyutları, uluslar arası kültürel farklılıkların ölçümünde önde gelen kriter olarak kabul görmektedir. Halbuki, bu kültürel farklılıkların ölçümünde son elli yılda kullanılan tek yöntem, çeşitli yer ve zamanlarda yapılan standardize edilmiş anket çalışmalarıdır. Kişinin, kendi davranışlarının ölçüldüğünün bilincinde olarak kendi hakkında beyanda bulunduğu resmi anket tabanlı veri toplama yöntemlerine kıyasla, müdahaleci olmayan, daha gizli saklı bir yöntemle ve doğal ortamlarda yapılacak kültürel değer ölçümleri çok daha yerinde olacaktır. Bu ihtiyaca cevap vermek üzere ve iktisattaki oyun teorisi çalışmaları ile psikolojideki algısal çalışmalardan esinlenerek tasarlanan bu çalışma, doğal veya tasarlanmış gerçek yaşam ortamlarında kültürel boyut değerlerinin ölçülebileceği benzer simülasyonların gerçekleştirilebilirliğini keşifsel olarak araştırmıştır. Çalışmamızda odaklanılan ortam, aile üyelerinin yemek masasındaki davranışları olup, Türk ve Nijerya kültürleri arasında kıyaslamalar yapılmıştır. Yarı-yapılanmış mülakat teknikleri kullanılarak, üniversite kampüsü içindeki Nijeryalı ve Türk öğrencilerden ve Kuzey Kıbrısta yaşayan Türklerden veri toplanmıştır. Bulgular, güç mesafesi, kişisellik, ve erkeksilik boyutlarında literatürü teyit ederken, belirsizlik kaçınımı boyutunda literatürden farklıdır. Daha da önemlisi, keşifsel araştırma süreci göstermiştir ki, kültürel farklılıkların günlük ortamlarda gözlemlenebilmesi için bir master tezine ayrılabilecek gözlem ve analiz kaynaklarından çok daha fazlası gerekmektedir. Davranışların çeşitliliği, doğal ortam deneylerinin ileride insan kaynakları uzmanlarına potansiyel faydalar sunabileceğine işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hofstede, kültürel boyutlar, masa etiketi, kıyaslamalı kültür.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All the Praise and thanks to Almighty Allah, who is the most merciful and the most beneficent, who gave me strength, power and courage to accomplished this research and helped me at every step of this thesis

I would like to acknowledge the extensive help and advice that I have received at all stages of completion of this research. First of all, a special thanks to my supervisor Professor Mehmet Islamoglu who provided me the opportunity to work with him. Without his help, guidance, support and patience, this research would never have been completed.

I would like to thank to the EMU Business Administration faculty staff and all the participants from Nigeria and Turkey for their cooperation in providing data for my research and whose help encouraged me to complete this research.

I would like to thank my sisters and my best friend Umbreen for their endless support and encouragement. I will never be able to thank them enough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Hofstede's cultural dimensions allow for healthy comparisons among various nations in terms of their values and belief systems (Hofstede, 1980). This, in turn, informs human resource management decisions and practices especially in organizations that employ multinational workforce and deal with a culturally diverse customer base.

At the drafting stage, the initial purpose of this study was to measure cultural dimensions among Turkish and Nigerian mba students by asking them how they would react if they were faced with certain situations in their workplace. Administering surveys that ask individuals what they would do in certain situations or whether they agree with certain value-loaded statements, rather than doing in-depth participant observations on what they actually did in certain situations in the past, is questionable enough without the further assumption that they have graduated and are working. When surveyed, individuals may falsify their preferences due to various social, economic, and political reasons (Kuran, 1997).

Observing individuals' behaviors at their natural settings, or asking them how they actually behaved at their natural settings, and determining their cultural values and then making extrapolations to workplace situations may be a more accurate way than collecting data about culture through surveys. Compared to 1960s and 70s, when such data were collected, the technological capabilities to collect video data from

various sources both at work and at domestic settings have been vastly expanded due to security cameras, mobile phone cameras, etc. One of the first, if not the first, attempt to observe cultural values at natural settings was a television reality show called The Tourist Trap, shot in a Turkish hotel at a holiday resort with visitors from USA, UK, Germany, and Japan (http://www.windfallfilms.com/show/1178/the-tourist-trap.aspx). Each week, new visitors arrived at the hotel from a different country and throughout their stay, they were immersed in situations so that their reactions, and hence their values, could be observed. Advances in pattern recognition technologies have already made it possible to commercially use technologies whereby customers' facial expressions, and hence their reactions, can be recorded as they go around the aisles in a supermarket or a fashion store. Perhaps, in future, such technologies shall also be deployed for observing cultural values at everyday settings. Such advances would greatly enhance the capability of human resource managers for collecting data on their actual and potential employees. Yet, as the literature review shall reveal, there is little research aimed at measuring culture at natural settings. This study is a first step in this direction.

