Applying Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions in Education: Insights, Critiques, and Implications for Diverse Classrooms

John Kirwa Tum Kole

Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia
Email: jkole2002@yahoo.com

Abstract

This narrative review explores the application of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Theory (Hofstede, 2015) within contemporary educational settings, with a particular focus on its relevance to refugee and migrant students in increasingly multicultural classrooms. Against the backdrop of a global refugee population that reached 43.4 million in 2024 (UNHCR, 2024), the need for culturally responsive pedagogical approaches is both pressing and profound. Hofstede's framework offers a valuable lens through which to examine how cultural values—such as power distance, individualism versus collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance—influence classroom dynamics, student-teacher relationships, and learning behaviours. Synthesising recent research, the review highlights how these dimensions manifest in diverse educational environments and shape key elements such as authority, collaboration, and student motivation. At the same time, the article critically engages with longstanding critiques of Hofstede's model, particularly its perceived rigidity, essentialism, and limited applicability to complex, hybrid cultural identities (Gerlach & Eriksson, 2021). While acknowledging these limitations, the review argues that Hofstede's theory retains relevance when applied with reflexivity and contextual sensitivity. It advocates for a flexible, dynamic interpretation of cultural dimensions that accounts for the evolving nature of identity in contexts shaped by migration, globalisation, and digital connectivity. The article concludes with a series of recommendations for adapting and extending the framework to better support inclusive and equitable practices in multicultural classrooms, positioning Hofstede's work as a foundational—though incomplete—tool for cross-cultural educational research and practice.

1. Introduction

As of mid-2024, the global refugee population reached 43.4 million, with many individuals resettling in Western countries such as the United States and Australia (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), 2024). This demographic shift underscores the urgent need to understand and navigate cultural complexity across key social domains—particularly education. Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory (Hofstede, 2001, 2015) provides a widely used analytical framework for examining how cultural values influence social interactions, institutional structures, and identity formation in educational settings (Gay, 2010, 2018; Banks, 2004). When applied thoughtfully, this framework can help educators and policymakers develop culturally responsive strategies that promote inclusion, equity, and meaningful engagement—especially for refugee and migrant students in increasingly multicultural classrooms.

1.1. Scope of the Paper

This narrative review explores how cultural values shape individual and collective behaviours across different societal contexts, with a particular focus on education environments. It synthesises recent peer-reviewed, English-language studies that apply Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory across diverse populations and settings. Foundational and seminal works are included to establish the theoretical grounding and trace the evolution of the framework. Studies published in non-English languages or those unrelated to cultural dimensions or education are excluded. The reviewed literature spans empirical research, theoretical discussions, and critical reviews, sourced from academic databases including PubMed, SocINDEX, Web of Science, the Social Sciences Citation Index, and Google Scholar.

1.2. Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions: Diversity and Inclusion in Education

Hofstede's cultural dimensions have been widely applied across various disciplines, including education, business, and psychology, with researchers selecting between two and seven dimensions depending on their analytical focus (Wenchang et al., 2024; Minkov et al., 2018; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). In the context of globalization and migration, educational institutions increasingly reflect diverse cultural backgrounds, creating complex intersections of cultures. This shift is driven by global interconnectedness and the movement of people across borders, resulting in a more diverse student body. In response, schools and universities are adapting by incorporating multicultural perspectives into curricula, promoting intercultural understanding, and providing support for interna-

tional students (Zalli, 2024).

Hofstede's framework offers valuable insights into how cultural norms influence classroom interactions, learning behaviours, and integration processes (Sarı & Yüce, 2020; Vertovec, 2007; Appadurai, 1996). In multicultural schools, the framework can help educators understand how students navigate their identities, reconciling cultural heritage with the expectations of their new educational environments (Seifert & Sutton, 2019). These insights support the development of inclusive practices that provide both academic support and cultural affirmation for students from refugee backgrounds.

The individualism-collectivism dimension, in particular, is relevant, as it influences how students and teachers interpret autonomy, authority, and collaboration within the classroom (Hofstede, 2001). While the framework has been extensively utilized in business and organizational research (e.g., Minkov et al., 2018; Stephan, Liberman, & Trope, 2011), fewer studies have explored its application in educational settings (e.g., Sarı & Yüce, 2020; Seifert & Sutton, 2019; Dennehy, 2015). This review aims to address this gap by examining how Hofstede's theory can inform inclusive pedagogical practices in culturally diverse schools.

1.3. Evolving Perspectives on Culture: Hofstede and Anthropological Critiques

The concept of culture has undergone significant theoretical development over time. Hofstede (2011) defines culture as a form of "shared mental programming" that distinguishes members of one group from another. He applies this definition across several domains—including ethnic, national, organisational, and occupational—emphasising that cultural meanings differ depending on the level of analysis. While societal and national cultures are typically acquired early in life and are deeply ingrained, occupational and organisational cultures tend to be learned later and are more adaptable. Hofstede also distinguishes between values (often unconscious and linked to societal culture) and practices (observable behaviours common in organisational contexts such as schools and workplaces).

