INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

CARLETON UNIVERSITY - SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

***ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN GERMANY: A COMPARISON
BETWEEN WEST AND EAST GERMAN COMPANIES***

THESIS

SUBMITTED BY:

KYLE KNAPP

to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Management Studies

MAY 2, 1997

© Kyle Knapp
All Rights Reserved

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-22134-2

ACCEPTANCE SHEET

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis

Organizational Culture in Germany: A Comparison Between West and East German Companies

submitted by Kyle Knapp in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Management Studies

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Thesis Co-Supervisor

Director, School of Business

Carleton University

May 2, 1997

TO MY FATHER, Vincent Knapp...

without whose love and support, both financially
and emotionally, I would be nowhere.

TO MY GRANDFATHER, Jerome Knapp...

who died at the age of 32 back in 1945.
The German man that I never had a chance to meet,
but would give anything to have.

ABSTRACT

This research studied whether the cultures of East Germany and West Germany were different. Hofstede's data collection instrument was used as a basis for this research. Data were collected from five East German and four West German business organizations. This also allowed the hypothesis that organizational cultures did not exist to be tested. It was found that East and West Germany had different cultures. It was also found that all of the organizations studied had their own organizational culture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One does not reach for the sky and achieve great accomplishments in life without standing on the shoulders of giants. My biggest giant for this thesis was, without doubt, Mr. Ulrich Sikora, my German teacher at the Goethe Institute here in Ottawa. His efficient and quality translating into German of the questionnaire and cover-letters made the part of this study that I had worried about the most, become the easiest to accomplish. A very special *Thank You* goes out to him.

I would like to thank the brilliant Michel Fuksa for all of his assistance in the statistical workings of this study. Also, thanks go out to Ms. Silke Gramsch of the Economic Section the German Embassy here in Ottawa for lending me access to their books in order to find companies for this study. I want to thank as well Jean Blair, the Graduate Secretary of the School of Business for all her assistance through this process.

In addition, for their spontaneous translating of minor faxes between myself and the companies involved in this study, I would like to thank Thomas Mueller, my German teacher at Carleton University, and other members of the German faculty: Robert Gould, Ragina Datta and Arnd Bohm.

Of course, I would also like to thank the nine German companies that agreed to participate in my study; *Ceram Tec AG, Brandenburgische Tuchfabriken, Deutsche Telekom Computer Service, Erdöl-Erdgas Gommern GmbH, MTW Schiffswerft GmbH, Christmann & Pfeifer Möbelsysteme GmbH & Co. KG, Hüttinger Elektronik GmbH, ABBSchalt-und Steuerungstechnik GmbH* and *Luehr Staubtechnik GmbH & Co. KG.*

I would like to extend a special “thank you” to the people of *Ceram Tec AG* in Wunsiedel: *Dr. Bernhard Kahl, Herr Zühl, Herr Hubl und Herr Wernitz*. Gentlemen, your kindness and efficiency in helping me with thesis was (and still is) very appreciated.

A NOTE FROM THE AUTHOR

Even before I went to Berlin in 1993 as a tourist and Heidelberg in 1994 as an exchange student, I knew that Germany would captivate me. Any country with such a rich and tangled history would have to. But it was only after I returned to the United States that I realized the extent to which Germany would have a hold on me all the way up until this present day. I want to live the rest of my life in Germany, that is how strongly I feel. I seek out every opportunity that I can to learn about German culture, history and society. Hence, the impetus behind this thesis.

In 1997, Germany's population exceeds 80 million, that of any other European country, barring Russia. Just over fifty years after the humiliating defeat of World War II, a once emotionally and physically ruined Germany now is the leading economic power in the *Europäische Gemeinschaft* (European Union). It stands in the heart of Europe, both geographically and historically, looking east and west, forward and backward. These facts alone mean that, whether the World likes it or not, Germany will again, as it has so many times in history, determine how Europe evolves.

By acting as the vanguard of the European Union, some researchers and academics have referred to present day Germany as the *Fourth Reich*. However, it is important to remember that this is not the Second or Third Reich reborn. Chancellor Helmut Kohl is neither a dictator nor warlord, but an elected head of a very civilized, peaceful, federal democracy. The profound irony of Kohl's *Fourth Reich* is that it has

the power to teach Europe a lesson in democracy. It has the ability to keep Europe open and free.

The Germans and their society represent the epitomes of extremes. As the famous researcher of German culture Gordon Craig once wrote “they have given mankind unique triumphs in science, literature, philosophy, music and art. They have also produced Hitler and the Holocaust. They are romantic and conservative, idealistic and practical, proud and insecure, ruthless and good-natured. They are, in short, the Germans”.

Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada K1S 5B6

Text complete; leaf |, omitted in numbering.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	4
Research Objective.....	5
Literature Review	7
The Definition of “Culture”	7
Organizational Culture.....	10
National Culture.....	11
The Non-Cultural Contingency Argument.....	11
The Culture-Specific Argument.....	13
West Germany - An Overview.....	21
East Germany - An Overview	25
Thesis Model	31
Methodology	32
Data Analysis	37
Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test.....	39
Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).....	41
Factor Analysis.....	48
Cultural Dimension Indices.....	50
Indices’ Tables.....	51
Indices’ Charts.....	57

Conclusions & Discussion.....	60
West Germany.....	62
East Germany.....	65
Germany.....	67
Limitations.....	69
Research Benefits.....	71
Appendix 1.....	74
Appendix 2.....	75
Appendix 3.....	77
Bibliography.....	87

INTRODUCTION

Germany presents a unique situation in the study of the organizational culture, and in the field of international business as a whole. The study in this thesis will be of a single country that for almost all of the second half of the twentieth century was made up of two very different countries. As of October 3, 1990 (the date of German reunification), 75% (60 million) of the German population lived in West Germany, still known as Federal Republic of Germany, which the other 25% (20 million) lived in East Germany, formally known as the German Democratic Republic. West Germany was (and still is) a liberal democracy representing the values of political and cultural pluralism and modified free enterprise (Orlow, 1995, p. ix). East Germany was a communist state whose leaders attempted to create a society founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The two nations were integrated into opposing military power blocs. West Germany is a friend of the United States and a member of the NATO alliance, while East Germany was the Soviet Union's most important European ally and a member of the Warsaw Pact. (Orlow, 1995, p. ix). For most of their history, relations between the two Germanies were strained. Now these two very different social and political cultures have merged and have to coexist under the banner of a united Germany, with the unspoken hope of former West Germany that those communist aspects of the former East Germany that exist in Germany's culture today will eventually dwindle away. Despite the long-time voiced and adamant opinion of German Chancellor Helmut Kohl who feels that there has always been just one German culture among its people, the fundamental hypothesis of this thesis is that the cultures of East and West Germany are distinct.

