

# What are the four major dimensions of the culture studied by Geert Hosted? What is the cultural profile of the United States and Mexico?

IJSER  
Abdulrahman Alswaidan

**Abstract** A small power distance culture has a tendency to keep up moral obligation a self-governance. A determinant of an overall population's motivation presentation: a manly culture underscores status got from pay rates and position; a femininity culture underlines on human relations and individual fulfillment. United States has high Individualism (IDV) situating that shows overall population with high individualistic perspective and decently flexibility of expression. The United States has Dimension of Masculinity (MAS) with a situating of 62. The men govern a basic piece of the expansive range group and constrain arrangement. Power Distance is the measurement with the most lessened (40) situating for the United States. Instability Avoidance (UAI) Dimension for the US with a situating of 46 which has feeble situating. Mexico's most hoisted Hofstede Dimension is Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) (82), speaking to the wide range low resistance for frailty. As a result of high Uncertainty Avoidance trademark, the expansive range open doesn't rapidly perceive change and is amazingly hazardous removed. Mexico has a low Individualism (IDV) situating (30). The expansive range open develops tried and true connections where everybody assumes liability for persons from their group. This mirrors the general public encounters a more elevated amount of sexual orientation division.

### **Power Distance**

The point to which power is distribution just as in a broad-spectrum and the extent that people acknowledges this distribution. A small power distance culture tends to maintain ethical responsibility and self-governance (Hofstede, 1980).

### **Uncertainty Avoidance**

The point to which inhabitants compel set restrictions and apparent formation: a high uncertainty culture permits individuals to acclimatize to risk and growth; a low uncertainty culture stresses on institutionalization and more prominent professional stability (Hofstede, 1980).

### **Individualism vs. Collectivism**

In an individual culture, the abandoned preference is intensely valued. In a collective society, individuals' needs are less important than the bunch's requirements (Hofstede, 1980).

### **Masculinity versus Femininity**

A determinant of a general public's purpose introduction: a masculine culture underscores status got

from salaries and position; a femininity culture emphasizes on human relations and individual satisfaction (Hofstede, 1980).

### **United States Culture**

Individualism positions most astounding and is a noteworthy variable in the life of U.S. individuals (Piepenburg, 2011). The low positioning of the Long-term point of reference mirrors an opportunity in the way of life from long haul customary responsibilities, which permits more remarkable adaptability and the flexibility to respond rapidly to new open doors (Piepenburg, 2011).

United States has high Individualism (IDV) positioning that shows general public with high individualistic state of mind and moderately freedom of expression (Piepenburg, 2011). The people are self-sufficient and pay particular intellect to themselves and close relatives (Piepenburg, 2011).

The United States has Dimension of Masculinity (MAS) with a positioning of 62 (Hofstede, 1980). This shows the nation meets a privileged rank of gender characteristics orientation division. The men rule a critical bit of the broad-

spectrum community and force formation (Hofstede, 1980). This situation created a womanly general population that turns out to be decisive as well as focused, with females moving toward the good gentleman paradigm and away from women roles (Hofstede, 1980).

Power Distance is the dimension with the most reduced (40) positioning for the United States. This is the most valued characteristic uniformity between community levels, as well as government, firms, and yet within of families (Hofstede, 1980). This introduction makes stronger association on the cross over force levels as well as develops steadier social surroundings (Hofstede, 1980).

Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) Dimension for the US with a positioning of 46 which has weak positioning. It demonstrates that broad-spectrum public has less principle as well as doesn't endeavor to be in charge of all outcomes (Hofstede, 1980). It likewise has an additional noteworthy rank of confrontation for mixed thoughts and convictions (Hofstede, 1980).

## **Mexico Culture**

Mexico's most elevated Hofstede Dimension is Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) (82), representing the broad-spectrum low resistance for insecurity (Hofstede, 1980). An ultimate objective of this general public is to be in charge of the whole lot keeping in mind the set objective to dispose of or preserve a calculated distance from the unexpected (Hofstede, 1980). As a consequence of high Uncertainty Avoidance trademark, the broad-spectrum public doesn't quickly recognize transformation and is extremely risky distant (Hofstede, 1980).

Mexico has a low Individualism (IDV) positioning (30). The points on this Dimension demonstrate the broad-spectrum public is Collectivist when compared with Individualist (Stacy, 2003). This shows long-term responsibility to the community, whether is a close family and or friends (Stacy, 2003). Steadfastness in a collective society is foremost as well as supersedes most other community guiding principle and conventions. The broad-spectrum public cultivates dependable relationships where everyone takes

responsibility for persons from their community (Stacy, 2003).

Masculinity (MAS) scores (69) in Mexico cultural study by Hofstede which is the second most elevated position. This reflects that the society experiences a higher level of gender division (Stacy, 2003). The man commands a critical part of the broad-spectrum. It encourages women population that turns out to be emphatic, although it doesn't match men's level (Stacy, 2003).

Power Distance (PDI) scores 81. This is characteristic of an unusual condition of disparity of authority of the broad-spectrum (Rodríguez O &Lepp, 1997). This state is not so much challenging, nevertheless moderately recognized by the general public (Rodríguez O &Lepp, 1997).

Mexico has high Uncertainty Avoidance positioning that articulates to community empathy in the nonexistence of steadiness and safety (Rodríguez O &Lepp, 1997). The approach of existence similarly spots high on the Power Distance and Masculinity dimensions reflecting a male ruled composition. The approach of existence is collectivism with close ties between

more distant families and groups (Rodríguez O &Lepp, 1997).

### **Working Relationship between USA and Mexico Employees**

When we look at the US Society, additionally, within every country regional social complexities exist, in like manner in the States. Americans, regardless, don't need to go to a social direction before moving to another state efficiently (Piepenburg, 2011). Inside American associations, the extent of control is developed for modification, supervisors are transparent depend on people and groups for their aptitudes (Piepenburg, 2011). There is in like manner an abnormal state of area flexibility in the United States.

Americans are common to work commonly or partner by the method for persons they don't know well (Piepenburg, 2011). Mexican employees are more inclined toward power distance, Masculinity, Indulgence, and Uncertainty Avoidance, which reflect that Mexican workers accept hierarchy in their positions (Pagán, 2004). The employees compete to achieve set goals keeping satisfaction in mind (Pagán, 2004). US workers believe on individualism, and informal

communication is highly appreciated among employees (Pagán, 2004

### REFERENCES

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Pagán, J. (2004). *Worker displacement in the US/Mexico border region*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Piepenburg, K. (2011). *Critical analysis of Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions*. München: GRIN Verlag GmbH.

Raat, W., & Brescia, M. (2010). *Mexico and the United States*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Rodríguez O, J., & Lepp, K. (1997). *Common border, uncommon paths*. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources.

Stacy, L. (2003). *Mexico and the United States*. New York: Marshall Cavendish.

IJSER