

## Are tourists from the same source market culturally homogeneous?

### Abstract

This study questions whether tourists are culturally homogeneous regardless of the destination visited or type of travel undertaken. This question is premised on the belief that tourists are culturally homogeneous, which underlies research that applies Hofstede's national cultural value framework; yet, it has not been asked before in the tourism literature. To address this research gap, a survey of Hong Kong residents who had travelled outside of the city for pleasure was conducted using the Cultural Value Scale (CVSCALE), a scale developed and validated to measure Hofstede's national cultural values at an individual level. The study revealed significant differences in expressed national cultural values on most dimensions tested, as well as the overall scale by destination choice and style of trip. This study contributes by showing that an examination of individual-level culture may be more important when looking at sub-populations of tourists from the same source market.

Keywords; Hofstede, CVSCALE, cross-cultural studies, Hong Kong

### Introduction

Are tourists from the same country a culturally homogeneous group regardless of where they travel or do their expressed national cultural values differ depending on the destination visited? This question is crucial in the tourism literature as the belief that tourists are culturally homogeneous underlies most research that applies Hofstede's (1980) national cultural value framework (see for example, Hsu, Woodside & Marshall 2013; Litvin, Crotts & Hefner 2004; Manrai & Manrai 2011; Reisinger & Crotts 2010; Reisinger & Turner 1998; You, O'Leary, Morrison & Hong 2000; Zhang, Li & Wu 2019). Such studies then proceed to recommend generic actions for how to treat tourists, how to market to them and the type of activities they will enjoy. The validity of this style of research may be called into question if it eventuates that tourists express heterogeneous cultural values by destination.

While ubiquitous, Hofstede's model is not without its critics (McSweeney 2002; Ng et al.. 2007), with the harshest ones dismissing it entirely as a misguided attempt to quantify culture, which is a concept that cannot be measured (Smelser, 1992; McSweeney 2002).

Hofstede's work has also received criticism for oversimplifying cultural differences, making it highly unlikely that the dimensions can encompass all the intricacies of a particular culture (Ng et al. 2007). Concerns have also been expressed that the metrics used tend to be rather blunt and narrow (McSweeney 2002; 2013). As an example, tourism research is often reduced to basic stereotypical views (Tung, 2019; Tung, King, & Tse, 2020). You et al. (2000) and Hsu et al. (2013) contrast Asian and Westerners on the basis that Asians, as represented by Japanese and Chinese are collectivist cultures that emphasize conformity, belonging, empathy and dependence while searching for in group acceptance. Litvin and Goh (2003) describe Asian societies as tending to score highly on collectivism, power distance and long term orientation, but moderately on masculinity and uncertainty avoidance, whereas Western societies generally score low on power distance are individualistic and short term oriented. Kim and Lee (2000:155) note "a group of mostly European and North American countries would emerge as high on individualism and low on power distance, whereas another group of mostly Latin American and Asian countries would emerge as low on individualism and high on power distance." Others, as cited in the literature review also draw generic conclusions about how people from collectivist societies prefer to travel to culturally different places and people with a long term orientation or from low power distance societies travel more (Zhang et al. 2019).

The most salient criticism, though, and a research gap that is often overlooked in tourism research, is the assumption that differences within a nationality are minimal (Reisinger & Crofts, 2010). While in aggregate, a national cultural norm may exist, there is no doubt that the potential for substantial within culture variation may also exist amongst its citizens (Ng, Lee & Soutar, 2007; Yang & Tung, 2018). Au (2000) suggests that the degree of variation within any one culture may even exceed that of the variation across cultures.

To address this research gap, the aim of this study is to examine national cultural values holistically across a population of tourists from the same source market who visit different destinations. It applies the Yoo, Donthu & Lenartowicz (2011), Cultural Value Scale (CVSCALE), a framework that enables cultural values to be measured at an individual level, to a sample of over 950 Hong Kong residents who have travelled internationally in the past year. In doing so, this study seeks to show that when culture is measured on an individual or small group level, internalized culture from tourists could vary significantly from the broader

national culture. Thus, while the concept of national culture is useful for studying nations and societies, an examination of individual-level culture may be more important when looking at sub-populations of tourists from the same source market.

## **Literature Review**

### **Hofstede and Tourism**

It is impossible to deal with culture in the field of international business without becoming aware of Hofstede's work (Crotts & Litvin 2003), for his framework has become a "cornerstone for cross-cultural research" (Minkov & Hofstede 2011: 10). It has been used in thousands of studies since first published in 1980. Hofstede (2015) defines culture as "the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from another." In analysing 116,000 surveys administered to IBM employees across 72 countries, he found that national differences in seemingly unrelated societal variables such as work-related values, beliefs, norms, and self-descriptions could be statistically and conceptually associated across common factors that all cultures must deal with (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011).

Hofstede's work effectively unpackaged the phenomenon of national culture into independent dimensions, a task that many researchers thought too complex to achieve (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). Five dimensions are relevant to this study, including:

1. *Power Distance* which represents the degree to which different societies handle authority, human inequality and the unequal distribution of power differently.
2. *Uncertainty Avoidance* which relates to how people from different societies cope or feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity about the future.
3. *Individualism/Collectivism* which describes how each individual relates to the tendency to integrate into groups that exist in a given society.
4. *Masculinity/Femininity* which shows how different societies cope with the differing emotional and social roles resulting from gender segregation.

5. *Long-Term Orientation versus Short-Term Orientation* which measures the extent to which a society's values have an orientation towards perseverance, thrift, and adapting to changing circumstances. This dimension is critical when East-Asian countries are being studied as it is based on Confucian values.