Anthropological perspectives offer alternative interpretations. For instance, Anderson-Levitt (2017) defines culture as shared beliefs and behavioural norms within specific societies but critiques essentialist and overly rigid models. She highlights a disciplinary shift toward more fluid, context-sensitive understandings of culture and warns that traditional approaches may risk stereotyping, exoticisation, and the neglect of race and power dynamics. Similarly, Rathje (2009) challenges the assumption of cultural homogeneity, noting that the idea of coherent national cultures has been increasingly contested in fields such as linguistics and history.

Despite these critiques, Hofstede's framework remains influential in cross-cultural research, including within education. It provides a structured tool for analysing how cultural values influence institutional behaviours. However, it is not without limitations—most notably, its tendency to generalise national cultures

and overlook intra-cultural diversity.

This narrative review critically engages with Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory, focusing on its application in educational contexts, the evidence emerging from case studies, and implications for practice. It also considers key critiques and explores opportunities for refining and extending the framework. The review concludes with practical recommendations for enhancing the theory's relevance and adaptability in increasingly diverse and dynamic educational settings.

2. Exploring the Influence of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Across Educational Contexts

Hofstede's cultural dimensions framework has been widely applied across disciplines to examine how cultural values shape social dynamics, including within educational settings (Jin et al., 2023; Gerlach & Eriksson, 2021; Minkov et al., 2018; Dennehy, 2015; McSweeney, 2013; Blodgett, Bakir, & Rose, 2008). For example, Cătălin and Cerasela (2012) highlight the role of cultural norms in shaping social interaction and conflict in intercultural exchanges. Supporting its utility, Gerlach and Eriksson's (2021) cross-national replication study involving 57 countries confirmed the framework's robustness in comparative cultural analysis. Collectively, these findings position Hofstede's model as a valuable analytical tool for understanding cultural dynamics within education.

Dennehy's (2015) research illustrates how Hofstede's dimensions are increasingly recognised in educational contexts, where cultural norms influence pedagogical expectations, communication styles, and classroom behaviour. The framework helps explain how students from diverse cultural backgrounds may hold differing assumptions about what constitutes appropriate classroom conduct or effective teaching.

Empirical studies further demonstrate that cultural variation significantly shapes classroom interaction. For instance, in cultures that value expressiveness, limited verbal participation may be misinterpreted as disengagement (Seifert & Sutton, 2019; Wang, 2011). Differences in nonverbal communication—such as norms surrounding eye contact, personal space, and wait time—can also lead to misunderstanding (Uono & Hietanen, 2015; Stephan, Liberman, & Trope, 2011). Moreover, culturally shaped perceptions of questioning—particularly the distinction between rhetorical and evaluative questions—may confuse students unfamiliar with these conventions (Lodge et al., 2018). Similarly, competitive classroom practices may clash with collectivist preferences for cooperation, potentially undermining both academic engagement and social integration (Sarı & Yüce, 2020).

In their foundational work, Hofstede et al. (2010) identified six cultural dimensions that have informed extensive educational research (Lin & Lou, 2024; Jin et al., 2023; Braithwaite et al., 2020; Dennehy, 2015; Catalin & Cerasela, 2012; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Among these, the Power Distance dimension (Hofstede et al., 2010; Huang & Brown, 2009) is particularly relevant in education, as it addresses how societies perceive and manage inequality in power relations. It reflects

the extent to which individuals in less powerful positions accept and expect unequal distributions of power.

In low power distance cultures, schools typically foster more egalitarian relationships between teachers and students (Johnson, Allen, & Cordoba, 2024). Students are encouraged to express opinions, question authority, and actively participate in decision-making. Teaching in these contexts often emphasises dialogue, collaboration, and learner autonomy. In contrast, high power distance cultures emphasise hierarchical structures and respect for authority. Teachers are regarded as unquestionable sources of knowledge, and students are expected to demonstrate obedience and deference. These cultural orientations shape classroom dynamics, pedagogical strategies, and broader educational environments by influencing how authority is negotiated.

The Individualism-Collectivism dimension reflects the extent to which cultures prioritise group cohesion versus individual autonomy (Hofstede et al., 2010; Huang & Brown, 2009). In collectivist societies, education often emphasises group harmony, adherence to tradition, and respect for authority. Students are expected to conform to group norms, avoid open disagreement, and show deference to teachers (Li, Britvan, & Tomasello, 2021). Instruction is typically teacher-led, with a focus on collective success and shared responsibilities. By contrast, individualistic cultures value independence, self-expression, and personal achievement. Students in these settings are encouraged to think critically, express their views, and take initiative in their learning (Salmon & Barrera, 2021). Classroom interactions often promote open discussion, personal choice, and the pursuit of individual goals over group conformity.