After 45 years of communist rule over 25% of a now unified German population, the idea that there is, and always has been, one single German culture is problematic at best. Chancellor Kohl's opinion has been disputed in Mark Fisher's book titled After the Wall: Germany, the Germans and the Burdens of History. Fisher writes in this book of former East German families that sought new lives and prosperity in the former West. These families ended up returning to the former East financially and emotionally broken because after much effort and anguish they could not adapt to the Western culture and lifestyle.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this thesis was to study the degree to which organizational cultures differ in Germany, thus the research focused on comparing organizations operating in both the former West Germany and the former East Germany. A second objective is to identify whether or not organizational cultures differ within each of the two "national" cultures of West and East Germany. A benefit of this study is that it will develop and contribute to the enhancement of the theoretical aspects of the topic of organizational culture and lead to an overall better understanding of it.

Secondly, the issue of organizational culture is a very practical one. As the business world becomes more and more globalized, a better understanding of this topic becomes not just helpful, but essential. As a result of this thesis studying one of the strongest former Eastern Block countries, East Germany, some very real aspects as to the organizational cultures that belonged to this country should come to light. Taking the

knowledge gained from conducting this thesis, one could get a better feel as to how to do business in the former communist area of Germany. Learning about the main organizational cultures, subsidiaries, worker attitudes, can all lead to better management skills and business practice.

The fundamental hypothesis of this thesis is that the cultures of East and West Germany are distinct. Thus, the fundamental expectation of this thesis was that the organizational cultures of companies operating in both the former West and East Germanies would be found to be different. This expectation is based on an article written by Godfrey Carr and Georgina Paul titled “Unification and its Aftermath: The Challenge of History”, which appeared in a book edited by Robert Burns titled German Cultural Studies: An Introduction. Carr and Paul argue in this article that culture is something that is evolutionary in design and takes much time and heavy influence to change. Since Germany was re-unified less than seven years ago, any cultural change that has been brought over from the West into the former East Germany has been minimal. However, one could ask that if culture is so difficult to change, how much effect did the communists actually have then upon the “Germanic” culture that had been in the territories of East Germany for centuries before 1945? This goes back to the “heavy influence” part of Carr and Paul’s statement about cultural change. In 1945, Germany and its people were devastated both physically and emotionally after the trauma of the Third Reich. German culture was in a very susceptible position to be introduced and built up again under a new cultural, social, and political system; that being communism. Therefore, it seems reasonable that differences would be expected to appear when

comparing West and East German organizational cultures in this thesis. Of course, it is possible that real differences existed between these two parts of Germany before World War II. For instance, the northern part of Germany that encompasses much of the former East Germany, used to be part of the Prussian Empire. The people of this area were largely Protestant, as opposed to areas of western and southern Germany where the people were largely Roman-Catholic, a lasting effect of the first German *Reich* under Charlemagne of the Holy Roman Empire (Weber, 1958). But of course, there is no way of knowing for sure whether these possible pre-existing differences between the two German regions had a direct impact on the results presented later in this thesis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Definition of "Culture"

A great concern that has been at the center of debate among academics and researchers has been the lack of a clear and concise definition of "culture" (Child, 1981; Denison, 1984; Evan, 1975; Hickson *et al*, 1974, Hofstede, 1980a; Kelley & Worthley, 1981; Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985; Sathe, 1983; Schwartz & Davis, 1981). Absent from studies of culture is a definition that is accepted, understood and interpreted by all researchers in this field of study as the same. Because of this, the entire concept of national culture has suffered greatly from vagueness and different interpretations (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 43). In their book, titled Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions, anthropologists Kroeber and Kluckhohn cite more than 164 different definitions of culture, designated into such group titles of normative, structural, genetic,

descriptive, historical and psychological (Evan, 1975, p. 92). Geert Hofstede states that culture is:

The collective mental programming of the people in an environment. Culture is not a characteristic of individuals; it encompasses a number of people who were conditioned by the same education and life experience. Culture, in the sense of collective mental programming, is often difficult to change; if it changes at all, it does so slowly (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 43).

Hofstede claims that culture, as the collective programming of the mind, distinguishes the members of one category of people from another. With that “category of people” being:

a nation, region, or ethnic group...a social class, a profession or occupation (occupational culture), type of business, a work organization or part of it (organizational culture), or even a family (Hofstede, 1994 a, p. 1).

However, as previously mentioned, different interpretations of culture prevail with many of the leading researchers in this field. John Child regards culture as:

An expression of values, norms and habits which are shared and deep-rooted within the nation (Child, 1981, p. 304)

Researcher Vijay Sathe adopted the following definition for his study:

Culture is the set of important understandings (often unstated) that members of a community share in common (Sathe, 1983, p. 6)

Sathe’s definition limits the concept of culture to what is contained and shared in the minds of the community members, which is similar to Hofstede’s “collective mental programming” definition. The phrase “often unstated” is an essential part of this definition because it implies that members of a culture are normally unaware of these mutual understandings. Yet another definition comes from Child and Kieser:

Cultures may be defined as patterns of thought and manners which are widely shared. The boundaries of the social collectivity within which this sharing takes place are problematic so that it may make as much sense to refer to a class or regional culture as to a national culture (Kelley and Worthley, 1981, p. 165).

Despite these discrepancies that exist among researchers' exact definitions and interpretations of culture, there is a collection of terms that are used quite often by researchers in this field of study in discussing culture (Sathe, 1983, p. 11).

Beliefs - These are basic assumptions concerning the world and how it works.

Values - These are also basic assumptions, like beliefs, but they have an "ought to" implicit in them.

Identity - These are the understandings that members share concerning who they are and what they stand for as a community.

Image - This is the community's identity as understood by members of another community.

Attitudes - These are the set of understandings that members of a community share about a specific object or situation.

Climate - This includes the understandings that members share about what it is like to work in the community.

Norms - These are the standards of expected behavior, speech, and "presentation of self".

Ideology - This is the dominant set of interrelated ideas that explain to members of a community why the important understandings they share "make sense".

Based on these definitions, the following definition of culture was adopted for this study:

Culture refers to the collective attitudes, beliefs and values that members of a given community share and which result in a group identity. This identity is thus recognized by other communities as being different and unique to itself.

This definition is derived mainly from Hofstede's definition of culture (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 43; Hofstede, 1994a, p. 1) because the measures used for this study were derived from

Hofstede. However, other scholars' definitions of "Culture" previously cited in this section (Child, 1981, p. 304; Sathe, 1983, p. 6; Kelley and Worthley, 1981, p. 165) did contribute to the forming of this author's definition stated above.

Organizational Culture

There is little doubt that cultures of organizations do exist, this is made evident by the following quote:

Apparently, the well-run corporations of the world [Coca-Cola, Sony, IBM...etc.] have distinctive cultures that are somehow responsible for their ability to create, implement, and maintain their world leadership positions (Schwartz and Davis, 1981, p. 30).

Where a debate in the field of international business does lie is in determining which factors form and continue to influence the cultures of organizations. With the world's markets ever more homogenized and the nature of business itself increasingly internationalized, additional burdens have been placed on managers to understand what specific factors, and the degree to which such factors, influence the organizational cultures of businesses (Punnett and Withane, 1990, p. 70). A more concise understanding of the factors that influence organizational cultures, will permit more effective control and better decision making (Punnett and Withane, 1990, p. 80).