Reisinger and Crotts (2010) note that Hofstede's cultural dimensions have become the most widely used and accepted means to document national cultural values in tourism research. The literature seems divided as to whether all dimensions play a role in travel or whether specific dimensions are more dominant. Works by Zhang et al. (2019), Reisinger and Crotts (2010) and Gnoth and Zins (2010) suggest all dimensions should be considered individually and collectively. As an example, Zhang et al. (2019) discuss the possible effect that each dimension could have on tourism. They suggest people from individualistic societies tend to choose destinations with similar cultures to their own, whereas those from collectivist societies tend to choose places with unlike cultures. Residents from nations that score high on long term orientation travel more than those with short term orientation. International tourists tend to travel out of countries with low power distance indices, while countries that are more comfortable with uncertainty avoidance tend to receive more inbound tourists. Of course, these differences may be a function of distance as much as culture (Ahn and McKercher 2013). Correia, Kozak and Ferradeira (2011), for example, concluded power-distance was the most influential factor in destination selection. But they also found collectivist cultures place greater emphasis on brand, price and the number of alternatives than individualistic cultures, while societies that reflect long term orientation refer to multiple sources, even if they do cause some confusion. Manrai and Manrai (2011) proposed a conceptual framework examining how individual dimensions influence the different stages of the travel process. They argue individualism/collectivism and uncertainty avoidance played a bigger role during the pre-planning and actual travel period than other factors, while individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity and long term orientation influenced post trip social behaviors.

Much of the research, though has discussed the roles played by uncertainty avoidance (Crotts 2004; Hashemi and Hanser 2018; Kim and Lee 2000; Litvin et al. 2004; Money and Crotts 2003; Quintal, Lee and Soutar 2010; You et al. 2000; Zhang et al. 2019) or individualism/collectivism (Gnoth and Zins 2010; Kim and Lee 2000; Litvin and Goh 2003;

Reisinger and Turner 1998; Zhang et al. 2019). Indeed, Mattila (2019) feels individualism/collectivism and uncertainty avoidance are the dominant cultural dimensions used in the hospitality and tourism literature. Kim and Lee (2000), comparing Japanese and American tourists found Japanese demonstrated collectivism in placing higher importance on family togetherness, while Americans were more individualistic and placed higher importance on novelty seeking.

Crotts (2004) and Hashemi and Hanser (2018) highlight the role of uncertainty avoidance, with Crotts (2004: 84) noting where visitor's tolerance for risk and uncertainty is less than that of the host culture it is reasonable to assume that they will engage in risk reducing travel by spending more time planning using packages, tour operators, etc. However, when the tourists' risk tolerance is higher they will likely engage in more free and independent travel. He found residents of countries with high uncertainty avoidance adopted a range of risk reduction strategies, ranging from travelling to known destinations, a preference for group travel and a longer planning horizon, while those from countries that scored lower on this dimension were more adventuresome. Reisinger and Turner (1998) assert individualism is a major dimension in almost any cross cultural study that differentiates cultures and explains interactions. They found that understanding the collectivist nature of Korean society was a key to effective interaction between Australia hosts and their Korean guests.

Measurement of cultural distance in tourism studies has proven to be challenging.

Traditionally, physical distance has been used as a proxy (Ng et al., 2007), for it is easy to calculate and seems to be intuitively logical given the innate cultural differences between continents. Kogut and Singh (1988) developed a *Cultural Distance Index* that utilizes the four cultural dimensions of Hofstede's original work and laterally has been expanded to consider all dimensions identified now. The method can calculate the relative cultural distance between two destinations. The use of this index "has the advantage of being easy to calculate from secondary data... and provide[s] a simple, standardized, tangible, convenient and quantitative tool to measure the overall cultural difference between two countries" (Ng et al., 2007: 1500). As an example, the index compiles the differences of each country from Hong Kong's rankings along each of the six cultural dimensions. It is presented as an open-ended score, beginning at '0', which reflects complete cultural symmetry. A higher score reflects increasing cultural distance. While Crotts (2004) criticized this model for assuming that each

of Hofstede's dimensions carries equal weight in categorizing cultures, it is the best model available to calculate the cultural distance. The formula is expressed algebraically as:

$$CD_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \{(I_{ij} - I_{ihk})^2 / V_i\} / n$$

$CD_j$  = cultural differences of the  $j$ th country from Hong Kong

$I_{ij}$  = Hofstede's score for the  $i$ th cultural dimension and  $j$ th country

$I_{ihk}$  = Hofstede's score for the  $i$ th cultural dimension and Hong Kong

$V_i$  = the variance of Hofstede's index for the  $i$ th dimension

$n$  = the number of cultural dimensions

*Adapted from: Kogut and Singh, 1988*

The cultural distance between Hong Kong and China is 0.47, with the score for Singapore 0.77, Thailand, 1.72 and Taiwan, 1.90, all indicating that these places are culturally similar to Hong Kong. Long haul destinations tend to be more culturally different, with for example, Canada recording a score of 3.56, the UK 3.88, America 4.33, and Australia 4.74. In Asia, though Japan is an anomalous case, recording a cultural difference score of 3.80, putting it in the same cultural distance category as such destinations as the UK, Switzerland, Greece and Chile. Korea is also someone anomalous with the second highest Asian cultural distance score of 2.48, suggesting its cultural distance from Hong Kong is similar to Germany, Spain and Italy.

### **Criticism of Hofstede and the development of the CVSCALE**

Hofstede (2001) asserts that his 30 item Value Scale should not be used for comparing individuals, and instead can only be used to evaluate a country's central tendencies, for "individual-level correlations produce dimensions of personality [while] country-level correlations produce dimensions of national culture" (Hofstede & Minkov 2013, p. 3). Indeed, past attempts to apply Hofstede's metrics to measure cultural scores at the individual level have been disappointing (Bearden et al.. 2005; Blodgett et al.. 2008; Spector et al..

2001). Efforts to do so have tended to focus on individual dimensions (Triandis 1995). While each scale may be valid, they cannot be aggregated conceptually or methodologically (Yoo et al. 2011).

Yoo, Donthu and Lenartowicz (2011) addressed the problem through the creation of a 26-item Cultural Value Scale (CVSCALE), “a scale that measures Hofstede’s five cultural dimensions at the individual level for a more general context while achieving satisfactory psychometric properties” (Yoo et al.: 2011: 197). The scale overcomes the major weakness identified above by allowing researchers and practitioners to assess the cultural orientation of individuals, without the pitfall of making country-level stereotypes. As the authors state, it is “a scale that measures Hofstede’s five cultural dimensions at the individual level for a more general context while achieving satisfactory psychometric properties” (Yoo et al. 2011: 197). The variables mirror those used by Hofstede. Factor analysis loads them onto similar dimensions.