The Masculinity-Femininity dimension offers further insight into how cultural values shape educational priorities and student motivation (Hofstede et al., 2010; Huang & Brown, 2009). In masculine cultures, schools often emphasise achievement, competition, and performance-based success (Ceylan & Sever, 2020). These environments reward individual excellence, set high academic standards, and cultivate a competitive ethos. Success is associated with measurable outcomes—such as grades, rankings, and awards—and valued traits include ambition, assertiveness, and leadership. Conversely, feminine cultures prioritise interpersonal relationships, well-being, and collaboration. Educational practices in these settings emphasise inclusion, empathy, and holistic development (Jardinez & Natividad, 2024). Classrooms often favour group work, shared success, and mutual support, with teachers fostering a nurturing and cooperative environment.

The Uncertainty Avoidance dimension provides valuable insights into how cultures manage ambiguity and risk in educational settings (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hofstede Insights, n.d.). High uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to favour structure, predictability, and rule-based instruction (Alter & Haydon, 2017). Teaching is typically well-organised, with defined objectives, standardised assessments, and clear behavioural expectations. Students in such environments may be less likely to question authority or take intellectual risks, as correctness and rule-following

are prioritised. In contrast, low uncertainty avoidance cultures are more open to flexible, exploratory learning (Benade, 2022). These contexts support creativity, critical thinking, and tolerance for ambiguity. Teachers may adopt open-ended tasks, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based approaches that foster innovation and adaptability.

The Long-Term vs. Short-Term Orientation dimension reflects cultural attitudes toward time, planning, and success (Hofstede et al., 2010; Huang & Brown, 2009). Long-term oriented cultures value perseverance, future-oriented goals, and delayed gratification. Schools in these contexts encourage students to view education as a long-term investment, cultivating traits such as resilience, patience, and a growth mindset (Rahardi & Dartanto, 2021). Academic setbacks are seen as opportunities for learning and personal development. In contrast, short-term oriented cultures tend to focus on tradition, immediate outcomes, and maintaining social expectations (Deal & Peterson, 2016). In these settings, students may prioritise passing exams or meeting short-term benchmarks over long-term learning. Instructional practices often reinforce established norms and place less emphasis on innovation or strategic planning.

Finally, the Indulgence vs. Restraint dimension addresses the degree to which cultures allow the free gratification of desires and emotional expression (Hofstede et al., 2010; Hofstede Insights, n.d.). In high-indulgence cultures, schools often prioritise student autonomy, creativity, and emotional well-being (Jin et al., 2023). These environments encourage self-expression, flexible learning approaches, and extracurricular participation, reflecting broader cultural values of enjoyment and personal fulfilment. In contrast, restraint-oriented cultures emphasise discipline, self-control, and academic rigor (Irby & Clough, 2015). Schools in these contexts may impose stricter behavioural expectations, limit personal freedom, and frame academic success in terms of social or familial obligations. Understanding where an educational system lies on this spectrum can inform more culturally responsive approaches to student engagement, classroom management, and curriculum design.

3. Applying Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions in Education: Key Cases and Outcomes

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions framework offers a comprehensive lens for understanding and navigating cultural differences across various domains, including education. The six dimensions—Power Distance, Individualism vs. Collectivism, Masculinity vs. Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long-term vs. Short-term Orientation, and Indulgence vs. Restraint—provide valuable insights into how cultural values influence behaviours, decision-making, and institutional practices (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Numerous studies have applied this framework to examine the impact of cultural norms on educational practices and student learning across diverse contexts.

Several studies underscore how shifts in cultural dimensions over time can

drive substantial changes in educational philosophies, pedagogical methods, and classroom dynamics. For instance, Morera and Galván (2019) used Hofstede's framework to assess transformations in Romania's educational culture over a 60-year period. Their analysis revealed a move away from authoritarianism and rigid information delivery towards greater autonomy and cooperative learning. This shift corresponded with a reduction in power distance and uncertainty avoidance, alongside increased individualism and masculinity—mirroring broader societal changes.

Other studies have focused on how specific cultural dimensions shape learning behaviours and styles. Alqarni (2022), in a comprehensive review, explored the influence of Hofstede's dimensions on language learning across different cultural and educational settings. The findings indicated that power distance, individualism vs. collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity vs. femininity play key roles in determining learning preferences, levels of engagement, and academic outcomes.

Cultural values also influence students' adoption of digital technologies and online learning platforms. Tarhini (2016) investigated how cultural dimensions affected e-learning acceptance among students in Lebanon and the UK. Their study found that cultural norms significantly shaped students' attitudes toward digital education, underlining the importance of tailoring e-learning strategies to align with learners' cultural expectations.

In classroom settings, cultural dimensions shape not only pedagogical methods but also student-teacher relationships and classroom dynamics. Adapting instructional practices to reflect cultural values can promote inclusivity, enhance self-efficacy, and better support diverse learners. For example, a previous study by Phuong-Mai, Terlouw, and Pilot (2005) examined teaching practices in Vietnam—a collectivist society with high power distance. Educators in this context employed group-based learning while maintaining a strong authoritative presence, reinforcing cultural values of hierarchy and cooperation. This approach resulted in improved student engagement and academic success. However, students from such backgrounds often faced challenges when transitioning to Western educational systems, where individualism and autonomy are prioritised—highlighting the need for culturally responsive pedagogy.