Observing individuals' behaviours at their natural settings and then determining their behavioural traits along particular dimensions would naturally provide much more accurate results about those individuals than having to rely on national-level aggregate data and making the same behavioral forecast for all individuals from a country. Hofstede admits that national level aggregate values should not be used to stereo typify all individuals from that nation when responding to criticism that national cultural dimension values can only account for a small percentage of the diversity of behaviours among individuals. Gerhart and Fang (2005) estimate, based

on Hofstede's data, that only "somewhere between 2 and 4 percent" of the variance at the level of individuals answers is explained by national differences - a tiny portion. Hosted's own estimate of 4.2 per cent is only marginally higher. Furthermore, two of the four (later five) dimensions employed by Hofstede to depict national cultures - "power distance" and "individualism and collectivism" were statistically identified by him only in nationally averaged data. At the level of individuals they had near-zero intercorrelations (Bond 2002; Schwartz 1994) for those dimensions and thus no explanatory power at that level. The massive gap between the ability of national-level data to describe or predict micro-level behaviour (above) is also consistent with the personality psychology literature which has long found that hypothesized global trait dispositions like friendliness, power-distance and dominance typically account for no more that 9 to 15 per cent of diversity of individual differences over naturally occurring situations (Shweder, 1979).Our study's contribution to literature is that it brings Hofstede and his critics to a middle ground by suggesting that the way forward is to rely on socially acceptable and ethically responsible use of video images in order to assign values directly to individuals as they go about doing their daily chores at their natural settings.

The choice of "family dinner table", as an everyday setting, stemmed from a necessity to find a frequently encountered, standard setting across all cultures. Other settings such as commuting, holiday, birthdays, socialization at the workplace, were not as standard and were not as clearly observed and remembered.

Ideally, observations of such a study should be spread at least over some months and recorded using a hidden camera, and the participants should be immersed into

particular situations with the help of an insider either at the table or performing the dinner service. Such an elaborate experiment design, however, was well beyond the time and resource constraints of this study.

1.1 Aim of the research

Another innovation brought to the literature by this study is the design of semi-structured interview questions that aim at measuring cultural dimensions in a non-work and natural everyday setting.

Chapter 2

CULTURE, HOFSTEDE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS, AND DINING

2.1 Introduction

According to Axelson (1986), around the globe there is a huge population which consumes food on daily basis in order to lead a healthy life. The pattern in which this sequence i.e. selection, preparation and ingestion is governed shows a complex association between the person or society and its collaboration with culture. Therefore, culture is the explicit reflection of a person's life or way of living. In terms of society, a culture shapes the manner in which a society contours itself including its philosophy, sentiments and responses. So culture provides the societal principles for a civilization to groom.

Culture in general sense has major influence on the approaches on management eating habits and behavior. It depends on many factors which directly or indirectly affect the food preferences in different societies. As globalization has increased, intense interactions among different cultures has given more flexibility in management of eating habits and behavior. However,various aspects of choosing, preparing and consuming food are based on traditional beliefs or inspired by local culture but as integration among different cultures is surging up, these traditional patterns are more likely to adopt according to new environment. Preferences or avoidance of certain types of food is also influenced by culture. Distinct cultures

variesenormouslyin food habits and selection patterns and while doing comparisons, it's difficult to trace which cultural factor is most dominant in affecting nutritional status in a particular culture and draw conclusions. There are many reasons environmental as well as religious responsible for these differences.So the culture in which a person is brought up most likely to develop his perceptions about food.

As critical review of literature and discussion showed that eating habits are deeply subjective to cultural norms. The basic aim of my research is to discover cultural influence on eating habits and behaviors in the light of Hofstede cultural dimensions. As in this regard not much work have been done before so basically practical implications have been taken into account by conducting thorough interviews on the population of interest. So in this study we are testing the impact of culture on management of eating patterns within family unit of two countries Nigeria and Turkey on the basis of Hofstede cultural dimensions to have a theoretical conclusion. Our main concern is with management of eating habit in daily routine in different cultures.

In this chapter we are discussing about what culture is, and how cultural dimensions given by Hofstede-based studies really measure it. Discussion of Hofstede's cultural dimensions are taken as most appropriate measurement of culture and its implementation on eating habits.

2.2 Pattern of the culture

Culture is from "Cult" from Latin word which can be taken asdwell in or develop the essence of a societal behavior (Warner & Joynt, 2002).

The general conclusion of classic anthropologists and other scientific definitions of culture is that culture can be seen as values, norms,ideas, patterns, rules, roles, perceptions, the way of thinking, behaving, resolving problems, decision makingand even an organization of humans for a purpose(see Hall, 1959, 1976; Triandis, 1995; Kluckhohn, 1951; Warner & Joynt, 2002).

Hofstede and others research studies conclude that differences in the culture are a big source of benefit in terms of business activities(see Hofstede, 1982a).Hofstede (1991) concluded that each country has different culture and their business activities revolve around their exclusive cultural trends prevailing in that country. According to him culture is identify as mutual guidancefor a distinct community which differentiates them from other community   (Hofstede, 2001, p. 9).

According to Olie culture in the era of 1951 described in 164 diverse ways (Olie, 1995, p. 128). Despite all the definitions of culture available currently, according to Doherty and Groeschl (2000), proposed that to identify culture in an explicit manner is still really hard.   Culture can be described in terms of eitherunambiguous or inherent.

2.3 Culture studies and Hofstede Model

There are number of various models have been used to provide an explicit understanding of cultural differences. A considerable amount of studies have found that cross-cultural differences in values exist (Schneider & DeMeyer, 1991; see Hofstede, 1982b). From researches,currently most meaning full perception of this cultural differentiationin different countries has been provided byHofstede, Trompenaars and GLOBE models. These authorsstressed that global corporations

can be benefitted from these cross culture variations only if they recognize them. Studies on cultural differences can be used as an instrumentto take a deep insight in each nation cultural variations and how to evaluate them (see Hofstede, 1982c, Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997a).