One of the major influences upon organizational culture that has been at the core of a debate among scholars and academics in the field on international business is that national culture.

National Culture

In regards to the relationship between national culture & organizational culture, there has been a debate between two major points of view from the very beginning of this issue and continues on to this date. The two opposing schools of thought regarding this issue are those of the Non-Cultural Contingency Argument, or Culture-Free, and the Culture-Specific Argument, also known as the Culture-Bound.

The Non-Cultural Contingency Argument

The side of the national culture & organizational culture debate known as the Non-cultural Contingency, or Culture-Free, Argument originated from the classic work titled Management in the Industrial World written by Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers in 1959. These two authors argue that industrialization inevitably creates the convergence of national cultures by bringing about specific changes within the context of organizations. Organizations increase in internal complexity and grow in overall size due to industrialization. As a result of these contextual changes, certain developments occur within the organization's structure, such as: increased specialization, dependence on rules, and "the logic of industrial development calls for increasing managerial decentralization as enterprises grow in size and complexity" (Harbison & Myers, 1959, pp. 44-5). Management becomes more "professionalized" and relationships between authorities and their subordinates become less autocratic and more participative in nature. Harbison and Myers insist that this logic of industrialization prevails no matter what the

cultural setting may be, but the two authors do feel that cultural factors can create a hindrance to the process and perhaps slow it down.

The Culture-Free theorists believe that an organization's culture is not determined as the result of a nation's culture, since national cultures have converged due to industrialization (Child & Kieser, 1979; Hickson *et al*, 1974; Horvath *et al*, 1976; McMillan *et al*, 1973) but instead because of contextual factors of a non-cultural kind, such as organizational size, ownership, technology, markets, interdependencies, scales and field operation (Hickson *et al*, 1974, p. 60; Child, 1981, p. 309). Within the wide range of views that culture-free theorists have as to which of these contextual factors are the primary determinants of organizational culture and behavior, three major ones take precedence:

First, there is the argument that technology molds, or sets the conditions for certain features of job and organizational design. Second, there is the argument that the relationship between variables of organization context, especially size, technology and dependence on other organizations, on the one hand, and the structural characteristics of work organizations on the other, will be stable across nations. Third, there is the argument that business organizations, if not other types as well, will pass through similar stages of structural development as they grow, and that strategic commitments to market and technological diversification will necessarily shape the structures of organizations that are to remain equally effective (Child, 1981, p. 309-10).

These three arguments reflect the major influences that are seen by the culture-free theorists to prevail in influencing corporate cultures, withstanding any variations that may exist in national cultures.

The Culture-Specific Argument

The side of the national culture & organizational culture debate known as the Culture Specific, or Culture Bound, Argument is a school of thought that notes how different societies express specific and relatively persistent cultures, i.e. shared patterns of thought and manners. These societies in turn produce organizations that are deep-rooted with the cultural forces of that society. The organizations will re-assert themselves in the way that people behave and relate to one another in the organization, even if those organizations are located within different societies that face similar contingencies and adopt similar modes of formal structure (Child & Kieser, 1979, p. 253). In essence, the culture bound theorists feel that an organization, whether operating domestically or abroad, will reflect the cultural norms and values of the society from which it originated (Evan, 1975; Goodstein & Hunt, 1981; Hofstede, 1980a, 1994; Kelley & Worthley, 1981). Perhaps the most prolific of the culture-bound theorists is Geert Hofstede, a Dutch researcher and emeritus professor of Organizational Anthropology and International Management at the University of Limburg at Maastricht, the Netherlands. Hofstede's 1980 book titled Culture's Consequences is seen as the classic work for the culture-bound theorists' ideology because it is made reference to in so many articles on the subject (i.e. Child, 1981; Goodstein & Hunt, 1981; Horvath *et al*, 1984; Punnett & Withane, 1990; Sathe, 1983, Schwartz & Davis, 1981; and Tse *et al*, 1988). Hofstede's article centered around determining the main criteria, which Hofstede labeled as dimensions, by which national cultures differ. The four dimensions that Hofstede found common in most cultures were those of: *Power Distance*, *Uncertainty Avoidance*, *Individualism-*

Collectivism, Masculinity-Femininity. Hofstede described in his 1980 article titled “Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad”, which was directly derived from Culture’s Consequences, by the following:

This article deals specifically with the influence of our national environment: that is, our country. Most countries’ inhabitants share a national character that’s more clearly apparent to foreigners than to the nationals themselves; it represents the cultural mental programming that the nationals tend to have in common (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 43).

The first dimension of national culture that Hofstede identified was *Power Distance*, defined as the degree to which a society accepts the reality that institutional and organizational power are not distributed equally. The second dimension, *Uncertainty Avoidance*, refers to the degree to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and attempts to avoid these situations by creating more career stability, establishing a more formal system of rules, tolerating few deviant ideas and behavior, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise. The third dimension Hofstede identified was *Individualism vs. Collectivism*. Individualism implies a loosely knit social framework in which people are expected to take care of themselves and their close circle of loved ones only, while collectivism refers to a tight social framework in which people see differences between in-groups and out-groups; they expect their in-groups (relatives, clan, organizations) to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it (Hofstede, 1980, p.45). The fourth cultural dimension from Hofstede’s 1980 study is that of *Masculinity vs. Femininity*. Masculinity refers to the degree to which “masculine” values - assertiveness, materialism, *not* caring for others, the quality of life, or people - are dominant in the society. On the opposite side is Femininity, this refers to the degree of lacking of these same values in a society.

Hofstede's four cultural dimensions were the result of both theoretical reasoning and massive statistical analysis, from what he describes as "most likely the largest survey material ever obtained in a questionnaire" (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 44). The surveys that provided the data for Hofstede's study totaled 116,000 and were distributed to the employees of the multinational corporation IBM in the United States and its subsidiaries in 40 countries all over the world. The surveys were handed out and collected from the total range of employees at IBM, from the low unskilled workers to research Ph.D.s and top managers (Hofstede, 1980, p. 44). The data were collected in two different periods from 1967-1973; the first group was from 1967-1969 and the second group was from 1971-1973. The questionnaire was translated into 20 languages and distributed in the dominant language of each country. From a total of 150 questions on the surveys, about 60 dealt with the respondent's beliefs and values, and those were analyzed for Hofstede's 1980 article. Hofstede's definitions of his four cultural dimensions are presented in Figures 1 through 4.

In 1994, Hofstede added a fifth cultural dimension, that of *Long Term/Short Term Orientation*, in his article titled "The Business of International Business is Culture". However, this last dimension was not tested in this thesis because the study utilized Hofstede's Questionnaire for his 1980 article, which at that point in time only contained questions pertaining to the original four cultural dimensions.