Integrating cultural dimensions into educational practice can also strengthen students' motivation and sense of belonging. In a recent mixed-methods study, Jin et al. (2023) used Hofstede's framework to analyse the relationship between cultural values, self-efficacy, and motivation through surveys and interviews with students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Their findings showed that the dimension of Indulgence vs. Restraint influenced students' ability to delay gratification, while Long-term vs. Short-term Orientation was linked to future-focused academic planning. Furthermore, students from high Uncertainty Avoidance cultures thrived in structured environments, which bolstered their confidence and performance. The study emphasised how multiple cultural dimensions interact in

complex ways to shape educational experiences and student outcomes.

Together, these case studies demonstrate the practical value of Hofstede's framework in educational analysis. Cultural dimensions significantly influence how students learn, how teachers teach, and how classrooms function. Recognising these cultural underpinnings enables educators and institutions to foster more inclusive and supportive learning environments. By integrating cultural awareness into educational design and practice, schools can enhance student engagement, bridge cultural divides, and improve academic outcomes across diverse educational settings.

4. Critiques of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Framework: Implications for Schools

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Framework (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010)—which conceptualizes culture as a form of shared mental programming distinguishing one group from another—has significantly shaped cross-cultural research. Its structured approach has also influenced educational theory and practice by providing a lens through which to examine how cultural values affect teaching and learning. However, numerous scholars have raised concerns about the model's conceptual and methodological limitations, especially in its application to dynamic and diverse educational contexts.

A primary critique centres on the framework's reductionist nature, which tends to categorize cultures into fixed, binary oppositions—such as individualist vs. collectivist—while overlooking the complexity and fluidity of cultural identities. Scholars such as Catalin and Cerasela (2012) and Minkov et al. (2018) argue that these simplistic dichotomies fail to capture the nuanced interplay of beliefs, values, and behaviours that shape real-world cultural expressions. This is particularly problematic in educational settings, where students often navigate hybrid identities shaped by migration, globalization, and evolving family and community dynamics.

The framework's static portrayal of culture further limits its relevance in today's multicultural classrooms. As Catalin and Cerasela (2012) note, cultural identity exists on a continuum, influenced by the interaction between individual agency and collective norms. Hofstede's model does not sufficiently account for the ways in which identities shift over time or in response to external factors such as digital technologies, socio-political change, or intergenerational differences—all of which are highly salient in schools serving diverse populations.

Another key concern involves the use of national averages to define cultural profiles. While these may offer a broad overview, they risk obscuring substantial intra-cultural variation. Educators relying on such generalizations may make assumptions about students based on nationality or ethnicity, leading to stereotyping and neglect of individual differences. In their earlier works, McSweeney (2002) and Taras, Kirkman, and Steel (2012) emphasize that cultural identity is also shaped by regional, generational, linguistic, and socio-economic factors—dimensions that are especially relevant in educational environments where such diver-

sity is commonplace.

The methodological foundations of the framework have also been widely scrutinized, prompting calls for further empirical investigation and theoretical refinement. Critics point out that the original data were collected primarily from International Business Machines (IBM) employees in the 1960s and 1970s, raising concerns about the sample's representativeness and the framework's applicability to contemporary, non-corporate settings such as schools (Schwartz, 2006, McSweeney, 2002). Additionally, the reliance on national averages tends to overlook intracultural variation and evolving social dynamics, limiting the framework's ability to account for cultural complexity in diverse educational contexts (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2012). These methodological concerns highlight the need for updated research using more inclusive, context-sensitive approaches that reflect the realities of today's multicultural learning environments.

Critics have also raised ontological and epistemological concerns. Scholars such as Dennehy (2015) and Chang et al. (2017) challenge the assumption that culture can be distilled into fixed, measurable dimensions. They advocate instead for more reflexive and flexible models that view cultural identity as dynamic, situated, and context-dependent. Supporting this critique, Gerlach and Eriksson (2021), in their recent 57-country study, found low internal consistency across Hofstede's dimensions, casting doubt on the reliability of the model's constructs. Similarly, Jin et al. (2023) reported inconsistencies in cross-national comparisons, further underscoring the need for more contextually grounded cultural analyses.

Despite its limitations, Hofstede's framework continues to serve as a valuable starting point for examining cultural influences in education. However, its use in school settings should be approached with critical awareness and supplemented by alternative models that offer greater nuance and flexibility. Frameworks such as the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) research project (House et al., 2004) and Schwartz's Theory of Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 2012) and provide deeper insights into cultural diversity and its implications for educational contexts. Schwartz's theory outlines ten universal values that motivate behaviour across cultures, emphasizing individual and collective priorities. Meanwhile, the GLOBE study examines how cultural practices and values shape leadership styles and organizational behaviour across societies. Both models offer more context-sensitive perspectives that better reflect the dynamic and multifaceted nature of today's educational environments.