## **Method**

The purpose of the study was to examine if and how expressed cultural values differ by destination visited. To answer this question, a gender-equal quota sampling approach was adopted to recruit Hong Kong residents who had travelled outside of the city in the previous year for overnight leisure travel was undertaken. Data collection was contracted to a Lightspeed, a market research agency in the spring and summer of 2018 (i.e., April to June) with the request of reaching approximately 1000 respondents which took three months to collect. To reduce potential bias qualified participants had to be born in Hong Kong, be over 18 years of age, retain Hong Kong permanent residency, and have travelled outside of Hong Kong for pleasure in the previous 12 months. The target population was those who had travelled to places other than Macau and Mainland China as the researchers were initially worried that reported travel destinations may be limited. Fortunately, fewer than 70 people reported that they had confined their travel to Mainland China and/or Macau.

The survey consisted of four main parts. The first part gathered information on travel activity in the previous 12 months, including the number of trips taken, details of up to four of the

most recent trips, plus additional information on the most recent destination visited, including past visitation history, travel party composition and satisfaction levels. These questions were based on overnight non-business, pleasure trips. A follow-up question asked respondents what their dream destination was if money, time, and availability of travel companions were not an issue and whether or not they had visited that destination. The second part of the survey asked people if they felt travel had changed their sense of identity of being a Hong Kong resident. The 26 item CVSCALE was then administered with scale items measured on a five point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The scale has become increasingly popular over time since it was published (Yoo & Shin 2017). These authors also mention it has produced valid and reliable results even when applied in different languages and across different types of respondents (students, adults, consumers, salespeople). For example, Mazanec et al. (2015) and Ahn and McKercher (2018) applied the CVSCALE in a tourism setting. The former authors concluded it to be a reasonably valid means of measuring Hofstede's five cultural dimensions on the individual or psychological level (Mazanec et al. 2016:303), providing one does not attempt to expand it by expanding the variable set, or else it will not produce a five factor solution. Ahn and McKercher (2018) also applied it in their study of outbound travel by Koreans and found that the results loaded onto the five predicted dimensions and explained two-thirds of the observed variance.

An additional six questions were added to measure tourist culture, with three questions about preference for travel to familiar places (preference to go to places with a similar culture, where one can speak his or her own language and where many Hong Kong residents visit) and three asking preferences for travel to unfamiliar places or for self development (chance to meet different people, discover new places or things and expand my knowledge). Finally, demographic information, such as age, education, and household income, were included. These are commonly reported in a profile of respondents. Mean scores for the sum of constituent variables in each dimension are reported.

The limitations of the study must be acknowledged. To begin, the study was designed to focus primarily on travel outside of the China mainland. As such, we may not have captured all trips undertaken by the sample, for Hong Kong residents take an average of six to ten,



trips a year to China. This leads to the second limitation. A small sample of respondents indicated that their only trip was to China. They have been included in the study to provide a point of comparison, but the sample size certainly is not representative of the total population who confine their travel to China. One additional data analysis issue arose. This study sought to understand travel patterns over the course of a year, whereas most studies examine only the most recent trip taken. Hong Kong people are active tourists, who visit a vast array of destinations on their journeys, creating the challenge of trying to develop meaningful clusters for analysis. After much trial and error, it was determined the most effective way to analyse the data in one of two ways, by considering the furthest trip taken over the course of the year and by comparing segments of short haul, long haul and those who travelled both short and long haul. Short haul was classified as destination-specific relative to the sample context of this study. Hong Kong residents travel frequently to short-haul destinations, including Mainland China, Taiwan, Singapore, Thailand, South Korea, and Japan.

## **Findings**

The study analysed respondents according to the furthest destination visited in the preceding 12 months via SPSS. They can be categorised into nine groups based on travel to six short haul, Asian destinations and three long haul regions.

### **Profile of respondents and the their travel behaviours**

Tables 1 and 2 profile the respondents (n = 956) and summarise their travel patterns, respectively, via chi-square tests. Relatively few demographic differences were noted among the groups, with no differences noted in the gender or age. The median age is between 31 and 40 years, while relatively few people aged 51 and over participated in the study. While not statistically significant, it is worth noting that those who visited North America were younger on average than others, reflecting the high level of visiting friends and relatives (VFR) travel observed here. As one would expect, though, differences in the related variables of education and income were identified, as they influence the willingness to enter culturally different places and/or the ability to afford travel long distances. Overall, almost three quarters of the sample had post secondary education, with one in ten holding a post graduate qualification. Those who travelled to Oceania, Europe and Singapore, were, on average, better educated

than others, while those who visited Taiwan, Thailand and Korea were more likely to have high school education or less. Incomes were measured in Hong Kong dollars and then translated into US dollars for ease of interpretation by an international audience. The median household income was reported to be between US\$62,000 and US\$78,000. Long haul tourists, in general and in particular those whose furthest trip was to Australia/New Zealand or Europe reported the highest incomes, with more than one-third earning more than US\$93,000 per annum. Interestingly, those who travelled to North America were middle income earners. Those who visited Taiwan, Korea and to a lesser extent Singapore reported the lowest household incomes.

Insert tables 1 and 2 about here

The sample is travel active, taking an average of more than two trips a year outside of the China mainland (Table 2). They also visited just under two destinations a year, indicating a degree of repeat visitation to preferred destinations. Japan was by far the most popular destination, with 56% of respondents taking at least one trip to here and ten percent taking multiple trips. Taiwan was the second most popular territory visited, accounting for some 30% of all trips, followed by Korea and Thailand. Singapore was relatively less popular. Australia was the most popular long haul destination, followed by the UK, the USA and France.