However, it seems that the debates between these models and authors will never end (Shi & Wang, 2011a), but one common theme that runs through all of themis that they all relate in one way or another to Hofstede's model. Both Trompenaars and GLOBE Models explicitly mention that their work supports in many ways Hofstede's dimensions (Hampten-Tuner &Trompenaars,1997c; House, et. al., 2002). According to Hofstede (2006, 2010) model (GLOBE) has expanded his five dimensions in to six, which can explained by fuzziness in questionnaires. In case of Trompenaars Model, Hosted criticized it quite aggressively. According to him this model fully not valid since there are problems with methodology, theories and even validity of collected data.

According to Jones (2007a) refers that the work done by Hofstede cannot be implemented to all aspects of culture but still his work has endured the changes occurred with time so still it is a benchmark for multinational stakeholders. Hofstede work is the base study for various researches have been done cultural differences (Jackson, 2009). According toShi and Wang(2011b) Hofstede's model criticized more as compared to some of current cultural studies as they are not evaluated much.

However today exists an opinion that by came of globalization soon there is no place for distinct culture (Tedlow & Abdelal, 2004).Generally, it is clear today that globalization has changed the whole world and different national cultures are evolving and merging. Nevertheless, national cultures still continue to play a dominant role and cultural differences are of paramount significance in management research. Each country has its own unique culture. When there is interaction between them due to political, business or simple exchange between citizens, cultural differences play a great role.Along with those debatable cultural models, Hofstede's model has been selected as the most fundamental and significant measurement of cultural differences (see Hosftede, 2011b; Jones, 2007b; Triandis, 2004). Now, we will turn our attention to giving a brief description of the Hofstede's model and review the results of the application of its' dimensions related to eating habits in two different countries.

Hofstede cultural studies

Having worked as a manager in Multinational Corporation IBM (International Business Machines Corporation) Professor Geert Hofstede noticed differences in employees' behavior within a company. Data on differences of behavior was collected from a pool of employees from more than seventy countries and cultures, first in 1967 and later in 1972 with total more than 116,000 questionnaires. This was by far the biggest wealth of data collected on cultural differences. Up to 2001 data had been analyzed only for fifty countries and later on for the remaining twenty sixcountries. Initially he defined four dimensions of culture as Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance (Shi &Wang, 2011b).

Later on, two more dimensions were added and accompanied by other authors. The fifth one is Long-Term Orientation (Pragmatism versus Established Values) was functional in 23 nations and expanded up to 93 countries later in 2010. Furthermore, according to Hofstede this dimension should be included only if the comparisons are clearly between West and East Asian countries. Because of that in this research this dimension is not taken into consideration.

The second new dimension, the sixth dimension overall, have been added in the last decade, measuring behaviours relating to indulgence and restraintand has been mentioned lack of relation in management field. This dimension is a result of interpretation of World Value survey whose purpose was to review changes in values done by Bulgarian researcher. Initially besides this dimension, he defined two more dimensions used in 93 countries which were matched to other Hofstede dimensions i.e. Individualistic and long term orientation. As a result in integration process in 2010, those two dimensions became part of previously existing Hofstede dimensions and one of them was allowed to extend to number of countries. Furthermore this six one are related to understanding of happiness. It is difficult to define or actually measure what happiness is, but still most scholars anticipated its usefulness in forecasting future (Minkov&Hofstede, 2011).

In the time period of 1991 and 2001 to 2010 the work done by Hofstede was further extended and modernized and continually been source of citation for several administrative and academic researches and even were discussions to open a business schools as the "Hofstede School" (Tayeb, 2001; Warner & Joynt, 2002, p.13).Some of this research focused on bringing out and clarifying concepts of

cultural behaviour, on making various distinctions between organizational and national culture, on deliberating how to measure culture, and on determining conditions which can affect culture(Hofstede, 2011a).Hofstede remarked thathis cultural dimensions acknowledged culture as a community level understanding proposing that understanding culture on individual level may differ from person to person.

Hofstede dimensions scores culture on empirical based. It makes different country to country or much but not cultures fit on each dimensions. The dimensions were empirically segregated and further pooled in different feasible combinations out of which some were used more than others (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005).

Power Distance Index (PDI)

This dimension measuresthe extent to which people may accept inequality and how the weak individuals are indifferent to having powerful individuals over them.Position, status, wealth, prestige, profession, family relation, and other factors may give rise to differences in power of individuals. At one end of the dimension are countries where there are small differences of power among individuals, called low power distance or 'egalitarian' countries, and at the other end are large power distance countries where people easily accept and do not mind inequality and they always show respect to more powerful individuals. In such a society, communication and negotiation between two sides is hard, moreover followers are not allowed to question decisions made by leaders. On the other hand, members of low power distance societies are open to conversation with subordinates, can easily express their opinionsto their superiors, and are more confident in participating at decision

making. Aforesaid type of society is more beneficial to participation and distribution of equality.

Individualism (IDV)

In individualistic societies people try to follow their own personal interests and celebrate their own individual achievements. On the other end of this dimension are collectivist societies where people are perceived as a part of group (family, friends etc.) and have obligations to behave according to group interests. So being part of some group,community and society as a whole, puts pressure on people to work for group interests instead of their own personal interests. These people take pride in group achievements as they are part of the achievement. In addition, harmony and maintaining face in a group is seen to be more important than discovering the naked truth and being bluntly honest. On the other hand, privacy, free speech, and self-realization are priorities for more individualistic societies.Furthermore, individualistic cultures are not much concerned about the external effects upon others of their own behavior (McConatha, 1993; Gudykunst, 1993a), while in collectivist society, from birth, individuals learnhow to restrain themselves and always follow behaviors that lead to favorable and positive effects on the community they are part of (Gudykunst, 1993b; Triandis, 1995c).

Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)

It is well-defined that different people handle uncertainty and ambiguity differently. To a certain extent, some people are not afraid of both factors and they are categorized as having weak uncertainty avoidance. Strong uncertainty avoidance people, on the other hand, become quite uncomfortable in situations involving

unstructuredness, surprises, ambiguity, and unusual, unexpected, and unknown things. The well-structured relation, rules, planning or control of future situation and safety or security of any unforeseen situation help them to avoid uncertainty or ambiguities. New changes are only acceptable and welcome through full understanding, clarification, and thorough analysis of all possibilities.

Masculinity (MAS)

A 'masculine' society is considered to be assertive, aggressive, seeking for success and competitiveness and with wide gender differentiation. Usually, men are achievers and women are there mostly to support them. However, women may be in the same pedestal as men but it is truly hard for them since women do not carry same level values as men. Contradictory to that in 'feminine' society men and women carry same values, respect and take into account the preferences of others and are more tolerant and caring for each other in terms of age differences and life quality.

Indulgence versus Restraint (IND)

Indulgence is all about being free to pursue one's own interests and activities related to having fun, pleasure, happiness, leisure and having freedom of expression without exercising any self-control or caring about the feelings and reactions of others. On the opposite side, there are restraint societies, where individuals who are going to have fun and satisfaction, exercise care and sensitivity towards the feelings of others who are not so fortunate. In restraint cultures, there are elaborate sets of rules that bring a lot of social restrictions and regulations about the way one should behave.

2.4 Impact of Cultural Dimensions on eating habits

With respect to previous scholars' work related to dimensions of Hofstede, this study

observes that the existing studies cannot fully cover all aspects of culture. There are thousands and thousands of articles related to cultural dimensions yet all of these focus on more or less the same issues and do not proceed to newer topics, such as are there alternative methods of measuring cultural dimensions other than the formal, work-related survey method of collecting data in the work-related context.

Furthermore, as reflected in some critics, Hofstede's dimensions have been measured within one international company, we would like to test dimensions on the basic unit of society the family and at natural settings because as we have mentioned earlier culture is system of values built up from childhood, difficult to change and family is a basic and first level of society, has great significance for cultural formation (see Hofstede 1983, 1997, 2001).

We will take into consideration management of such aspects of family as eating patterns and behavior and how it is affected by and measured in the light of Hofstede cultural dimensions under different circumstances.However, we will not dig in detailed discussion of cooking and shopping of food stuff because it is not our issue of concern. Moreover, this kind of research is like first mover, in an attempt to determine the impact of Hofstede dimensions on how it varies the food choices of families in different cultures.

Eating habits and behavior may be defined in general as deciding what you are eating, at which times of day and where you are eating. It also includes preferences for company while eating, either with or without family or friends and lastly who will decide what should be chosen. Identification of this management process related

to eating pattern will help to understand the differences across each culture dimensions in different cultures and apprehend its importance.

In concordance with earlier mentioned discussion of dimensions, this current paper intends to analyze the Nigerian and Turkish community in North Cyprus to illustrate Hofstede's cultural dimensions and their measurability in everyday settings, rather than through formal surveys.

Table. 2.1. Score of Nigeria and Turkey on cultural dimensions

Countries/Dimensions	PDI	IND	MAS	UAI	IDV
Nigeria	80	30	60	55	84
Turkey	66	37	45	85	49

Note. Country comparisons. Retrieved from http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html

From the table it is visible that according to Hofstede dimensions, scores of different countries varies along the same dimensions rendering to cultural differences.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Description

Unlike all previous studies which deployed the same formal survey instrument and asking people questions about how they would act, a brand, new set of semi-structured interview questions were developed by this study, as a contribution to literature as an exploratory attempt to measure cultural dimensions at everyday setting of family dinner table by observing how people actually act. Our sample consisted of interviewees from Nigerian people who were mostly students and Turkish people ranging from students to those with families. Nigerians students were interviewed at the university campus, at dormitories and in their apartments. Turkish people were interviewed at the university campus, in workplace (market, cafe, and private clinics) and in their apartments. Questions focused on not how they behave in their student life at dormitories with fellow students but on how they behave at home when with their family and friends.

Samples were selected randomly and sample size was approximately forty, 20 from each country. Data was collected from citizens of two collectivist countries Nigeria and Turkey who are living in Famagusta, North Cyprus.

Since my methodology was based on semi-structured interviews, there were some starting questions but further questioning was based on responses of respondents.

Therefore each interview on average lasted from twenty to thirty minutes each on the minimum and up to 60 minutes when respondents were particularly difficult and time consuming to communicate.

Instruments

Instrument used in this study is a brand new semi-structured interview format that was designed from ground up with the specific goal of obtaining cultural dimension data from everyday family dinner table setting by correlating natural setting observations to cultural values.

Group of questions concerning general information were:

- What is your name?

- What's your (cultural, not official) nationality in terms of your and your family's behavior?

- Does your mother/father work? What field does she/he work?

- Do you live in a joint family system (grandfather, grandmother, uncle)?

- Does your relatives live with you? Are you from village/town/city?

- Have you been away from your home for more than 6 months before you were sixteen? If yes where (city, town, another country)?

There were five categories for cultural dimension questions:

Power Distance Index (PDI)

1) When it comes to the decision of what should be eaten, do you take turns making sure that everyone gets a chance to decide once in a while about what should be

cooked and to whose palate it should appeal to (according to whose taste) (in terms of salt, spices, sweetness of the sauce, amount of cheese, any other features)?

2) When a meal is cooked and is being served, who is served the best parts ? Is there taking turns, putting children (or needy) first, or some kind of seniority or significance or any other hierarchical order takes priority ?