In light of these critiques, there is a growing recognition of the need for updated research that employs more inclusive, context-sensitive approaches capable of capturing the complexities of today's multicultural educational settings. Traditional frameworks like Hofstede's, while foundational, often fall short in addressing the dynamic, intersectional nature of cultural identities in contemporary schools. As a result, educators and researchers are increasingly encouraged to adopt interdisciplinary and adaptive models that move beyond static cultural typologies. Such approaches recognize culture as fluid and shaped by intersecting factors including migration, socio-economic status, generational change, and dig-

ital influence. By embracing these more flexible frameworks, educational institutions can develop more inclusive practices, adapt teaching methods to the diverse needs of students, and create learning environments where cultural diversity is not only acknowledged but actively respected and empowered. This shift is essential for fostering a sense of belonging and improving educational outcomes for all learners in an increasingly globalized world.

5. A Way Forward: Enhancing Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Framework in Education

While Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Framework has served as a foundational tool in cross-cultural research (Wenchang et al., 2024; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010), its application in educational contexts warrants critical reconsideration. The model's largely static, binary conceptualisations of culture often fail to capture the complexity of identity formation and cultural negotiation within today's multicultural schools. As education systems increasingly reflect global migration patterns, technological interconnectivity, and pluralistic societies, a more dynamic and context-sensitive approach is essential.

First, it is imperative to reconceptualise culture not as a fixed set of traits, but as a fluid, evolving process shaped by changing beliefs, values, behaviours, and lived experiences (Xing & Jin, 2023). In schools, students frequently embody hybrid cultural identities, drawing from multiple influences—familial, societal, digital, and global—in shaping their worldview (Chang & Wu, 2023; Appadurai, 1996; Bhabha, 1994). Rather than positioning learners along rigid axes such as individualism or collectivism, future research should explore how students navigate and blend these values, adapting their behaviour according to situational demands (Chen & Unal, 2023; Cortina, Arel, & Smith-Darden, 2017).

Second, applying cultural analysis directly to educational settings yields important insights into how cultural norms inform teaching practices, classroom interactions, and student–teacher relationships. Cultural values shape how students interpret authority, engage with peers, and participate in learning activities (Earley & Gibson, 2002; Triandis, 1995). Recognising these influences allows educators to tailor pedagogical strategies that foster equity, respect, and inclusion, thereby supporting more responsive and culturally sustaining classrooms (Lee et al., 2024).

Third, methodological refinement is essential to ensure that cultural frameworks remain relevant and representative. Expanding sample diversity—including students and educators across socio-economic strata, regions, ethnicities, and age groups—enhances the generalisability and inclusiveness of findings. Mixed methods approaches, integrating surveys with interviews, ethnographies, and focus groups, provide a richer and more nuanced understanding of how cultural identities are enacted and negotiated within school communities (Minkov & Kaasa, 2022; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In particular, first-person narratives from teachers and students offer valuable insights into the situated nature of cultural experience in educational spaces (Ho, 2022).

Fourth, integrating cross-disciplinary perspectives enhances cultural analysis. Theories from psychology, sociology, anthropology, and education offer diverse conceptual tools for examining identity formation, institutional power, and social belonging. Longitudinal studies are especially useful for tracking cultural evolution over time, revealing shifts in student values, school climate, and community expectations (Minkov & Kaasa, 2021; Mandel & Realo, 2015). Additionally, emerging technologies—including computational methods and cultural analytics—offer novel approaches for examining large-scale data to identify trends in cultural expression and learning outcomes (Manovich, 2020; Martinho, 2018).

Fifth, cultural analysis must attend to context. Culture does not operate in isolation; it is deeply embedded within broader socio-political and historical structures that shape educational institutions (Jin et al., 2023; Triandis, 1995). Adopting a layered, systems-level approach that considers classroom practices, school policies, and national education frameworks can reveal how cultural dynamics operate at multiple levels of the schooling experience (Tung & Verbeke, 2010).

Sixth, temporal sensitivity is vital. Cultural identities and expressions are not static; they shift in response to societal changes, immigration trends, policy transformations, and technological developments (Alsaleh, 2024; Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), 2020; Bhugra & Becker, 2005). Capturing these changes requires real-time data and longitudinal designs that allow educators to stay attuned to evolving student needs and community identities (Mandel & Realo, 2015; Kashima, 2014).

Finally, enhancing cultural research in education necessitates reflexivity and the use of complementary frameworks. Models that incorporate individual, organisational, and systemic dimensions—such as those offered by Tung and Verbeke (2010) and Bolzonella (2024)—enable more comprehensive analyses. Crucially, researchers and educators must engage in cultural reflexivity: the ongoing examination of their own assumptions, values, and positionalities. As McSweeney (2002, 2013) warns, uncritical application of cultural models risks stereotyping and essentialising student identities. Reflexivity fosters ethical research and practice by ensuring that cultural frameworks are applied in ways that empower rather than constrain. It also enables educators to better understand how their perspectives shape pedagogy, relationships, and classroom climate (Baily, 2025).

In sum, advancing Hofstede's framework for contemporary education requires moving beyond static, one-dimensional representations of culture. A more adaptive, interdisciplinary, and reflexive approach better reflects the cultural complexities of today's educational landscapes. By embracing these enhancements, educators, researchers, and policymakers can foster more inclusive, equitable, and culturally responsive learning environments that honour the rich diversity of student experiences.