Hong Kong people do not seem to be a particularly adventuresome lot of travellers as relatively little interest was shown in visiting emerging Asian destinations, such as Vietnam (12 visits) and Sri Lanka (one visit) or in more established places that have had political crises or natural disasters, such as the Philippines (two visits) or Bali/Indonesia (two visits). They also showed a very strong tendency to revisit destinations as almost three quarters of people had been to their most recent destination in the past five years. A possible reason is that these locations are considered as relatively less safe compared to other short haul destinations that are favored by Hong Kong residents, such as Japan and Korea. For example, in 2010, the Manila hostage crisis, officially known as the Rizal Park hostage-taking incident, took place when a former Philippine National Police officer hijacked a tourist bus that carried tourists from Hong Kong. A number of hostages were killed and the Hong Kong Government issued a “black” travel alert for the Philippines (Lai, 2011).

A somewhat different picture emerges when the most distant destination visited is considered. Again, Japan ranked first, accounting for over one-third of all trips (36.4%). A possible reason is that popular culture, such as anime, food, beauty products (e.g., cosmetics and skin care items), and music from South Korea and Japan are seen as highly favorable (Tung, Lee, & Hudson, 2019). These considerations tend to be important for Hong Kong residents when they travel. However, more than 120 people who visited Japan also took long haul trips. A European destination was identified by about one in six respondents (16.5%) as their most distant place visited. While Taiwan, Korea and Thailand were popular destinations overall, they rarely represented the most distant trip taken. Instead, many people who vacationed here also visited Japan.

Significant differences were noted in the self assessed level of travel experience as well as preference for certain types of travel. Those who visited North America felt they were the most experienced tourists and were most likely to travel for personal development. But, they also showed the strongest tendency to want to travel to familiar places, likely as a reflection of the high degree of VFR travel noted with this segment. Somewhat unexpectedly, those who confined their travel to the China mainland registered the second highest level of travel experience, while as expected, showed a strong inclination to travel to familiar places. Taiwan and Korea, attracted the least experienced tourist, while Thailand attracted those most likely to want to travel to unfamiliar places.

### **National Cultural Values**

The results from analysis of variance (ANOVA) suggests that Hong Kong tourists express substantially different cultural values depending on the most distant destination visited on their overall cultural value score (CVSCALE) (i.e., calculated as the overall mean from all 26 items in the scale) as well as on its constituent dimensions of Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, Masculinity and Confucian Dynamism (see Table 3). The goal of this approach to clarify that Hong Kong tourists are not a culturally homogenous group, echoing past research that suggested a population could be heterogeneous (has segments) (Huan, Beaman and Shelby 2002). Indeed, Uncertainty Avoidance was the only dimension where consistent results emerged. This finding is somewhat ironic, for the literature suggests it, along with Individualism/ Collectivism are the two most influential factors.

Insert Table 3 about here

Hong Kong society scores a relatively high 68 out of 100 in Hofstede's Power Distance dimension. According to Hofstede (2019) a score this high indicates that inequalities amongst people are acceptable, with the subordinate-superior relationship polarized. In general, people who limited their furthest trip to China or Taiwan support this assertion, and in particular supported the assertion that people in higher positions should make decision and avoid socialising with people in lower positions. By contrast, those whose further trip was to Singapore, Korea, Australia and to a lesser extent Thailand rejected these views and saw travel decision making as a more collaborative and cooperative exercise.

Hofstede (2019) believes Hong Kong is a collectivist culture where people act in the interests of the group and not necessarily for themselves. Broad-based support for this belief was indicated regardless of the furthest destination visited, as the mean score for each cohort was in excess of 3.0. However, those who visited the Americas and China as their furthest trip supported this assertion more strongly than others, while those who visited Korea showed the least support.

Hong Kong is seen as a somewhat masculine society, success oriented and driven, where the need to ensure success can be exemplified by the fact that many will spend many hours at work (Hofstede 2019). Again, the overall proposition was supported, but a North America, southeast Asia schism was noted. Those whose furthest trip was to Singapore and Thailand supported this idea modestly, while those who went to North America tended to express the most masculine values.

Hong Kong is seen as a place where Confucian values and long term orientation are supported modestly. Instead, Hofstede (2019) says Hong Kong's culture is pragmatic, where people believe that truth depends very much on situation, context and time. They show an ability to adapt traditions easily to changed conditions, a strong propensity to save and invest, thriftiness, and perseverance in achieving results. Few differences were noted among across the sample, other than among those people who visited the Americas.

Overall, substantial differences in national cultural values emerged by furthest distance travelled, although the results are not as unequivocal as one would expect. Those whose furthest trip was to the Americas registered the highest scores, but people who limited their travel to China ranked second. In both cases their values differed from others on a number of dimensions, including the collectivism scale. By contrast tourists who limited their longest distance trips to Singapore or Korea, and to a lesser extent Thailand expressed contrasting views. They saw travel as a more democratic activity and expressed cultural values that leaned toward a feminine view of the world.

### **Values by Style of Travel**

Data were also analysed by collective style of travel, given the vast array of destinations visited. An extensive iterative process aimed at identifying meaningful clusters of trip styles and destination combinations eventually led to the emergence of five cohorts of tourists by travel style. These groups included those who took long haul trips only (110 respondents), those who combined short and long haul trips (178 respondents), those who took multiple short haul trips to different destinations (255 respondents), those who travelled to a single short haul destination (253 respondents) and a group of 160 people who confined their travel to China or Taiwan. Few differences were noted in their demographic profiles, other than the aforementioned differences in education and income by distance travelled. Those who travelled both long haul and short haul or who visited multiple short haul destinations took an average of three trips a year, while members of the other cohorts took less than two trips a year on average. Not surprising then, the former group felt that were more experienced tourists than the members of the latter cohorts.

As Table 4 indicates, significant differences were observed by trip type on four of the five national cultural dimensions tested and on the overall CVSCALE via analysis of variance (ANOVA). Within the power distance dimension, those people who confined their travel to China and Taiwan were the anomalous group, scoring highest on the overall dimension, agreeing most strongly that people in higher positions should make most decisions without necessarily consulting people in lower position and feeling people in lower positions should not question these decisions. When the dimension is disaggregated into its component

variables, though, members of the China only cohort and those who combined both short and long haul trips felt people in lower positions should not challenge decisions.