FIGURE 1

THE POWER DISTANCE DIMENSION

<i>Small Power Distance</i>	<i>Large Power Dimension</i>
Inequality in society should be minimized.	There should be an order of inequality in this world in which everybody has a rightful place; high and low are protected by this order.
All people should be interdependent.	A few people should be independent; most should be dependent.
Hierarchy means an inequality of roles, established for convenience.	Hierarchy means existential inequality.
Superiors consider subordinates to be "people like me."	Superiors consider subordinates to be a different kind of people.
Subordinates consider superiors to be "people like me."	Subordinates consider superiors as a different kind of people.
The use of power should be legitimate and is subject to the judgment as to whether it is good or evil.	Power is a basic fact of society that antedates good or evil. Its legitimacy is irrelevant.
All should have equal rights.	Power-holders are entitled to privileges.
Those in power should try to look less powerful than they are.	Those in power should try to look as powerful as possible.
The system is to blame.	The underdog is to blame.
The way to change a social system is to redistribute power.	The way to change a social system is to dethrone those in power.
People at various power levels feel less threatened and more prepared to trust people.	Other people are a potential threat to one's power and can rarely be trusted.
Latent harmony exists between the powerful and the powerless.	Latent conflict exists between the powerful and the powerless.
Cooperation among the powerless can be based on solidarity.	Cooperation among the powerless is difficult to attain because of their low-faith-in-people norm.

Reproduced from: Hofstede, Geert, "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, 1980, p. 46.

FIGURE 2**THE UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE DIMENSION**

<i>Weak Uncertainty Avoidance</i>	<i>Strong Uncertainty Avoidance</i>
The uncertainty inherent in life is more easily accepted and each day is taken as it comes.	The uncertainty inherent in life is left as a continuous threat that must be fought.
Ease and lower stress are experience.	Higher anxiety and stress are experienced.
Time is free.	Time is money.
Hard work, as such, is not a virtue.	There is an inner urge to work hard.
Aggressive behavior is frowned upon.	Aggressive behavior of self and others is accepted.
Less showing of emotions is preferred.	More showing of emotions is preferred.
Conflict and competition can be contained on the level of fair play and used constructively.	Conflict and competition can unleash aggression and should therefore be avoided.
More acceptance of dissent is entailed.	A strong for consensus is involved.
Deviation is not considered threatening; greater tolerance is shown.	Deviant persons and ideas are dangerous; intolerance holds sway.
The ambience is one of less nationalism.	Nationalism is pervasive.
More positive feelings toward younger people are seen.	Younger people are suspect.
There is more willingness to take risks in life.	There is great concern with security in life.
The accent is on relativism, empiricism.	The search is for ultimate, absolute truths and values.
There should be as few rules as possible.	There is a need for written rules and regulations.
If rules cannot be kept, we should change them.	If rules cannot be kept, we are sinners and should repent.
Belief is placed in generalists and common sense.	Belief is placed in experts and their knowledge.
The authorities are there to serve the citizens.	Ordinary citizens are incompetent compared with the authorities.

Reproduced from: Hofstede, Geert, "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, 1980, p. 47.

FIGURE 3

THE INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM DIMENSION

<i>Collectivist</i>	<i>Individualist</i>
In society, people are born into extended families families or clans who protect them in exchange for loyalty.	In society, everybody is supposed to take care of himself/herself and his/her immediate family.
"We" consciousness holds sway.	"I" consciousness holds sway.
Identity is based in the social system.	Identity is based in the individual.
There is emotional dependence of individual on organizations and institutions.	There is emotional independence of individual from organizations or institutions.
The involvement with organizations is moral.	The involvement with organizations is calculative.
The emphasis is on belonging to organizations; membership is the ideal.	The emphasis is on individual initiative and achievement; leadership is the ideal.
Private life is invaded by organizations and clans to which one belongs; opinions are predetermined.	Everybody has a right to a private life and opinion.
Expertise, order, duty, and security are provided by organization or clan.	Autonomy, variety, pleasure, and individual financial security are sought in the system.
Friendships are predetermined by stable social relationships, but there is need for prestige within these relationships.	The need is for specific friendships.
Belief is placed in group decisions.	Belief is placed in individual decisions.
Value standards differ for in-groups and out-groups (particularism).	Value standards should apply to all (universalism).

Reproduced from: Hofstede, Geert, "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, 1980, p. 48.

FIGURE 4**THE MASCULINITY-FEMININITY DIMENSION**

<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Masculine</i>
Men need not be assertive, but can also assume nurturing roles.	Men should be assertive. Women should be nurturing.
Sex roles in society are more fluid.	Sex roles in society are clearly differentiated.
There should be equality between the sexes.	Men should dominate the society.
Quality of life is important.	Performance is what counts.
You work in order to live.	You live in order to work.
People and environment are important.	Money and things are important.
Interdependence is the ideal.	Independence is the ideal.
Service provides the motivation.	Ambition provides the drive.
One sympathizes with the unfortunate.	One admires the successful achiever.
Small and slow are beautiful.	Big and fast are beautiful.
Unisex and androgyny are ideal.	Ostentatious manliness ("machismo") is appreciated.

Reproduced from: Hofstede, Geert, "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization, "Do American Theories Apply Abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, 1980, p. 49.

Hofstede then assigned the 40 countries that he studied both an index value and a ranking that were based on the mean answers of key questions on his value survey module. The index values were positioned on two-dimensional graphs: *Power Distance* by *Uncertainty Avoidance*, *Power Distance* by *Individualism-Collectivism*, *Masculinity-Femininity* by *Uncertainty Avoidance* and presented in Hofstede's 1980 article.

Hofstede, in his 1994 article titled “The Business of International Business is Culture”, produced the cultural scores of 23 countries. Germany’s cultural score on Hofstede’s four dimensions are represented below (Hofstede, 1994, p. 5). It is important to note that in Hofstede’s 1980 study, what constituted “Germany” was only the former West Germany, since Socialist block countries were excluded from the study.

FIGURE 5

WEST GERMANY’S CULTURAL SCORE

Power Distance		Uncertainty Avoidance		Individualism/Collectivism		Masculinity/Femininity	
Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank
35	42-44	65	29	67	15	66	9-10

Ranks: 1=highest, 53=lowest (for long term orientation, 23=lowest).

The literature review up until this point focused on presenting four main points of interest for this study; (1) the ambiguity with definitions of “Culture”, (2) the existence of “Organizational Cultures”, (3) the two schools of thought in the debate over the “National Culture & Organizational Culture Relationship” and (4) the introduction of Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions. These components all provide a basis that leads into the final two sections of the Literature Review for this study; overview sections of West and East Germany.

West Germany - An Overview

What constituted “Germany” in Hofstede’s original 1980 study was his results taken from West Germany. In this section, Hofstede’s indices for the West German cultural dimensions are explained in more detail and compared with other countries’ indices.

The Power Distance Dimension - as defined by Hofstede is “the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations are distributed equally” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). Countries that have large power distance indices are the East Asian countries (i.e. Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Philippines, Taiwan) and South American countries (i.e. Argentina, Chile, Columbia, Venezuela, Mexico), meaning that power-holders in those societies are seen as being entitled to hold privileges. Inequality exists and is accepted in countries with large power distance indices. Germany, like other central and northern European countries (i.e. Norway, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland, Great Britain), was ranked by Hofstede as having a small power distance index, being 42-44 out of a possible 53 (lowest). This means that the German society aims to minimize inequality and encourages the interdependence among its people. This is supported by the example of the university system that has traditionally existed in Germany. Even though Heidelberg University is the oldest in Germany, it is in no way considered the best. In fact, there is no university that is considered the best. All the universities in Germany are viewed to be on the same level and the graduate of one is not considered better than the graduate of any other university in Germany based on where they went to school. There are no elite or prestigious standout universities in Germany.