3) In terms of timing of the meal service, is the time decided with the average time when equals get hungry or according to when the most powerful or oldest or most significant gets hungry and the others wait for that without questioning or being assisted in any other way such as with appetizers and starters?

The questions (#4 and #5) below are deliberately not included in the PowerDistance questions for the interviews because these are not 'core' to the table scene and they have too many overlapping boundaries with other chores of domestic and family life, e.g. gardening, shopping, etc.

4) When the cooking chores are being done, or the table is being set up or taken away, are there any egalitarian division of labor or hierarchical traditional separation of roles ?

5) Who decides on where and at what price and quality ingredients are to be obtained from ? Are extended family help in food and supplies and cooking?

Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV)

1) When visitors happen to be visiting at meal times, or when they visit at times when they get to see beyond doubt that a meal is being prepared or is being had, to what extent would they be invited to be part of the meal ? To what extent does the answer change and by how much if the visitors are members of extended family, friends

(close and somewhat close)? Be specific about who gets included and excluded from invitation to join in and the willingness and repeatability of such invitations in short and long term future.

2) When the immediate and extended family members are having meals together, and the immediate family members (mother versus father, or a parent versus a sibling) are in a conflict, do they seek or resort to the senior (patronizing) member(s) of extended family for support favouring their position ? Do seniors intervene more when they support or patronize more ?

Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS)

1) When (a) discussing alternative ways to do something (cut like this, at this thickness, put this much onion or spice, don't keep heat on high, use cold water not hot, etc.) during the preparation and cooking phase, or when (b) people eating at the table are making comments (compliments, criticisms, etc.) regarding the food (recipes and their preparation), do they state their negative opinions strongly or with courtesy and pleasantly?

2) Again, given scenarios (a) and (b) above, do they openly attempt to compare and rank individuals (such as Ms.Smith's pudding was much better than Ms.Hodges' one) or do they make their suggestions without hurting anyone ?

3) Do they make strong rather than weak generalizations, such as 'Mr.Enişte's doner kebab is the best, I don't care what anybody else says' rather than saying 'I think Mr.Enişte is the top but many of my friends think Nihat is better' ? Do they compromise and soften their positions so as to be coexistentially respectful or do they maintain their line ?

Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)

1) Are meal times traditional and people rearrange their activities to fit them ? When some people are late, (or early), is it considered a big thing ? If some have not yet come, do you still start right on time ? Does this change depending on who the late person is or not ?

2) Are people eating at the table generally suspicious and conservative or receptive and willing to try out new flavours, dishes, drinks, desserts, etc.?

3) If a traditional ingredient or a dish is hard to find or cook, do they still try to find it or cook it, instead of using a new, alternative ingredient or serving an alternative dish?

4) When people go out to eat, do they try a different place for the first time? When they go out to eat to celebrate a special occasion such as anniversary or birthdays or when they go out to eat with guests, do they try a different place for the first time? Do they prefer to stay at home and eat what they know rather than go to a new place ?

Indulgence versus Restraint (IND)

1) Are portions and amount and range of dishes on the table modest or truly more than enough for everybody?

2) Are requesting seconds or asking for more when being served welcomed by the majority at the table ?(for food or drinks)

3) If something that you like or want is not served on the table, and it is clear that the majority is happy with what they have got, do you ask for it? If they don't have it, do you show your displeasure or disappointment?

In addition, various types of questions were asked depending on the answers given by the respondents in accordance with the pattern of above mentioned questions in each dimension.

General list of questions are:

- Who decides what kind of food should be eaten in the family?

- How often does thishappens? What are the reasons of making decisions (On the base of decision maker's knowledge, Authority, Budget, health consciousness, nutritional information, taste or personal preferences)?

- Are you involved in this decision? Does switching turns happen frequently? When and why?

- Why you prefer majority decision over yours? Do you have some exceptions for it?

- You are visiting some friends for a week. These friends usually prefer fatty food and deserts after meals. It is not part of your eating habits. What will be your reaction?

- Your parents send food through your friend. Do you share with your friend or not? If not, what will be his reaction? If yes, why do you decide to share?

Chapter 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter the empirical data regarding dinner table manners will be presented and analyzed in relation to five cultural dimensions of Hofstede, according to the answers obtained in the semi structured interviews. For facilitating interpretation, collected data is shown below in tables.

4.1 Power Distance

Table 4.1. Who decides what should be eaten?

	Mother/Sister/ Brother	Mother According to father preference	Mother/father according to children preference
Nigerian	14	4	2
Turk	4	3	13
Total	18	7	15

Table 4.2. Does Mother/father ask preferences of family members for making decision? How often they do it?

	Don't ask	Yes, sometimes	Yes, always ask
Nigeria	12	2	5
Turk	4	1	15
Total	16	3	20

Table 4.3. Does the person deciding what should be eaten also accept any changes according to taste?

	yes	No, cook your own way
Nigerian	4	16

Turk	11	9
Total	15	25

Table 4.4. Is their any kind of hierarchical order present during serving lunch or dinner?

	Yes	No
Nigerian	16	4
Turk	6	14
Total	22	18

Table 4.5. When meal is served, to whom the best partis served?

	First father	First older ones	First childen	Equality, anyone can try
Nigerian	8	7	1	4
Turk	4	2	2	12
Total	12	9	3	16

Table 4.6. Do you prefere to eat together with your family?

	Yes	No
Nigeria	8	12
Turk	17	3
Total	25	15

Table 4.7. Does your family membesr wait for other family members coming late for dinner?