Insert Table 4 about here

People who took a combination of long and short haul trips and those who travelled only to China or Taiwan scored highest on the collectivism scale, while those who travelled only long haul or only short haul trended to express more individualistic opinions. In particular, those who took a single short haul trip showed least support for the belief that individuals should focus on organisational goals rather than personal goals. In contrast, those who took both long and short haul trip and those who confined their travel to China agreed most strongly with the proposition that team loyalty should be promoted even at the cost on individual goals.

Significant differences were observed in masculinity dimension and in particular, in the contributing variable about approaches men take to solve problems. Respondents who travelled short haul only, other than to China expressed the most neutral masculinity opinions, while those who engaged in long haul travel alone or in conjunction with short haul trips and those who went to China only expressed more masculine attitudes.

The Confucian dynamism/long term orientation dimension integrates two sets of sub-dimensions, one focussing on persistence and doggedness and the other on taking a long term view of the world. Respondents who took a single trip to one Asian destination scored lowest in this aspect of the dimension, while those who took multiple short and long haul trips scored highest. Disaggregating the dimension though provides further insights into value systems. In general, members of the both short and long haul group scored highest on the variables testes, with those who confined their travel to China and Macau a close second. People who took other short haul trips, and in particular those who took a single trip tended to score the lowest on all variables measured. When the overall, cumulative CVSCALE is considered a somewhat confounding situation emerged, whereby the two cohorts of people who travelled only to China or Taiwan and those who took both long and short haul trips expressed similar national cultural values, while the other three cohorts also tended to express consistent views.

## **Discussion**

This study sought to determine if tourists from the same source market were a culturally homogeneous group regardless of the destination chosen or the type of travel undertaken. A survey of Hong Kong outbound tourists was undertaken, with the sample segmented in one of two ways: by furthest distance travelled; and by type of trip(s) undertaken.

This study contributes to the literature by challenging the assumption of a fixed national culture in tourism research. Hofstede (1980) asserts that national culture is fixed and that there are few within culture differences. Others, notably Au (1999) and Crofts and Reisinger (2010), argue within culture differences may be greater than between culture differences. It would appear that most cross cultural tourism research adopts Hofstede's thesis. Moreover Hofstede's dimensions are often reduced to basic stereotypical behavior, without consideration of the potential significant within group differences. You et al. (2000) and Hsu et al. (2013) contrast Asian and Westerners on the basis that Asians, as represented by Japanese and Chinese are collectivist cultures that emphasize conformity, belonging, empathy and dependence while searching for in group acceptance. Litvin and Goh (2003) describe Asian societies as tending to score highly on collectivism, power distance and long term orientation, but moderately on masculinity and uncertainty avoidance, whereas Western societies generally score low on power distance are individualistic and short term oriented. Kim and Lee (2000:155) note "a group of mostly European and North American countries would emerge as high on individualism and low on power distance, whereas another group of mostly Latin American and Asian countries would emerge as low on individualism and high on power distance." Others, as cited in the literature review also draw generic conclusions about how people from collectivist societies prefer to travel to culturally different places and people with a long term orientation or from low power distance societies travel more (Zhang et al. 2019). The findings of this study supports the view of within culture differences and significant differences were noted in expressed national cultural values on both destination choice and the type of trip undertaken.

This study also highlights the merits of adopting Yoo et al. (2011) CVSCALE model to measure national cultural values at an individual level. Following on from this observation, caution must be used when applying Hofstede's framework. Li (2014) identified a number of

limitations of Hofstede's model. Gnoth & Zins (2010) question whether the application of country stereotypes is applicable and, instead, warn they must be applied with caution for their use can lead to misunderstandings and very unsatisfied tourists. Importantly as well, the population of tourists is not internally cohesive and micro-level tourism research in particular need to be cautious about using Hofstede's global generalizations as study rationale. For example, simply arguing that tourists from two source countries were recruited because they generally differ on certain dimensions of national values may be insufficient as a research justification because the current findings suggest significant differences between tourists even from the same originating market. Doing so would fail to account for intra-cultural differences within the traveling population, thereby propagating ecological fallacy in tourism research (i.e., inferences about tourists deduced from aggregate data for the group to which they belong to without considering variations within their host country or culture) (Wong, 2017). It is important to appreciate that each destination will attract potentially a slightly different subpopulation of residents from host communities.

This study also contributes by highlighting one of the operational challenges in using Hofstede's measures from a tourism perspective: reporting cultural distance may be a moot point if the destination is popular with the travelling public. Hofstede measures the central tendency of the population of each country, while the Kogut and Singh formula documents differences in central tendencies. Hofstede's cultural index was intended to be viewed at a high-level for a broad understanding of national values as they pertain to the general resident population, not for the traveling sub-population in tourism research.

From a practical perspective, tourism, hospitality, and events management research in applied settings, where the unit of analysis is commonly at the individual-level, needs to be cautious about using Hofstede's justifications as their interpretations of results. This is particularly important for large source markets and nations with broad ethnic diversity since there could be significant variations amongst travellers originating from different regions of the country. It is a misnomer to assume a typical national culture exists and to provide implications, especially managerial recommendations on services and facilities, based solely on the national culture of the guest or visitor.



Industry, especially national, state/provincial, and local destination management organisations (DMOs), must adopt a cautious approach, especially when targeting emerging markets where relatively little is known about the behaviours, preferences and tendencies of the market. Mistakes can be made by considering these markets as being homogeneous, when in fact this study reveals a great deal of heterogeneity by destination visited. Moreover, as this study suggests, because substantial differences in national cultural values exist by furthest distance travelled, it can be especially dangerous to assume that the profile of visitors to one destination will represent the profile of visitors to another destination. This study suggests more targeted marketing research is required to identify the most viable market segments and develop strategies to target them effectively.

There are limitations in this study and opportunities for future research. This study is one of, if not the first, to focus exclusively on the travel patterns of single market. Most other studies have been cross sectional in nature and have looked at multiple markets visiting a single destination. However, Hong Kong is a special case of an urban outbound market, and future research could consider investigating cultural values at the national level. Additionally, Hong Kong is relatively unique in that all outbound visits are reported as international travel. Consequently, the findings are not representative at the national level due to where international outbound travel is only a subset of total tourism activities for many destinations. Future research should extend the scope of this study and consider the dynamics of both domestic and international travel within the perspective of cultural values.

