

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOFSTEDE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND HSE CULTURE INDIVIDUAL ACCORDING GELLER MODEL

Khadijeh Izadi Zamanabadi

Department of Environment management, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Esmail Kavousy¹ (Ph.D.)

Department of Management, Tehran Shomal Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Mahnaz Mirza Ebrahim Tehrani (Ph.D.)

Department of Management, Tehran Shomal Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

This study has done to surveying the relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and HSE culture individual according to Geller model. Populations were 25 people of cultural management and planning elites. For a sampling it was used of simple sampling method. For gathering data in theoretic section we used library and also interview with scholars and specialists of the organization and in data gathering section we used questionnaire method. In this research, In order to determine the validity of data collection we used Cronbach's alpha to test the validity of the formal symbol or reliability. To analyze hypothesis, we have used descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Findings show that there is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Power distance, Individualism–collectivism, Masculinity–femininity, Uncertainty avoidance, Long-term orientation) and culture individual according to HSE model.

Keywords: *culture, Power distance, Individualism–collectivism, Masculinity–femininity, Uncertainty avoidance, Long-term orientation*

INTERDICTION

In the 20th century, "culture" emerged as a central concept in anthropology, encompassing the range of human phenomena that cannot be directly attributed to genetic inheritance. Specifically, the term "culture" in American anthropology had two meanings:

- the evolved human capacity to classify and represent experiences with symbols, and to act imaginatively and creatively; and
- the distinct ways that people, who live differently, classified and represented their experiences, and acted creatively (Velkley, 2002).

¹ Correspondence Author: ekavousy@yahoo.com

Hoebel (1966) describes culture as an integrated system of learned behavior patterns which are characteristic of the members of a society and which are not a result of biological inheritance.

Distinctions are currently made between the physical artifacts created by a society, its so-called material culture, and everything else (Gerber and Linda, 2010), the intangibles such as language, customs, etc. that are the main referent of the term "culture."

Culture is central to the way we view, experience, and engage with all aspects of our lives and the world around us. Thus, even our definitions of culture are shaped by the historical, political, social, and cultural contexts in which we live (Sorrells, 2013).

Culture constitutes the broadest influence on many dimensions of human behavior. This pervasiveness makes defining culture difficult. According to Lenartowicz and Roth (1999) this difficulty hampers research about the influence of culture on international consumer behavior and Sekaran, (1983) has been used to criticize cross-cultural. Buzzell (1968) Believe that Culture is "a convenient catchall for the many differences in market structure and behavior that cannot readily be explained in terms of more tangible factors" (p.191) and Usunier (1999) "a 'rubbish bin' concept," which constitutes rather clear and strong images of the superficial form the concept of culture is often called upon, as an explanatory variable for residuals, "when more operative explanations have proved unsuccessful" (p.94). (Soares et al, 2007).

Several scholars discuss the choice of dimensions most appropriate for conceptualizing and operationalizing culture. However, Hofstede's framework is the most widely used national cultural framework in psychology, sociology, marketing, or management studies. Hofstede used 116,000 questionnaires from over 60,000 respondents in seventy countries in his empirical study (Hofstede, 2001). He created five dimensions, assigned indexes on each to all nations, and linked the dimensions with demographic, geographic, economic, and political aspects of a society, a feature unmatched by other frameworks. It is the most comprehensive and robust in terms of the number of national cultures samples (Smith et al., 1996). Moreover, the framework is useful in formulating hypotheses for comparative cross-cultural studies. Consequently, Hofstede's operationalization of cultures (1984) is the norm used in international marketing studies, compares Hofstede's dimensions to other approaches for unpacking the concept of culture. It shows a high level of convergence across approaches, supports the theoretical relevance of Hofstede's framework, and justifies further use of his dimensions.

1-Individualism–collectivism

Individualism–collectivism describes the relationships individuals have in each culture. In individualistic societies, individuals look after themselves and their immediate family only whereas in collectivistic cultures, individuals belong to groups that look after them in exchange for loyalty.

2-Uncertainty avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance refers to "The extent to which people feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid these situations" (Hofstede, 1991: 113). This dimension deals with the need for well-defined rules for prescribed behavior.

3-Power distance

This dimension reflects the consequences of power inequality and authority relations in society. It influences hierarchy and dependence relationships in the family and organizational contexts.

4-Masculinity–femininity

Dominant values in masculine countries are achievement and success and in feminine countries are caring for others and quality of life.