6. Discussion and Recommendations

This review reaffirms the ongoing relevance of Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Theory as a foundational framework for examining how cultural values shape behaviour, interactions, and learning in educational settings. The six dimensions—power distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term versus short-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint—provide valuable analytical tools for understanding how cultural norms influence teaching practices, classroom dynamics, and student engagement.

Within school contexts, Hofstede's framework can aid educators in recognising and accommodating the diverse cultural backgrounds of their students, ultimately supporting improved engagement and academic achievement. For instance, greater awareness of students' cultural attitudes toward authority and collaboration—reflected in the dimensions of power distance and individualism versus collectivism—can inform the design of classroom management strategies and group work activities. Empirical studies suggest that such culturally responsive teaching practices significantly enhance student motivation and performance (Jin et al., 2023; Phuong-Mai et al., 2005).

Nonetheless, the model is not without critique. A growing body of scholarship has highlighted that Hofstede's typologies can inadvertently reduce culture to overly simplistic binaries, which is particularly problematic in today's multicultural classrooms. Students frequently navigate hybrid identities shaped by globalisation, transnational migration, and digital connectivity, defying the static national categories assumed by Hofstede's framework (Minkov et al., 2018; Catalin & Cerasela, 2012). Furthermore, questions remain about the framework's methodological validity, given that its original data were derived from a narrow corporate sample of IBM employees in the mid-twentieth century—raising concerns about its applicability to broader, contemporary educational contexts.

In response to these concerns, this article advocates for a more nuanced and flexible application of Hofstede's framework in educational research and practice. First, it is crucial to contextualise cultural dimensions to the unique linguistic, ethnic, and socio-economic realities of specific school communities. Cultural generalisations should be interpreted cautiously, with an awareness of intra-national and generational differences (Gerlach & Eriksson, 2021).

Second, future research should embrace mixed-method approaches that combine the strengths of quantitative instruments, such as surveys and scales, with qualitative methods, including interviews, classroom observations, and ethnographies. This methodological pluralism enables a more holistic understanding of how students and educators experience and negotiate cultural identities within schooling environments (Minkov & Kaasa, 2022).

Third, cultivating cultural reflexivity among educators is essential. Teachers should be encouraged to critically examine their own cultural assumptions, positionalities, and biases. Such reflexivity promotes more ethical, inclusive engagement with students and helps avoid the reification or stereotyping of cultural identities (Gay, 2010, 2018).

Fourth, there is a need to track cultural change over time. Longitudinal studies and real-time data collection can capture the evolving cultural landscape of schools, particularly in response to global migration patterns, shifting policy environments, and the pervasive influence of technology on identity formation (Manovich, 2020).

Fifth, researchers should consider integrating complementary theoretical frameworks, such as Schwartz's Theory of Basic Human Values, to supplement Hofstede's model. These frameworks provide additional insights into value orientations and behavioural motivations, offering a more comprehensive lens through which to analyse cultural influences on learning (Schwartz, 2006).

Finally, there is an urgent need to expand the empirical base of cultural research in education. More studies are required to examine how Hofstede's dimensions function in real-world educational settings, with particular attention to curriculum design, teacher-student relationships, peer dynamics, and school leadership structures (Taras et al., 2012).

Taken together, these recommendations support a more adaptive and contextually responsive use of Hofstede's framework in educational research. By moving beyond rigid typologies and embracing methodological and theoretical plurality, educators and scholars can more effectively engage with the cultural complexity of today's classrooms. Such an approach holds the potential to foster more equitable, inclusive, and culturally attuned educational environments that support all learners.

Declaration

The author of this study declares no affiliations or involvements with any organizations or entities that have financial or non-financial interests in the subject matter, or materials covered in this manuscript.

AI-assisted editing and proofreading were conducted using ChatGPT-4.0 to enhance clarity, coherence, and readability.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Alqarni, A. M. (2022). Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions in Relation to Learning Behaviours and Learning Styles: A Critical Analysis of Studies under Different Cultural and Language Learning Environments. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 18,* 721-739.

Alsaleh, A. (2024). The Impact of Technological Advancement on Culture and Society. *Scientific Reports, 14,* Article No. 32140. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-83995-z

Alter, P., & Haydon, T. (2017). Characteristics of Effective Classroom Rules: A Review of the Literature. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 40,* 114-127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417700962

Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2017). Complicating the Concept of Culture. In *World Culture*

Recontextualised (pp. 45-58). Routledge.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.

Baily, A. (2025). Embracing Temporality: Reflexive Insights into Positionality and Relational Dynamics in Intercultural Research. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, 4,* Article ID: 100183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2025.100183

Banks, J. A. (2004). *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

Benade, L. (2022). Flexible and Innovative Learning Spaces: An Exploration of Parental Perspectives on Change, Consultation and Participation. *European Educational Research Journal, 21,* 568-584. https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041211041204

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.