## **Conclusion**

This study sought to answer a fundamental question: “Are tourists from the same country a culturally homogeneous group regardless of the destination they visited?” The answer is no. Based on a study of Hong Kong outbound tourists, this study supported the view of within culture differences and challenged the assumption of a fixed national culture in tourism research. Overall, when the unit of analysis is at the individual-level, researchers need to appreciate that the traveling sub-population may have different national values, and destinations need to recognize that they will attract potentially a slightly different subpopulation of residents from host communities.

## References

Ahn, M. & B. McKercher (2013) The Effect of Cultural Distance on Tourism: A Study of International Visitors to Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*. 20(10), 94 – 113.

Ahn, M., & B. McKercher (2018) Hofstede's Cultural Indices Revisited: The relationship between cultural values and international tourism. *Tourism, Culture and Communications*. 18(4), 241-250.

Au, K. Y. (1999). Intra-Cultural Variation: Evidence and Implications for International Business. *Journal for International Business Studies*, 30(4), 799-812.

Au, K. Y. (2000). Intra-Cultural Variation as Another Construct of International Management: A Study Based on Secondary Data of 42 Countries. *Journal of International Management*, 6, 217-238.

Bearden, W. O., Money, R. B., & Nevins, J. L. (2006). A Measure of Long-Term Orientation: Development and Validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), 456-467.

Blodgett, J. G., Bakir, A., Rose, G. M. (2008). A Test of the Validity of Hofstede's Cultural Framework. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(6), 339-349.

Bonn, M, Joseph, S., Dai, M. (2005) International versus Domestic Visitors: An Examination of Destination Image Perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 294 – 301.

Carr, N. (2002) A comparative analysis of the behaviour of domestic and international young tourists. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 321 - 325

Choong., D., Wang, Y. (2014) *The Future of Asia Pacific Outbound Travel (2016 to 2021)*. Mastercard Insights. <https://origin-www1.mastercard.com/content/dam/intelligence/documents/Future-of-Outbound-Travel-in-Asia-Pacific.pdf>

Correia, A. Kozak, M., Ferradeira, J. (2011) Impact of Culture on Tourism Decision-making Styles. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 433 – 446.

Crotts, J., & Erdmann, R. (2000). Does national culture influence consumers' evaluation of travel service? A test of Hofstede's model of cross-cultural differences. *Managing Service Quality*, 10(6), 410-419.

Crotts, J., (2004) The Effect of Cultural Distance on Overseas Travel Behaviour. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 83-88.

Crotts, J., & Litvin, S. W. (2003). Cross-Cultural Research: Are Researchers Better Served by Knowing Respondents' Country of Birth, Residence, or Citizenship? *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 186-190.

CSD. (2017). By Census 2016 – Proportion of Population Aged 5 and Over Able to Speak Selected languages/Dialects by Year <https://www.bycensus2016.gov.hk/en/bc-mt.html>

Eckhardt, G. (2002). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations. *Australian Journal of Management*, 27(1), 89-95.

Eurostat. (2017). Tourism statistics - participation in tourism. [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Participation\\_in\\_tourism\\_of\\_EU\\_residents\\_\(aged\\_15\\_and\\_over\),\\_2016.png](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Participation_in_tourism_of_EU_residents_(aged_15_and_over),_2016.png)

Gnoth, J., Zins, A. (2010) .Cultural Dimensions and the International Tourist Role scale: Validation in Asian Destinations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 111- 127.

Hashemi, M., & Hanser, E. (2018). Cultural antecedents of inbound tourism in five Asian and Middle East countries: A fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(6), 698-712.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, & Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, & Organizations Across Nations (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (2015). *National Culture*. <http://geert-hofstede.com/national-culture.html>.

Hofstede, G. (2019) Country Comparison: What about Hong Kong. <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/hong-kong/>

Hsu, S., Woodside, A., Marshall, R. (2013) Critical Tests of Multiple Theories of Cultures' Consequences: Comparing the Usefulness of Models by Hofstede, Inglehart and Baker, Schwartz, Steenkamp, as well as GDP and Distance for Explaining Overseas Tourism Behavior. *Journal of Travel Research* 52(6), 679 - 704

Huan, T. C., Beaman, J., & Shelby, L. B. (2002). Using action-grids in tourism management. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 255-264.

Jafari, J. (1987). Tourism Models: The Sociocultural Aspects. *Tourism Management*, 8(2), 151-159.

Kelly, L., MacNab, B., & Worthley, R. (2006). Crossvergence and Cultural Tendencies: A Longitudinal Test of Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the United States Banking Sectors. *Journal of International Management*, 12(1), 67-84.

Kim, C., Lee, S. (2000) Understanding the Cultural Differences in Tourist Motivation between Anglo-American and Japanese Tourists. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 9(1-2), 153 – 170.

Kim, S. S., & McKercher, B. (2011). The Collective Effect of National Culture and Tourist Culture on Tourist Behavior. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 28, 145-164.

Kogut, B. & Singh, H. (1988). The Effect of National Culture on the Choice of Entry Mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411-432.

Krippendorf, J. (1986) *The Holiday Makers: understanding the impact of leisure and tourism*. London: Heinemann.

Lai, A. (2011). Taking the Hong Kong tour bus hostage tragedy in Manila to the ICJ? Developing framework for choosing international dispute settlement mechanisms. *International Lawyer*, 45(2), 673–693.

Lee, G., & Lee, C. (2009) Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Image of Guam Perceived by Korean and Japanese Leisure Travelers: Importance-performance analysis. *Tourism Management*, 30, 9212 – 931

Li, M. (2014) Cross Cultural Tourist Research: A meta analysis. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Research*, 38(1), 40 – 77.

Litvin, S., Crotts, J., Hefner, F. (2004) Cross-cultural tourist behaviour: a replication and extension involving Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance dimension. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6, 29-37.

Litvin, S., Goh H. (2003) Individualism/Collectivism as a Moderating Factor to the Self-image Congruity Concept. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(1), 23 – 32.