4-Long-term orientation

Long-term orientation “stands for the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift” (Hofstede, 2001: 359). A late addition to the initial four (Bond, 1987), this dimension represents a range of Confucian like values and was termed Confucian Dynamism. Hofstede (1991) later proposed the long-versus short-term designation as more appropriate for this dimension.

METHODOLOGY

This study has done to surveying the relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and HSE culture individual according to Geller model. Populations were 25 people of cultural management and planning elites. For a sampling it was used of simple sampling method.

For gathering data in theoretic section we used library and also interview with scholars and specialists of the organization and in data gathering section we used questionnaire method.

In this research, In order to determine the validity of data collection we used Cronbach's alpha to test the validity of the formal symbol or reliability. The method is based on a pilot study of 30 employees, the reliability of Hofstede's cultural dimensions 0.74 and 0.90 for individual culture.

To analyze the data and test hypotheses by using SPSS software version 20 using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and etc.) and inferential statistics (the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, Pearson correlation and regression multiple) were used.

RESULTS

In this paper we have one main hypothesis. The statistical way of analysis of hypotheses is two ways, H_1 is acceptance of hypothesis and H_0 is rejecting of hypothesis. In other words, it means that H_1 has positive meaning and H_0 has negative meaning.

Hypothesis 1: There is relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture individual according to HSE model.

- Null: There is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and HSE culture individual according to Geller model.
- Alternate: There is relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and HSE culture individual according to Geller model.

In multivariable regression equation to determine the coefficient of determination (R^2) and the weight of each variable (Beta), a collection of independent variables enter in the equation. Moreover, in order to determine the contribution of each variable in the dependent variable multivariate regression model was used to explain it.

Table 1: regression analysis to predict Hofstede's cultural dimensions on the culture individual

Model		Coefficients ^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.196	1.242	-	-0.185	.876
	Power distance	0.414	0.186	.367	0.76	.457
	Individualism–collectivism	0.166	0.17	.415	0.976	.342
	Masculinity–femininity	0.002	0.235	.003	0.01	.992
	Uncertainty avoidance	0.143	0.141	.196	1.201	.324
	Long-term orientation	0.299	0.18	.531	1.566	.112

As table (1) shown there is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and HSE culture individual according to Geller model

CONCLUSION

This study has done to surveying the relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and individual culture according to HSE model. Populations were 25 peoples of cultural management and planning elites. So, we developed one main hypothesis and analyze regression multiple.

According to table (1) Standardized Coefficients for Power distance is .367 and the t-value is 0.76 and Sig. is .457 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H_0 and reject alternate hypothesis; the Standardized Coefficients for Individualism–collectivism dimension is .415 and the t-value is 0.976 and Sig. 0.342 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H_0 and reject alternate hypothesis; Standardized Coefficients for Masculinity–femininity dimension is .003 and the t-value is 0.01 and Sig. 0.992 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H_0 and reject alternate hypothesis; Standardized Coefficients for Uncertainty avoidance dimension is .196 and the t-value is 1.201 and Sig. 0.324 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H_0 and reject alternate hypothesis; and Also, Standardized Coefficients for Long-term orientation dimension is .531 and the t-value is 1.566 and Sig. 0.112 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H_0 and reject alternate hypothesis

Findings show that there is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Power distance, Individualism–collectivism, Masculinity–femininity, Uncertainty avoidance, Long-term orientation) and culture individual according to HSE model.

References

1. Bond M. (1987), Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *J Cross-Cult Psychol*;18:143–64 [June]
2. Gerber M., Linda J., (2010). *Sociology 7th Canadian Ed.* Toronto, Ontario: Pearson Canada Inc. p. 53.
3. Hoebel, A., (1966). *Anthropology: Study of Man.* New York: McGraw-Hill
4. Hofstede G. (2001), *Culture's consequences.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
5. Hofstede G., (1991), *Cultures and organizations — software of the mind.* New York: McGraw Hill
6. Smith P, Dugan S, Trompenaars F., (1996), National culture and the values of organizational employees—a dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *J Cross-Cult Psychol* 1996;27(2):231–64
7. Soares A. M., Farhangmehr M., Shoham A., (2007), Hofstede's dimensions of culture in international marketing studies, *Journal of Business Research* 60 -277–284
8. Sorrells, K. (2013). *Intercultural communication: globalization and social justice.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
9. Velkley, R., (2002). "The Tension in the Beautiful: On Culture and Civilization in Rousseau and German Philosophy". *Being after Rousseau: Philosophy and Culture in Question.* The University of Chicago Press, pp. 11–30.