Bhugra, D., & Becker, M. A. (2005). Migration, Cultural Bereavement and Cultural Identity. *World Psychiatry, 4,* 18.

Blodgett, J. G., Bakir, A., & Rose, G. M. (2008). A Test of the Validity of Hofstede's Cultural Framework. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 25,* 339-349. https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760810902477

Bolzonella, F. (2024). *Evaluating through Culture: Rethinking Hofstede's Framework in Policy Analysis*. European Evaluation Society. https://europeanevaluation.org

Braithwaite, J., Tran, Y., Ellis, L. A., & Westbrook, J. (2020). Inside the Black Box of Comparative National Healthcare Performance in 35 OECD Countries: Issues of Culture, Systems Performance and Sustainability. *PLOS ONE, 15,* e0239776. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239776

Catalin, P., & Cerasela, S. (2012). A Critical Approach to Hofstede's Model on Cultural Dimensions. *Ovidius' University Annals, Economic Sciences Series, 12,* 644-649.

Ceylan, E., & Sever, M. (2020). Schools' Emphasis on Academic Success in TIMSS 2015: The Case of Finland, Singapore, and Turkey. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies, 7,* 202-212. https://doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2020.04.019

Chang, L., & Wu, S. (2023). The Correlation between Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions and COVID-19 Data in the Early Stage of the COVID-19 Pandemic Period. *Healthcare, 11,* Article No. 2258. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11162258

Chang, T., Tucker, A. R., Norton, C. L., Gass, M. A., & Javorski, S. E. (2017). Cultural Issues in Adventure Programming: Applying Hofstede's Five Dimensions to Assessment and Practice. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning, 17,* 307-320. https://doi.org/10.1080/14729679.2016.1259116

Chen, C. C., & Unal, A. F. (2023). *Individualism-Collectivism: A Review of Conceptualization and Measurement*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management.

Cortina, K. S., Arel, S., & Smith-Darden, J. P. (2017). School Belonging in Different Cultures: The Effects of Individualism and Power Distance. *Frontiers in Education, 2,* Article No. 56. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00056

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2016). *Shaping School Culture*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119210214

Dennehy, E. (2015). Hofstede and Learning in Higher Level Education: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Management in Education, 9,* 323-339. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijmie.2015.070125

Earley, P. C., & Gibson, C. B. (2002). *Multinational Work Teams: A New Perspective*. Law-

rence Erlbaum Associates.

G Johnson, R., Allen, K., & Gallo Cordoba, B. (2024). Where Does Culture Belong at School? Exploring the Role of Individualism and Power Distance in School Belonging across Cultures. *Current Psychology, 43,* 13492-13527. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05280-y

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers' College Press.

Gerlach, P., & Eriksson, K. (2021). Measuring Cultural Dimensions: External Validity and Internal Consistency of Hofstede's VSM 2013 Scales. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12,* Article ID: 662604. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.662604

Ho, J. E. (2022). What Counts? The Critical Role of Qualitative Data in Teachers' Decision Making. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 91,* Article ID: 102046. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2021.102046

Hofstede Insights (n.d.). *Country Comparison.* https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations.* International Educational and Professional.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2,* Article No. 8. https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

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

Hofstede, G. J. (2015). *Hofstede Insights: National Culture Dimensions.* https://www.hofstede-insights.com

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations, Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival.* McGraw-Hill.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The Globe Study of 62 Societies.* Sage.

Huang, J., & Brown, K. (2009). Cultural Factors Affecting Chinese ESL Students' Academic Learning. *Education, 129,* 643-653.

Irby, D., & Clough, C. (2015). Consistency Rules: A Critical Exploration of a Universal Principle of School Discipline. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 23,* 153-173. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2014.932300

Jardinez, M. J., & Natividad, L. R. (2024). The Advantages and Challenges of Inclusive Education: Striving for Equity in the Classroom. *Shanlax International Journal of Education, 12,* 57-65. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v12i2.7182

Jin, R., Wu, R., Xia, Y., & Zhao, M. (2023). What Cultural Values Determine Student Self-Efficacy? An Empirical Study for 42 Countries and Economies. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14,* Article ID: 1177415. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1177415

Kashima, Y. (2014). How Can You Capture Cultural Dynamics? *Frontiers in Psychology, 5,* Article No. 995. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00995

Lee, J. Y., Sagastui, J., Mischo, C., Masters, A. S., Peters, S., Wolstein, K. et al. (2024). Understanding Cross-Cultural Differences in Pedagogical Beliefs: A Comparison among South Korean, Spanish, and German Early Childhood Teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 148,* Article ID: 104704. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104704

Li, L., Britvan, B., & Tomasello, M. (2021). Young Children Conform More to Norms than to Preferences. *PLOS ONE, 16,* e0251228. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251228

Lin, H., & Lou, L. (2024). A Study on Cross-Cultural Business Communication Based on Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Theory. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 12,* 352-368. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.129021

Lodge, J. M., Kennedy, G., Lockyer, L., Arguel, A., & Pachman, M. (2018). Understanding Difficulties and Resulting Confusion in Learning: An Integrative Review. *Frontiers in Education, 3,* Article No. 49. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00049

Mandel, A., & Realo, A. (2015). Across-Time Change and Variation in Cultural Tightness-looseness. *PLOS ONE, 10,* e0145213. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0145213

Manovich, L. (2020). *Cultural Analytics.* MIT Press.