Litvin, S., Tan, P., Tay, J., & Aplin, K. (2004). Cross-cultural differences: An influence on tourism ethics. *Tourism*, 52(1), 39-50.

Manrai, L., & Manrai, A. Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions and Tourist Behaviors: A Review and Conceptual Framework *Journal of Economics, Finance & Administrative Science*, 16(31), 24-48.

Mattila, A. (2019) A Commentary on Cross-cultural Research in Hospitality & Tourism inquiry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 10 – 12.

Matza, D. & G. Sykes (1961) Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 712 – 719.

Mazanec, J., Crofts, J., Gursoy, D., & Lu, L. (2015) Homogeneity versus heterogeneity of cultural values: An item-response theoretical approach applying Hofstede's cultural dimensions in a single nation. *Tourism Management*, 48, 299 – 304.

McKercher B (2009) Non-travel by Hong Kong Residents. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(6), 507 – 519.

McKercher, B., & F. Chen (2015) Travel as a Life Priority? *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(7), 715-729.

McKercher, B. (2014) Tourism: the Quest for the Selfish. *Tourism Recreation Research*. 39(1): 99-104. Also re-published in Var. T. V. (Ed) (2015) *Challenges in Tourism Research*. Channel View Publications; pp 87-96.

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith – A Failure of Analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89-118.

McSweeney, B. (2013). Fashion Founded on a Flaw: The Ecological Mono-deterministic Fallacy of Hofstede, GLOBE, and Followers. *International Marketing Review*, 30(5), 483-594.

Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G (2014) A Replication of Hofstede's Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension Across nationally representative Samples from Europe. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 14(2), 161 – 171.

Money, R., & Crofts, J. (2003). The effect of uncertainty avoidance on information search, planning, and purchases of international travel vacations. *Tourism Management*, 24(2), 191-202.

Ng, S., Lee, J., Soutar, G. (2007) Tourists' Intentions to Visit a Country: The impact of cultural distance. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1497-1506

Quintal, V., Lee, J., & Soutar, G. (2010). Tourists' information search: the differential impact of risk and uncertainty avoidance. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12, 321-333.

Reisinger, Y., & J. Crofts (2010) Applying Hofstede's National Culture Measures in Tourism Research: Illuminating issues of divergence and convergence. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(2), 153 – 164.

Reisinger, Y., Turner, L. (1988) Cross-Cultural differences in Tourism: A strategy for tourism marketers. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(4), 79-106

Sivakumar, K., & Nakata, C. (2001). The Stampede towards Hofstede's Framework: Avoiding the Sample Design Pit in Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 555-574.

Smelser, N. J. (1992). Culture: Coherent or Incoherent. In Munch, R. & Smelser, N. J. (Eds). (1992). *Theory of Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Sparks, K. (2001). An International Study of the Psychometric Properties of the Hofstede Values Survey Module 1994: A Comparison of Individual and Country/Province Level Results. *Applied Psychology*, 50(2), 269-281.

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

Tung, V. W. S. (2019). Helping a lost tourist: The effects of metastereotypes on resident prosocial behaviors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(5), 837-848.

Tung, V. W. S., King, B. E. M., & Tse, S. (2020). The tourist stereotype model: Positive and negative dimensions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(1), 37-51.

Tung, V. W. S., Lee, S., & Hudson, S. (2019). The potential of anime for destination marketing: Fantasies, otaku, and the kidult segment. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(12), 1423-1436.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's Five Dimensions of Cultural Values at the Individual Level: Development and Validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23, 193-210.

Yoo, B., Shin, G. (2017) Invariant Effect of Individual Cultural orientations: an application of the CVSCALE. *International Marketing Review*, 34(6), 735 – 759.

You, X., O'Leary, J., Morrison, A., & Hong, G. (2008) A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Travel Push and Pull Factors: United Kingdom vs. Japan. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 1(2), 1 – 26.

Yang, R., & Tung, V. W. S. (2018). How does family influence the travel constraints of solo travelers? Construct specification and scale development. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(4), 507-516.



Zhang, Y., Li, X., & Wu, T. (2019). The impacts of cultural values on bilateral international tourist flows: A panel data gravity model. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(8), 967-981.

Table 1  
Profile of Respondents by Furthest Trip taken

	China	Taiwan	Singapore	Thailand	Korea	Japan	Australia / New Zealand	Europe	USA/ Canada	Total	Test Score
n	69	75	42	75	62	348	68	158	59	956	
% female	55.1	49.3	31.0	41.3	53.2	52.0	51.5	50.0	52.5	50.0	$\chi^2 = 10.105, p = .258$
Age (%)											$\chi^2 = 20.826, p = .649$
<= 30	17.4	30.7	33.3	20.0	27.4	24.7	25.0	30.4	37.3	26.6	
31 to 40	39.1	29.3	28.6	45.3	40.3	40.5	35.3	37.3	32.2	38.0	
41 to 50	27.5	30.7	26.2	21.3	21.0	23.3	30.9	20.3	22.0	24.0	
51 and older	15.9	9.3	11.9	13.3	11.3	11.5	8.8	12.0	8.5	11.5	
Education											$\chi^2 = 28.290, p = .029$
High school or less	27.9	37.3	14.3	33.3	32.3	29.0	29.7	19.6	22.0	27.4	
College or university	62.3	58.7	69.0	58.7	59.7	60.1	54.4	62.0	69.5	60.9	
Post graduate qualification	10.1	4.0	16.7	8.0	8.1	10.9	17.6	18.4	8.5	11.7	
Household income (US\$ equivalent)											$\chi^2 = 74.799, p < .001$
< \$46,500	21.7	36.0	28.6	16.0	37.1	19.8	11.8	11.4	11.9	20.0	
\$46,500 to \$62,000	20.3	8.0	21.4	24.0	14.5	20.4	20.6	17.1	23.7	19.0	
\$62,001 to \$77,500	18.8	17.3	11.9	24.0	17.7	22.1	17.6	17.1	32.2	20.4	
\$77,501 to \$93,000	20.3	18.7	11.9	22.7	16.1	12.1	16.2	18.4	13.6	15.7	
>\$93,000	18.8	20.0	26.2	13.3	14.5	25.6	33.8	36.1	18.6	24.9	