(Fisher, 1995, p. 98) German society even is considerate of those people that did not pursue university level educations by enrolling them in intense and very beneficial apprenticeship programs that allow them to be as productive, or even more productive, as university graduates, thus maintaining their self-esteem (Fisher, 1995, p. 99).

In addition, during the 1960's, the Germans spurned the trend toward the relaxed use of the informal *du* form of "you" (which was intended to gradually make class distinctions disappear), preferring to return to the traditional *Sie* form of "you" that maintained clear distances between levels of society. Secretaries and professionals alike boasted of being so formal that they did not even know their coworkers' first names, it was always "*Herr This*" and "*Herr That*" (Fisher, 1995, p. 55).

The Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension - as defined by Hofstede "indicates the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise" (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). The years from 1871 to 1945 proved to be the most crucial in leading to the division of Germany that resulted after World War II. Germany became a country in 1871, before that year it what was made up of 64 separate states. For almost three quarters of a century German history was synonymous with "the German problem," a shorthand way of indicating that Germany was an unstable and unpredictable factor in modern European history (Orlow, 1995, p. x). Germany throughout its history has gone through three *Reichs* or Empires (the first under Charlemagne, the second under Bismarck & Kaiser Wilhelm II and the third under Adolf

Hitler). In addition, Germany survived the devastating aftermaths of two World Wars (1914-1918 and 1939-1945) and an economic depression during the Weimar Republic (1919-1932) that was significantly greater than the Great Depression in North America. Germany also carries with it the burden of the Holocaust. Germany was finally re-united for the second time in its history in 1990 after 45 years of being divided between capitalist West Germany and communist East Germany. Taking into account all of these facts, it is not surprising that Germany ranked very high on Hofstede's Uncertainty Avoidance dimension. The "establishing more formal rules" part of Hofstede's definition, pertaining to a country dealing with a strong Uncertainty Avoidance, is made evident in German society by the existence of no less than 100,000 regulations governing behavior (Fisher, 1995, p. 46). Countries that have weak (or low) Uncertainty Avoidance indices are the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland), as well as the United States of America and Canada. Weaker Uncertainty Avoidance means that the countries who have such a trait are not as threatened by social changes or uncertain situations. The societies within them are not characterized by a high level of anxiety, nor does there exist a strong inner urge for people to work very hard in order to better cope with unpredictable social circumstances (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45).

The Individualism-Collectivism Dimension - Hofstede described individualism as "a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and of their immediate families only," while he described collectivism as "a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups; they expect their in-groups to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute

loyalty to it," (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). Like many other European countries, Germany ranked high on the Individualist scale. In Germany, people are expected to take care of themselves and their immediate families, and everybody keeps their private life just that - private. Countries that ranked more on the Collectivist scale were the East Asian countries (i.e. Japan, Singapore, Taiwan, Indonesia, Hong Kong) and the South American countries (i.e. Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru). Countries that fall more in the Collectivist scale have within their societies tight social frameworks and the "we", instead of the "I", consciousness prevails (Hofstede, 1980, pp. 45 & 48).

The Masculinity-Femininity Dimension - Hofstede described a culture as being "masculine" if the dominant values such as - assertiveness, acquisition of money and things, and *not* caring for others, the quality of life, or people - exist in the society, and "feminine" if they do not (Hofstede, 1980, p. 46). Germany ranked higher on the masculinity scale rather than femininity in accordance with Hofstede. The teutonic work ethic and efficiency have become world-wide stereotypes of the Germans; which fits directly into Hofstede's characteristic of "you live to work" in his description of Masculinity (Hofstede, 1980, p. 49). In Germany, the masculine trait of "order" (*Ordnung*) is everything. Examples of this include; automobile drivers will flash not only when they turn, but also when the road curves sharply; buses, trains, and street-cars pride themselves on their punctuality right down to a window of error of ten seconds; buses are instructed to only stop for would-be passengers that are within three meters of the bus stop; and mail posted anywhere in Germany by 6 p.m. will reach its destination the next day (Fisher, 1995, p. 50). Countries that fell more towards the Femininity scale were the

Scandinavian countries (i.e. Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland), as well as a countries such as France, Spain, Brazil, Peru, Portugal, Chile, Israel. These countries, according to Hofstede, have societies that feel the people and the environment are important, quality of life is important, and sex roles should be fluid (Hofstede, 1980, p. 49).

East Germany - An Overview

Hofstede's study did not include any Socialist block countries, thus formal rating data of east Germany is not available. However, since this thesis is comparing the organizational cultures of the former West and East Germanies, it is important to have an estimated view of where approximately East Germany would have ranked on Hofstede's dimensions had he included them.

The Power Distance Dimension - as defined by Hofstede is "the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations are distributed equally" (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). The former East Germany existed from 1948-1990, and in that country the communist rule tried to create and run a society founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. These principles of *socialism*, in theory, were aimed to abolish class distinctions and inequality in the society so that individuals were to be considered equal to one another. However the reality behind socialism, that East Germany and many of the other Eastern European realized, was that it had the opposite effect of what its theoretical aims were (Burns, 1995, p. 152). In East Germany, instead of abolishing the class system and elitism, the communists created a new elite (i.e. communist party members, people loyal to the party) that profited from the work of the

majority of the people in the society, who did not reap the benefits and have the privileges (i.e. better products, vacation homes, ability to travel freely) from which the minority elite benefited (Burns, 1995, p. 154).

Additional support for a Large Power distance for East Germany comes from author Harold James in his book titled A German Identity - 1770 To The Present Day. In this book on page 168, James describes how after the failed revolts by the people of Budapest, Hungary in 1956 and Prague, Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Communist government put the ring-leaders of the would-be revolution on “show trials”. Even more so, the Communists expelled, and in some cases executed, party members that were suspected of treasonous behavior, in the time of or leading up to the revolutions. Both of these reprisals by the Communists governments were very public and thus depict Hofstede’s characteristic of a Large Power Distance being: *Those in Power should try to look as powerful as possible*.

Based on this, this author estimated that East Germany would have ranked large on Hofstede’s Power Distance Dimension, which is unlike West Germany that ranked small. The new elite that the communists created matches directly with Hofstede’s description on a large Power Distance being one in which “a few people should be independent; most should be dependent” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 46).

However, despite this literature, there is a view that the societies under communism (i.e. East Germany) were far more egalitarian; meaning that everyone had a job, everyone had health care, everyone had a home, and that this, in turn, created very strong equality among those people under the communist governments. This view holds

that the class distinctions in the communist societies were kept secret by the upper class from the rest of the society. There were not the wide-spread income ranges that one finds in a market economy, people were more on equal grounds. Despite the possibility that this is so, this author still feels that East Germany would have ranked with a large *Power Distance* for reasons explained earlier in this section.

The Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension - as described by Hofstede “indicates the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). The Uncertainty Avoidance Dimension is the only dimension of Hofstede’s that was thought perhaps to be on equal levels when comparing the two cultures of West and East Germany. West Germany was ranked by Hofstede as having a Strong Uncertainty Avoidance and this author felt that East Germany should be estimated to have a strong one as well, based on what author Gordon A. Craig writes in his book titled The Germans. In it, Craig describes how the East German communist government would “dictate” the lives of the people living the society to them (Craig, 1991, p.221). This meant that from a very early on East Germans would know how high a level of schooling they would receive, what kind of apprenticeship they then move on to, what kind of job they would have after that; as well as the knowledge that they would have “cradle to grave” health care and that the chances of them being unemployed at any time in their lives was minimal (Craig, 1991, p. 221). In East German society, there was no risk taking; deviant ideas and behaviors that were noticed or

observed would not go undealt-with by the *Stasi* (East German Secret Police), and ordinary citizens were viewed as incompetent compared with the authorities.

Additional support for a Strong Uncertainty Avoidance can be found in the monumental act of the Communists building of the Berlin Wall. In the 1950s, East Germany suffered from a continuous exodus of its people to the West (James, 1994, p. 169). In keeping with Hofstede's characteristic of a Strong uncertainty Avoidance being: *The uncertainty in life is left as a continuous threat that must be fought*, the communists fought this uncertainty about the future of its power in East Germany by building the Berlin Wall in 1961 and effectively sealing off the last remaining contacts between East Germany and the West (James, 1994, p. 172). All of these lend to the conclusion that East Germany would have had with a high Uncertainty Avoidance in Hofstede's study.

The Individualism-Collectivism Dimension - Hofstede described individualism as "a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and of their immediate families only", while he described collectivism as "a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups; they expect their in-groups to look after them, and in exchange for they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it," (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). Unlike the West German ranking of Individualistic, it was thought by this author that East Germany would probably have had the opposite ranking, that of Collectivist.

In many of the former Socialist block countries, the communists established societies in which the people who did not fall into the new elite, meaning the majority of people, would have a strong interdependence among them and on the social system for

which they belonged (Burns, 1995, p. 159). Further evidence that East Germany would have ranked on the Collectivist dimension is found in Fisher (1995). As stated in the *Introduction* section of this thesis, Fisher in his book writes of former East German families that sought new lives in the West, only to return to the former East Germany unsuccessful. One of these families, the Hotzes, were very disappointed at the friendships they made during their time in the West. Friendships in the West were seen by many East German families, not just the Hotzes, as being superficial and to a certain degree fake. One of the few joys that the Hotzes experienced coming back to the former East Germany was “the openness, the warmth and the things easterners talked about among themselves” (Fisher, 1995, p. 137), and returning to the true nature of friendships, the bonding with similar people and the emotional security involved.

The “*We*” *Consciousness holds sway* is a particularly important characteristic of Hofstede’s Collectivist cultural Dimension when studying former Communist countries. This is because it was the main basis of the *socialism* ideology. This carried over not just for the people within East Germany, but the entire Soviet Empire in Eastern Europe was viewed as being much more gelled and concrete than members of NATO in the West (James, 1994, p. 172). When the Soviet Union boycotted the 1980 Olympics, it was not just Russian athletes that did not come, but also Polish, Czech, Hungarian, etc. This certainly depicts the “*We*” consciousness that was abundant in much of the former Communist countries culture.

The Masculinity-Femininity Dimension - Hofstede described a culture as being “masculine” if the dominant values such as assertiveness, acquisition of money and

things, and *not* caring for others, the quality of life, or people exist in the society, and “feminine” if they do not (Hofstede, 1980, p. 46). Hofstede ranked West Germany on the side of “Masculine”, while this author felt that East Germany would have ranked on the “Feminine” side for the reasons that will follow. One characteristic Hofstede regards as Feminine is that “interdependence is ideal” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 49), which ties into earlier arguments regarding the Collectivist dimension of East Germany. Moreover, another description of Hofstede’s is “sex roles in society are more fluid”. This is made evident in Robert Burns’ book titled German Cultural Studies: An Introduction , in which he states on page 183 that by the time the Berlin Wall came down more than 80% of all East German women were out in the workforce , instead of staying at home being housewives, while only 40% of West German women were out in the workforce.

Critical Point to East Germany - It has been argued by some researchers and authors that the communists did not affect the East German culture at all, that they instead “froze” the German culture and that West Germany was the culture that changed by adapting to modernism brought on by the West. However, this does not change the fundamental hypothesis of this thesis, nor the results from the data.

The forthcoming sections of ***Data Analysis*** and ***Conclusions & Discussion*** of this study further pertain to the previous paragraph’s topic.

THESIS MODEL

This thesis will test to see if there are, and the extent of, any differences in the cultures of organizations operating in both the former West and East Germanies, measured by Hofstede's four cultural dimensions: *Power Distance*, *Uncertainty Avoidance*, *Individualism vs. Collectivism*, and *Masculinity vs. Femininity*. In addition, if the sample size permits, this thesis will test for evidence of differences that exist within the realm of each organization.

There may be some speculation on the topic of whether Hofstede's "national" level cultural dimensions can legitimately be applied and interpreted on the "organizational" level. Hofstede states:

Founders of organizations, while usually unique individuals, are also children of a national culture; so the founders' national values appear to be reflected in the values of their organizations, even if the organizations spread internationally....The reason why the founders have such an impact is that they are the only ones who can fully adapt the organization to themselves. Every person who joins later will to an extent have to adapt him/herself to the organization (Hofstede, 1985, p. 350).

As the result of the founder(s) of an organization being the product of his, her or their national culture, the organization can not help but to take on similar values that the founder(s) have and hold those values as the core of the organization's culture. Therefore, Hofstede's five cultural dimensions on the national level can be applied to culture on the organizational level.

METHODOLOGY

DATA - The data collection methodology of this thesis was a mail-out survey (questionnaire) translated into German and sent to German companies in Germany. All cover letters and the questionnaire were first back-translated and then pilot-tested with three ethnic Germans (professional teachers at the Goethe Institute German Language School in Ottawa, Canada) to ensure understandability. The surveys mailed out were accompanied with a large self-addressed stamped envelope with German postage fees already paid, so that it was convenient and free of charge for the German managers of the companies to send them back. The questionnaire used was a German translation (checked by back translation) of the English questionnaire that Hofstede developed and used for his 1980 study (Brislin, 1970, p. 189).