	Yes	No	Yes, if its mother, father	Yes, if guests
Nigerian	5	11	2	2
Turk	4	13	1	2
Total	9	24	3	4

Table 4.8. Do you have some difference in waiting for father or younger ones? Do you have some differeciation whom to wait?

	No	Yes
Nigeria	14	6
Turk	16	4

Tatol	30	10

Based on the empirical evidence presented above, it becomes obvious that on power distance dimension Nigeria is represented as a high power distance and Turkey as a more egalitarian country. Most Nigerians answers showed that there is high level of hierarchy from parents to children. Mother is the decision maker, the center of power, and one who do not accept any changes and correction. She has this decision power because she is the one who cooks and manages the house economy. However second influential member in the family is father who is given the most respect by being given the main place at the table and being always served first. In addition, we can say that other family members accept their decision power easily because they know this is how it should be. Meanwhile, in their environment no one criticizes mother's decision and take turn before father. According to sample responses, in Turkish culture people are mostly egalitarian in case of eating habits. Family members are open to discuss any issue and in decision making majority's opinion is considered. Any decision made by elder family members is always considered as beneficial for children.

4.2 Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV)

Table 4.9. Are visitors/guests welcomed to the home and invited to eat?

	Yes	No
Nigerian	20	0
Turk	20	0
Total	40	0

Table 4.10. Is their any difference in inviting normal visitors and relatives?

	No, any visitor is welcome	Yes , we cook for relatives and normal visitor just snacks
Nigerian	6	14
Turk	13	7
Total	19	21

Table 4.11. Do you have some extra food in case of visitor may come?

	Yes	No	No, but we always can cook/ buy when visitor come
Nigerian	2	10	8
Turk	12	6	2
Total	14	16	10

Table 4.12. During the meal time,if some family members are conflicting, do others interrupt?

	Yes, they interrupt	Yes if it is serious	No- they dont
Nigerian	15	3	2
Turk	12	6	2
Total	27	9	4

Table 4.13. Can younger one interrupts if elders are in a conflict?

	Yes	No
Nigeria	9	11
Turk	15	5
Total	14	26

Table 4.14. Do elders intervene in case of any conflict to support or just to stopit?

	To stop	To support	No reaction
Nigerian	14	6	0
Turk	10	9	1
Total	24	15	1

Both Turkish and Nigerian responses showed high score in this dimension and are highly collectivist. They welcome guests warmly and try to keep in touch even with distant relatives. They are very concerned for the guests' comfort even more than themselves. There is almost no differentiation between formal visitors and relatives. However they like to honor relatives by making delicious food and being generous to them.

From both sample responses it is clear that there is not much privacy available in homes in terms of any kind of conflict. Most of the times every family member is aware of all the issues going on inside family. So anyone can interrupt and give opinion about it either to support his/her views or to solve it depending upon the seriousness of the conflict. In case of Nigerian culture, elder members can interfere to solve the conflicts between younger members but opposite is not possible. Elders or parents opinions are preferred and in any case considered always right. Also sometimes issues are not discussed during meal times in order to avoid or hide it.

4.3 Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS)

Table 4.15. If you are eating food, will you make comments (compliment/criticize) openly on food?

	Yes, positive and courteous way	Yes, openly negative way	No comments
Nigerian	11	5	4
Turk	15	0	5
Total	26	5	9

Table 4.16. Will your answer change depending on your environment (home or outside)?

	No	Yes
Nigeria	7	13
Turk	6	14
Total	13	27

Table 4.17. How often do you thanks for your food?Are you emotional to compliment food?

	We usually don't thank / justsay thankyou	Food was delicious, I enjoy it etc.
Nigerian	16	4
Turk	16	4
Total	32	8

Table 4.18. Do you personally compare two persons cooking?

	No	Yes sometimes	I never compare mothers food she is always best
Nigerian	10	10	0
Turk	5	12	3
Total	15	22	3

In this dimension, Both Nigerian and Turkish responses scores are not much inclined towards feminine or masculine but are almost in the middle. Both cultures showed that the family is more polite towards showing it is behavior. Family members usually avoid passing harsh comments about the food e.g. taste or way of cooking but discussed it in a lighter way. In Nigerian culture they can criticize food cooked by any other member but only exception is for mother. Conversely, they are more expressive about food while eating outdoors. Turkish people usually prefer to eat in those places which they already know and make comments in a polite way. Nigerians are same in this regard but it depend on their mood as well and they are polite too. So

I can conclude that both countries are more inclined towards feminine orientation,

however Nigerian is more masculine.

4.4 Uncertainty Avoidance (AUI)

Table 4.19. What kind of food do you like to eat, traditional or different type of food at home?

	Mostly, traditional food	Flexible, any food
Nigerian	13	7
Turk	15	5
Total	27	13

Table 4.20. Do you have fix meal timings? Does your family member rearange the time to fit them?

	Yes, and family members **don't** rearenge their time	Yes, and family members rearenge their time	No, and we don't expect rearengement of time for it
Nigerian	11	0	9
Turk	13	0	7
Total	24	0	16

Table 4.21. Are you flexible about what to eat outside? What will you do if place cannot offer that food/drink which you were searching for?

	I am ok with alternative	I will go to another place	Not flexible
Nigerian	9	5	6
Turkish	17	2	1
Total	26	7	7

Table 4.22.When you are going out, do you like to visit places you know already or like to try new place?

	Yes,I always go to same place which I know or my friends advise	No, I like to try new taste sometimes	I don't eat outside

Nigerian	10	8	2
Turk	16	4	0
Total	26	12	2

Table 4.23. If you are going out for special occasion or with guests, what will be your prefernce, traditional place or wants to try some new place?