Table 2  
Travel Profile by Furthest Trip Taken

	China	Taiwan	Singapore	Thailand	Korea	Japan	Australia / New Zealand	Europe	USA/ Canada	Total	Test Score
n	69	75	42	75	62	348	68	158	59	956	
Mean number of trips per year outside of China	0.0	1.4	2.6	2.5	2.2	1.9	2.7	2.5	2.8	2.1	F = 29.512, p <.001
Mean number of discrete destinations visited outside of China	0.0	1.0	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.5	2.2	2.2	2.5	1.7	F = 62.196, p <.001
Average cultural distance of all trips taken	.47	1.18	1.63	1.97	2.42	3.31	3.95	3.14	3.66	2.78	F = 282.808, p <.001
% visited most recent destination in the past 5 years	88.4	78.7	71.4	82.7	64.5	73.9	60.3	64.6	76.3	72.9	$\chi^2$ = 27.073, p <.001
Most recent destination	China (100%)	Taiwan (97.3%) China (2.3%)	Singapore (38.1%) Japan (28.6%) Taiwan (14.3%)	Thailand (78.7%) Taiwan (17.3%) China (4.0)	Korea (82.3%) Taiwan (11.1%)	Japan (75.3%) Taiwan (17.3%)	Australia (47.1%) Japan (23.5%) New Zealand (13.2%)	UK (23.4%) Japan (20.9%) France (10.1%) Russia (5.7%) Korea (5.1%)	USA (50.8%) Japan (32.2%) Canada (8.5%)	Japan (35.8%) Taiwan (17.9%) China (9.1%) Thailand (8.7%)	
All destinations visited in last 12 months (sums may exceed 100%)	China (100.0%)	Taiwan (102.7%) China (2.7%)	Singapore (100.0%) Japan (59.5%) Taiwan (28.6%) Thailand (26.2%) Korea (16.7%)	Thailand (100.0%) Taiwan (47.6%) Japan (37.3%) Korea (12.0%)	Korea (104.8%) Taiwan (925.8%) Japan (24.2%)	Japan (120.1%) Taiwan (30.2%) Korea (14.7%) Thailand (10.3%)	Australia (77.9%) Japan (54.40%) New Zealand (26.5%) Korea (20.6%)	Japan (53.3%) UK (32.9%) France (22.8%) Taiwan (11.4%) Korea 911.4%)	USA (91.5%) Japan (61.0%) Taiwan 927.1%) Canada (16.9%) Korea (11.9%)	Japan (67.7%) Taiwan (30.3%) Korea (17.9%) Thailand (16.4%)	

							Taiwan (16.2%)				
Travel experience (%)	26.1	48.0	23.8	21.3	37.1	29.0	20.6	20.9	15.3	27.2	$\chi^2 = 41.561, p < .001$
Inexperienced	42.0	38.7	50.0	52.0	46.8	46.6	50.0	50.0	40.7	46.7	
About average	31.9	13.3	26.2	26.7	16.1	24.4	29.4	29.1	44.1	26.2	
Experienced											
Prefer travel to familiar places	3.53	3.42	3.27	3.16	3.26	3.28	3.21	3.23	3.66	3.31	F = 2.686, p = .006
Prefer travel for personal development	4.21	4.11	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.14	4.23	4.30	4.42	4.21	F = 2.514, p = .010

Table 3  
National Cultural Values by Furthest Trip

	China	Taiwan	Singapore	Thailand	Korea	Japan	Australia / New Zealand	Europe	USA / Canada	Total	Test score
n	69	75	42	75	62	348	68	158	59	956	
Cultural distance from Hong Kong as calculated by Kogut and Singh	0.47	1.90	0.77	1.73	2.48	3.80	Australia = 4.74	UK = 3.88 / France = 3.08	USA = 4.33		
Average cultural distance of all trips taken	.47	1.18	1.63	1.97	2.42	3.31	3.95	3.14	3.66	2.78	F = 282.808, p <.001
Power distance	3.01	2.98	2.54	2.70	2.66	2.81	2.67	2.81	2.86	2.81	F = 2.126, p = .031
Uncertainty avoidance	4.03	4.01	3.85	3.97	3.95	3.99	3.97	4.00	4.17	3.99	F = 1.351, p = .215
Individualism / collectivism	3.97	3.85	3.84	3.79	3.70	3.80	3.85	3.85	4.09	3.84	F = 2.116, p = .032
Masculinity	3.71	3.68	3.52	3.54	3.59	3.59	3.71	3.67	3.88	3.64	F = 2.071, p = .036
Confucian dynamism / Long term orientation	4.07	4.01	3.95	3.96	3.96	3.98	4.09	4.04	4.19	4.02	F = 1.939, p = .048
CVSCALE	3.77	3.72	3.56	3.61	3.59	3.65	3.67	3.69	3.85	3.68	F = 3.324, p = .001

Table 4  
National Cultural values by Trip style

	Both short haul and long haul	Long haul only	Short haul to a single destination (Other than greater China)	Short haul to multiple destinations	Travel to China or Taiwan only	All	Test score
<b>Power Distance (average of 5 variables)</b>	2.89	2.70	2.75	2.72	2.97	2.80	F = 3.483, p = .008
<b>Uncertainty Avoidance (average of 5 variables)</b>	4.04	4.00	3.97	3.96	4.02	3.99	F = .809, p = .519
<b>Collectivism / Individualism (average of 5 variables)</b>	3.95	3.81	3.75	3.82	3.90	3.84	F = 2.898, p = .021
<b>Masculinity (average of 4 variables)</b>	3.78	3.65	3.55	3.60	3.68	3.64	F = 3.877, p = .004
<b>Confucian Dynamism / Long Term Orientation (average of six variables)</b>	4.10	4.05	3.95	3.99	4.05	4.02	F = 2.761, p = .027
<b>Overall CVSCALE score (average)</b>	3.76	3.66	3.61	3.64	3.74	3.67	F = 5.374, p < .001