SAMPLE - The sample method of this thesis consisted of the author researching at the German Embassy in Ottawa, Canada to find the suitable companies for this study. Originally, seventy German companies were found in total: 35 companies that are operating in the former West Germany and 35 companies operating in the former East Germany.. The critical criterion that was used for selecting companies was the availability of fax numbers. The fax numbers were used to better facilitate communication between the author and the companies to be studied. A rolling sample size was administered for this thesis. That meant that if the author received a response to the initial fax letter saying that the company in question did not want to participate in the study, then the author continued to ask new companies until he had 10 confirmed

responses from German companies (5 from West Germany and 5 from East Germany) stating that they would indeed participate in the study. Eight of the ten packages were sent out to the German companies during the last week of November, 1996, while the ninth was sent out during the first week of December, 1996. This author would like to make special note of the fact that only nine packages were sent out because one of the East German companies sent back on its own initiative 32 questionnaires that they had distributed from a single copy that was faxed in order to first meet their approval.

The response rate for getting the return packages of questionnaires from the German companies was 88% (8 out of 9). Five East German companies and four out of the five West German companies completed the questionnaires and sending them back. One West German company, even after reminder faxes were sent, was never heard from again. Due to a time restraint on finishing this thesis, the author allowed a final due date of March 15, 1997 to receive the tenth and final package of questions for this study. The dead-line came and went without any word from the one remaining company and thus the author decided at that moment to go ahead with the data analysis without including the final company.

The organizational sample is represented in Appendix 1, along with the number of employees each company has, what type of company it is, its address and fax number.

PROCEDURES - Because of concerns over the response rate of this mail-out plan, and in an effort to obtain as high a response rate as possible, each prospective company was first faxed a cover letter (translated in German) introducing the author and the study, which also requested the name and department of a specific contact person that

would be willing to accept the questionnaires (Appendix 2). The contact person was then be notified as to approximately what date to expect the questionnaires. For each company, an instruction letter and 30 questionnaires was sent (Appendix 3). In total then, the number of questionnaires mailed out was 300. Within each package sent to a German company was a self-addressed return envelope, containing 15 *Deuschemarks* to pay for the return postage back to Canada.

The list of the companies that participated is given in Appendix 1. A coded list of participants, along with the number of questionnaires that were returned and their individual response rates, is presented below.

WEST GERMAN COMPANIES:

Company A = 28
Response Rate = 93.3 %
Company B = 28
Response Rate = 93.3 %
Company C = 29
Response Rate = 96.6 %
Company D = 24
Response Rate = 80 %

EAST GERMAN COMPANIES:

Company Z = 32
Response Rate = 106 %
Company X = 23
Response Rate = 76.6 %
Company Y = 19
Response Rate = 63.3 %
Company U = 21
Response Rate = 70 %
Company V = 19
Response Rate = 63.3 %

In total, there were 109 questionnaires returned from the West German Companies and 114 questionnaires returned from the East German companies, so out of the total 300 questionnaires sent, the response rate was 74.3 %. Of the West German

companies there was a response rate of 72.6 % and of the East German companies there was a response rate of 76 %.

Both sets of questionnaires making up the two different samples for the data analysis section (West German responses 109; East German 114) were statistically large enough to insure validity of the test. As long as there were over a 100 questionnaires for each sample, the statistical methods were properly conducted (Stevens, 1986, p. 189).

MEASURES - For the first test of this thesis, if any differences exist between the organizational cultures of West and East German companies, the unit of analysis were the individual responses within the German companies. For the second test of this thesis, if any differences exist within each individual company, the unit of analysis was the employees of the company. Thirty questionnaires were sent in order to obtain the effects of the central limit theorem in statistics for the second test of this thesis. According to the central limit theorem, for “sufficiently large samples (n greater than or equal to 30), the sample means will be distributed around the population mean approximately in a normal distribution. Even if the population is not normally distributed, the distribution of sample means will be normal if there is a large enough set of samples” (Cooper and Emory, 1995, p. 211).

Four formulas were used in order to determine the cultural dimension indices for (1) the nine German companies individually, (2) the East German companies as one group and the West German companies as one group and (3) all nine companies in a single group called “Germany”.

The formulas for calculating each culture dimension (Hofstede, 1980b, pp. 76, 121, 160 & 195; Noyes, 1992, pp. 123, 124 & 128) are listed below:

POWER DISTANCE INDEX (PDI):

The index is comprised of *Questions 19, 20 and 26*.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PDI} = & 135 - 25 \times (\text{mean score of Question 26}) \\ & + (\% \text{ Question 20 perceived manager 1} + 2) \\ & - (\% \text{ Question 19 preferred manager 3}) \end{aligned}$$

UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE INDEX (UAI):

The index is comprised of *Questions 21, 22 and 27*.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{UAI} = & 300 - 30 \times (\text{mean score of Question 22}) \\ & + (\% \text{ Question 27 intending to stay less than 5 years}) \\ & - 40 \times (\text{mean score of Question 21}) \end{aligned}$$

INDIVIDUALISM/COLLECTIVISM INDEX (IDV/CLV):

The index is comprised of *Questions 1, 2, 4 and 7*.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IDV/CLV} = & 25 \times (2 + \text{mean score Questions that are positively correlated} - \text{mean} \\ & \text{scores Questions that are negatively correlated}) \\ \text{IDV/CLV} = & 25 \times (2 + \text{mean scores of Questions 2} + 7 + 1 - 4) \end{aligned}$$

MASCULINITY/FEMININITY INDEX (MAS/FEM):

The index is comprised of *Questions 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 14*.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MAS/FEM} = & 25 \times (2 + \text{mean score Questions that are positively correlated} - \text{mean} \\ & \text{score questions that are negatively correlated}) \\ \text{MAS/FEM} = & 25 \times (2 + \text{mean scores of Questions 2} + 11 + 14 - 13 - 8 - 6 - 5) \end{aligned}$$

DATA ANALYSIS

This section refers to *Hofstede's 16 Questions*. These are the 16 questions, out of the 33 total, that allow the researcher to calculate the values for Hofstede's four cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1980b, pp. 75, 121, 155, 160 and 195; Noyes, 1992, pp. 123 and 128) using Hofstede's recommended data collection instrument. The following is a list of the questions that fall under the each of the cultural dimensions.

Power Distance - Questions 19, 20 and 26, shown below:

The descriptions below apply to four different types of managers. Please read through these descriptions:

MANAGER 1: Usually makes his/her decisions promptly and communicates them to his/her subordinates clearly and firmly. Expects them to carry out the decisions loyally and without raising difficulties.

MANAGER 2: Usually makes his/her decisions promptly, but, before going ahead, tries to explain them fully to his/her subordinates. Gives them the reasons for the decisions and answers whatever questions they may have.

MANAGER 3: Usually consults with his/her subordinates before he/she reaches his/her decisions. Listens to their advice, considers it, and then announces his/her decision. He/she then expects all to work loyally to implement it whether or not it is in accordance with the advice they give.

MANAGER 4: Usually calls a meeting of his/her subordinates when there is an important decision to be made. Puts the problem before the group and invites discussion. Accepts the majority viewpoint as the decision.