	Yes, prefer Traditonal place	No,Try some new place
Nigerian	16	4
Turk	18	2
Total	34	6

Table 4.24. If you are celebrating your birthday, food should be according to your taste or guest taste?

	My preference	Mix guest and my preference	Only for guest preference new foods
Nigerian	3	17	0
Turk	1	18	1
Total	4	35	1

Note. Country comparison. Retrieved from http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html

In this dimension, scores are realistic in terms of both countries culture. In Turkish culture ambiguity is higher than Nigerian culture. Subsequently responses showed Turkish people do not like to try new places and new food because they are reluctant about the way it turned out. Furthermore, their attitude towards food is more flexible if they know the place already. On the contrary, they like to try new food or visit different places only if they are recommended by friends or family members. In Nigerian culture, people prefer to go to known places but they are more flexible to try new places as well.

4.5 Indulgence versus Restraint (IND).

Table 4.25. Are portions and amount and range of dishes on the table modest or truly more than enough for everybody?

	Extra amount in case guest may come	extra in case l someone will be hungry or for next day	No, we don't want to waste food
Nigerian	2	10	8
Turk	5	8	7
Total	7	18	15

Table 4.26. Are requesting seconds or asking for more when being served welcomed by the majority at the table?

	No, I don't like to be rude that's why I am with majority	I can ask/say if I am with people whom I know well
Nigerian	14	6
Turk	16	4
Total	30	10

Table 4.27. Do you show your displeasure or disappointment if you don't get that food which you want?

	I will show displeasure	I will not say anything	Depends on mood
Nigerian	9	9	2
Turk	13	4	3
Total	22	13	5

Responses of both Turkish and Nigerian sample showed that majority's opinion is usually preferred over personal view. The reason behind this attitude is the social pressure in a gathering which widely influences the personal view. On the basis of result I can say that mostly social norms of a society dictate to honor majority preferences. Another reason behind this behavior is the fear of majority's reaction if they try to be indifferent from others. On contrary, they are more expressive about their opinions with family and shows it freely. However, in the presence of a visitor

or relatives they feel more obliged towards social norms.

4.6 General Information

Table 4.28. What is the profession of your mother/father?

	Business woman	Housewife	Teacher	Govt. work
Nigerian	8	2	7	3
Turk	2	9	4	5
Total	10	11	11	8

Table 4.29. Do you live in a joint family system (grandfather, grandmother, uncle)? Does your relatives live with you? (Cousins, etc.)

	Yes	No
Nigerian	10	10
Turk	4	16
Total	14	26

Table 4.30. Are you from village/town/big city?

	Village	Town	City
Nigeria	3	5	12
Turk	2	7	11
Total	5	12	23

Table 4.31. Have you been away from your home for more than 6 months before you were sixteen? If yes where (city, town, another country)?

	Yes	No
Nigeria	5	15
Turk	3	17
Total	8	32

Questions regarding general information were added in addition to see the impact of professions, joint family systems, and general environment on the decision making process. For example, do "shifting places in childhood" and "living in different

locations" change people's cultural values and social norms? In Turkish culture mothers are viewed as housewives and teachers so mostly they are managing homes and free to take decisions about what should be eaten at home. As compared to Nigerians Turkish people do not change locations frequently. Even most of the Nigerian people usually lived in their own country during childhood period and moved abroad later for studies. However in Nigerian culture mothers can manage both home and work themselves and sometimes share this authority with other members of the family as well.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

This research is comprised of eating patterns and behavior based on Hofstede dimensions governing two nations. The data was collected by conducting semi-structured interview about Hofstede cultural dimensions. Sample wastaken from Nigerian and Turkish population and students studying or working in Famagusta, North Cyprus. Since our main interest is in their home country culture so we respondents were interviewed according to their home country experiences.

In first dimension surprisingly Turkish respondents showed more egalitarian relation in terms of culture. In Turkish culture, family relations were mostly concerned to children preferences and egalitarian way of making decisions. Mostly motheris the one who makes decisions about what should be eaten,entirelybased on what is the best for children. Taking turns according to food preferences, takes place more often between children. Since there is no hierarchy within family, so family members can easily discuss what should be eaten and managing satisfaction of each family member. The food is served equally to everyone but sometimes mothers prefer to serve children before other members or wait for them. On the other handthose family members who are doing jobs have their own timings and not waited much.Butoverall people at home prefer to eat together. However, Nigerian

respondents'answers give an idea that they are highly power distance oriented. Mother usually plays role of decisionmaker and father is most respected person at home. Mother's decision cannot be criticized or changed. Sometimes she makesschedule for whole month what should be eaten. If she is working woman, she always cooks and store it in fridge or instructsother members of the family about cooking. When food is served, mostly fathers are served first with best part in hierarchical order. Sometimes hierarchy is also based on age or sometime gender differences. Generally in Nigerian culture, family members do not sit in one place. Most of the times, Parents eat in the kitchen and other family members take their plates to their rooms after food has been served to the parents.

In second dimension, both cultures are alike and preferred to be within a group and serve for their interests.According to their answers guests are always welcomed to the meal and snacks. However for Nigerians,there is some point differentiation between normal visitors and relatives. Later ones are always honored, warmlyinvited at home and always offered best food without exception. But normal visitors are mostly served with snacks and drinks. They usually do not prepare extra food in case of some guests may come. In terms of conflict during meal between youngers or elders, there is a freedom of speech but depending on seriousness of conflict other member can intervene mostly to stop it. However, in Turkish culture first of all,they try to avoid any conflict in front of family members but if it takes place other family members can interfere to support opinions or to stop it. Generally in both societies, elders' opinions are supported more in case of conflicts then the younger ones.