Martinho, T. D. (2018). Researching Culture through Big Data: Computational Engineering and the Human and Social Sciences. *Social Sciences, 7,* Article No. 264. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7120264

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith—A Failure of Analysis. *Human Relations, 55,* 89-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702551004

McSweeney, B. (2013). Fashion Founded on a Flaw: The Ecological Mono-Deterministic Fallacy of Hofstede, Globe, and Followers. *International Marketing Review, 30,* 483-504. https://doi.org/10.1108/imr-04-2013-0082

Minkov, M., & Kaasa, A. (2021). A Test of Hofstede's Model of Culture Following His Own Approach. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 28,* 384-406. https://doi.org/10.1108/ccsm-05-2020-0120

Minkov, M., & Kaasa, A. (2022). Do Dimensions of Culture Exist Objectively? A Validation of the Revised Minkov-Hofstede Model of Culture with World Values Survey Items and Scores for 102 Countries. *Journal of International Management, 28,* Article ID: 100971. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2022.100971

Minkov, M., Bond, M. H., Dutt, P., Schachner, M., Morales, O., Sanchez, C. et al. (2018). A Reconsideration of Hofstede's Fifth Dimension: New Flexibility versus Monumentalism Data from 54 Countries. *Cross-Cultural Research, 52,* 309-333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397117727488

Morera*, I., & Galván, C. (2019). Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions in the Educational Context. In *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences* (pp. 298-306). Cognitive-Crcs. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2019.04.02.38

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (2020). *Towards 2035 Strategic Foresight: Making Migration and Integration Policies Future Ready.* OECD.

Phuong-Mai, N., Terlouw, C., & Pilot, A. (2005). Cooperative Learning vs Confucian Heritage Culture's Collectivism: Confrontation to Reveal Some Cultural Conflicts and Mismatch. *Asia Europe Journal, 3,* 403-419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10308-005-0008-4

Rahardi, F., & Dartanto, T. (2021). Growth Mindset, Delayed Gratification, and Learning Outcome: Evidence from a Field Survey of Least-Advantaged Private Schools in Depok-Indonesia. *Heliyon, 7,* e06681. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06681

Rathje, S. (2009). The Definition of Culture: An Application-Oriented Overhaul. *Interculture Journal, 8,* 35-58.

Salmon, A. K., & Barrera, M. X. (2021). Intentional Questioning to Promote Thinking and Learning. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 40,* Article ID: 100822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100822

Sarı, M. H., & Yüce, E. (2020). Problems Experienced in Classrooms with Students from

Different Cultures. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science, 13,* 90-100. https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2020.130204

Schwartz, S. (2006). A Theory of Cultural Value Orientations: Explication and Applications. *Comparative Sociology, 5,* 137-182. https://doi.org/10.1163/156913306778667357

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2,* Article No. 11.
https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116

Seifert, K., & Sutton, R. (2019). Student Diversity. In K. Seifert, & R. Sutton (Eds.), *Educational Psychology* (pp. 209-257). Orange Grove Texts Plus.

Stephan, E., Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2011). The Effects of Time Perspective and Level of Construal on Social Distance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47,* 397-402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.11.001

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2012). Examining the Impact of Culture's Consequences: A Three-Decade, Multilevel, Meta-Analytic Review of Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 405-439.
https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018938

Tarhini, A. (2016). *The Effects of Cultural Dimensions and Demographic Characteristics on e-Learning Acceptance.*

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism.* Westview Press.

Tung, R. L., & Verbeke, A. (2010). Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the Quality of Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41,* 1259-1274. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2010.41

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2024). *Global Trends: Forced Dis-placement in 2024.*

Uono, S., & Hietanen, J. K. (2015). Eye Contact Perception in the West and East: A Cross-Cultural Study. *PLOS ONE, 10,* e0118094. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118094

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-Diversity and Its Implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30,* 1024-1054. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465

Wang, J. (2011). Culture Differences and English Teaching. *English Language Teaching, 4,* 223-230. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p223

Wenchang, C., Vasudevan, A., Arumugam, V., Zhang, J., Balakrishnan, R., & Rusuli, M. S. C. (2024). A Case Study with Hofstede's Culture: Working Performance of Chinese Expatriates in Dubai. *Journal of Ecohumanism, 3,* 1674-1690.
https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i4.3697

Xing, Y., & Jin, C. (2023). The Impact of Cultural Values on Attitude Formation toward Cultural Products: Mediating Effects of Country Image. *Sustainability, 15,* Article No. 11172. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151411172

Zalli, E. (2024). Globalization and Education: Exploring the Exchange of Ideas, Values, and Traditions in Promoting Cultural Understanding and Global Citizenship. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development, 11,* 55.
https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv11n1s109