In third dimension, both cultures try to keep strong family relationships. In terms of

inappropriatetaste of food at home, family members express their views or suggestions courteously and in light way. While eating outside they are more expressive but depend on mood and food taste. Moreover, Nigerians way of expression also varies withage of family member or on relation to the person.

In fourth dimension, Turkish culture is defined as high in uncertainty avoidance. Almost all answers showed that they prefer to eat traditional food, like to visit only familiar places, and try new places only on advice of friends.Nigerians also prefer familiar places however they are more flexible and like to try new places and tastes. But for occasions or with family they prefer traditional places.

 In fifth dimension, questions are mostly related to eating behavior while eating outdoor. It showed that respondents freely express their opinions if eating alone or with friends otherwise they always prefer to show conscience with majority. Related to freedom of expression, both cultures prefer polite manners. Generally both countries are defined as restraint culture if they are in group(family, friends), however Nigerians may be freer in terms of satisfying their personal needs.

5.2 Limitations and Recommendations

The present study had to rely on interviewees reporting their own family's values regarding everyday dinner table behaviours. A more accurate data collection would be possible if cameras could be installed and videos of behaviours could be analyzed in greater detail, including body language and facial gestures. Given today's technology, especially with tablets and mobile phones, such data collection is not really outside the capabilities of students.Other more obvious limitations were relying on interviews involving two countries. Given today's globalized education

market, it should be not too difficult to reach at least twenty countries.Number of interviewees should also be large enough to minimize the influence of individual's traits, e.g. their occupation, age, upbringing, on their cultural behavior. Also, multilingual interviewers should be preferred when settings are chosen in countrieswhere native language is not English. Interviewers should alsohave acquired stronger empirical data collection skills especially regarding body language and gestures. Finally, business schools should actively get involved in setting up a global research network whereby similar international projects can be carried out by mba students from various universities.

REFERENCES

Axelson, M. L. (1986). The impact of culture on food-related behavior. Annual Review of Nutrition, 6(1), 345-363.

Bond, M. H. (2002) Reclaiming the individual from Hofstede"s ecological analysis – a 20-year odyssey: comment on Oyserman et al. Psychological Bulletin 128(1): 73-77.

Gudykunst, William B. (Ed.). (1993). Communication in Japan and the United States.Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, F. (1997). The seven cultures of capitalism: Value system for creating wealth in the United States, Britain, Japan, Germany, France, Sweden and the Netherlands. London: Piatkus.

http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html

http://www.windfallfilms.com/show/1178/the-tourist-trap.aspx

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural Constraints in Management Theories.Academy of Management Executive, 7(1), 81 – 93.

Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds. Journal of international business studies, 37(6), 882-896.

Hofstede, G. (2010). The GLOBE debate: Back to relevance. Journal of International Business Studies, 41(8), 1339-1346.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. Online readings in psychology and culture, 2(1), 8.

Gerhart and Fang (2005) National Culture and Human Resource Management: Assumptions and Evidence, International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16:6, (971-986).

Goodall, K. (2002). Managing to Learn: from cross-cultural theory to education practice, Warner M and Joynt P (Eds.) Managing Across Cultures: Issues and Perspectives.

Groeschl, S., & Doherty, L. (2000).Conceptualising culture. Cross Cultural Management, 7(4), 12-17.

Gudykunst, William B. (Ed.). (1993). Communication in Japan and the United States.Albany: State University of New York Press.

Jackson, T. (2009). A critical cross - cultural perspective for developing nonprofit international management capacity. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 19(4), 443-466.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action: An Exploration in Definition and Classification. In Parsons, T. and Shils, E. A. (eds) Toward a General Theory of Action, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Kuran, T. (1997). Private truths, public lies: The social consequences of preference falsification. Harvard University Press.

Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2011).The evolution of Hofstede's doctrine. Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 18(1), 10-20.

McConatha Jasmine T. (1993). Cultural variations in emotional expression.In Magill's Survey of Social Science: Psychology (p. 887-892). Pasadena, CA: Salem.

Olie, R. (1995). The'culture'factor in personnel and organization policies.International Human Resource Management: An integrated approach. A. Harzing and VRJ London, Sage Publications, 124-143.

Shi, X., & Wang, J. (2011). Interpreting Hofstede Model and GLOBE Model: Which Way to Go for Cross-Cultural Research?. International journal of business and management, 6(5), p93.

Smith, C. (2003). Moral, believing animals: Human personhood and culture. Oxford University Press.

Smith, M. E. (2003). Changing an organisation's culture: correlates of success and failure. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24(5), 249-261.

Schneider, S. C., & De Meyer, A. (1991). Interpreting and responding to strategic issues: The impact of national culture. Strategic management journal, 12(4), 307-320.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994) Beyond individualism/collectivism; new cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim et al. (Eds.) op. cit.: 85-119.)

Shweder, R. A. 1979. Rethinking culture and personality theory part I: a critical examination of two classical postulates. Ethos 7(3): 255-278.)

Tayeb, M. (1995). Organisations and National Culture: Methodology Consideration. Organisation Studies, 14, 429–446.

Tayeb, M. (2001).Conducting research across cultures: Overcoming drawbacks and obstacles. International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 1(1), 91-108.

Tedlow, R. S., & Abdelal, R. (2004). Theodore Levitt's "The Globalization of Markets". The global market: Developing a strategy to manage across borders, 11.

Triandis, H.C. (1995), Individualism and Collectivism, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. C. (2004). The many dimensions of culture. The Academy of

Management Executive, 18(1), 88-93.