19. Now, for the above types of manager, please mark the *one* which you would prefer to work under (circle one answer number only):

1. MANAGER 1
2. MANAGER 2
3. MANAGER 3
4. MANAGER 4

20. And, to which *one* of the above four types of managers would you say your own superior *most closely corresponds*?

1. MANAGER 1
2. MANAGER 2
3. MANAGER 3
4. MANAGER 4

26. How frequently, in your work environment, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?

1. VERY FREQUENTLY
2. FREQUENTLY
3. SOMETIMES
4. SELDOM
5. VERY SELDOM

Uncertainty Avoidance - Questions 21, 22 and 27, shown below:

21. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?

1. I ALWAYS FEEL THIS WAY
2. USUALLY
3. SOMETIMES
4. SELDOM
5. I NEVER FEEL THIS WAY.

Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREE DISAGREE

22. A company or organization's rules should not be broken - even when the employee thinks it is in the organization's best interests.

1 2 3 4 5

27. How long do you think that you will continue working for this company or organization?

1. TWO YEARS AT THE MOST
2. FROM TWO TO FIVE YEARS
3. MORE THAN FIVE YEARS (BUT I PROBABLY WILL LEAVE BEFORE I RETIRE)
4. UNTIL I RETIRE

Individualism/Collectivism - Questions 1, 2, 4, and 7, shown below:

UTMOST IMPORTANCE	VERY IMPORTANT	MODERATE IMPORTANCE	LITTLE IMPORTANCE	VERY LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
----------------------	-------------------	------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

1. Have sufficient time left for your personal or family life? 1

1 2 3 4 5

2. Have challenging tasks to do, from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment?

1 2 3 4 5

4. Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)? 1

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

7. Have considerable freedom to adapt your own approach to the job? 1 2 3 4 5

Masculinity/Femininity - Questions 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 14, shown below:

	UTMOST IMPORTANCE	VERY IMPORTANT	MODERATE IMPORTANCE	LITTLE IMPORTANCE	VERY LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
2. Have challenging tasks to do, from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Have a good working relationship with your direct superior?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Have security of employment?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Work with people who cooperate well with one another?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Have an opportunity for high earnings?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Live in an area desirable to you and your family?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs?	1	2	3	4	5

I. CRONBACH'S ALPHA RELIABILITY TEST

An internal consistency reliability test was conducted by using Cronbach's alpha.

This test measured the “degree to which instrument items are homogeneous and reflect the same underlying construct(s)” (Cooper & Emory, 1995, p. 155). This reliability test is a measure of internal consistency within each set of variables (in this case questions from the questionnaire) that it was administered to. It should be noted that Hofstede does not report the value of this statistic for his scales

Cronbach's alpha was computed for each company, with the variables within each company being the answers to the 2 sets of questions that specifically determine Hofstede's the *Individualism/Collectivism* and *Masculinity/Femininity* cultural dimensions. Only those two cultural dimensions could have the *Cronbach's alpha* applied to them because the questions that made up the computational part of their indices were scaled in nature. The Questions for computing the *Power Distance* and *Uncertainty Avoidance* dimensions, Questions 19, 20 & 26 and Questions 21, 22 & 27 respectively, can not have a Cronbach's alpha computed for them because as Tull and Hawkins (1987, p. 224) point out, "all items on the index must designed to measure precisely the same thing". The other two sets of dimension questions involve the respondent in assessing a number of specific dimensions. Because these dimensions are somewhat independent, "an internal-comparison measure of reliability is not appropriate across dimensions" (Tull and Hawkins, 1987, p. 224).

In this section one negative alpha does appear. According to Norusis (1994, p. 147): "Negative α values can occur when items are not positively correlated among themselves and the reliability model is violated." A correlation matrix was computed; the scales for which the negative alpha value appeared proved to consist of a negatively correlated item.

WEST GERMAN COMPANIES:

Company A :

Individualism/Collectivism = .4672

Masculinity/Femininity = .4746

EAST GERMAN COMPANIES:

Company Z :

Individualism/Collectivism = .4212

Masculinity/Femininity = .2136

Company B :

Individualism/Collectivism = .0772

Masculinity/Femininity = .2456

Company C :

Individualism/Collectivism = .5496

Masculinity/Femininity = -.2852

Company D :

Individualism/Collectivism = .3122

Masculinity/Femininity = .3720

Company X :

Individualism/Collectivism = .0268

Masculinity/Femininity = .2146

Company Y :

Individualism/Collectivism = .2167

Masculinity/Femininity = .6179

Company U :

Individualism/Collectivism = .1382

Masculinity/Femininity = .5826

Company V :

Individualism/Collectivism = .1557

Masculinity/Femininity = .3124

II. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (MANOVA)

A *MANOVA* was used to test for the differences that exist between the West and East German “national” cultures and between the companies within each “national” culture.. *MANOVA* is a generalization of analysis of variance to a situation in which there are several *dependent variables* (Tabachnick, 1989, p. 371).

In total, twelve *MANOVAs* were computed from the data. *MANOVAs* 1-4 pertain to the companies within both the East German and West German “national” cultures. *MANOVAs* 5-8 pertain to the companies only within West Germany. *MANOVAs* 9-12 pertain to the companies only within East Germany. In all cases each set of the four Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension Questions were the dependent variables. An alpha level of 5 % ($\alpha = .05$) was used to test for significance. Hence, any *Exact P* value (*Sig. of F* from the data reported) that is less than .05 leads to the conclusion that significant

differences did exist between the two samples. Likewise, any *Exact P* value that is greater than .05 leads to the conclusion that significant differences did not exist between the two samples.

(1) A *MANOVA* was used on the aggregate data from both West and East German companies, with the Power Distance Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.04582	3.34503	3.00	219.00	.020
Wilks	.95619	3.34503	3.00	219.00	.020

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00019	1.67750	122.31354	1.67750	.55345	3.03095	.083
VAR00020	4.27300	207.83462	4.27300	.94043	4.54368	.034
VAR00026	3.68849	224.27563	3.68849	1.01482	3.63462	.058

Therefore: Significant Differences existed between the two samples with regard to Power Distance, particularly among Question 20.

(2) A *MANOVA* was used on the aggregate data from both West and East German companies, with the Uncertainty Avoidance Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.07781	5.68036	3.00	219.00	.001
Wilks	.92780	5.68036	3.00	219.00	.001

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00021	4.82629	133.81048	4.82629	.60548	7.97106	.005
VAR00022	4.96185	176.9737	4.96185	.80079	6.19616	.014
VAR00027	2.28447	147.34782	2.28447	.66673	3.42636	.065

Therefore: Significant Differences existed between the two samples with regard to
Uncertainty Avoidance, particularly among Questions 21 and
22.

(3) A *MANOVA* was used on the aggregate data from both West and East German
companies, with the Individualism/Collectivism Questions acting as the dependent
variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.09605	5.23500	4.00	218.00	.000
Wilks	.91236	5.23500	4.00	218.00	.000

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00001	2.70342	98.94681	2.70342	.44772	6.03815	.015
VAR00002	3.10236	92.99630	3.10236	.42080	7.37256	.007
VAR00004	1.94743	105.92701	1.94743	.47931	4.06301	.045
VAR00007	1.91571	136.07533	1.91571	.61573	3.11130	.079

Therefore: Significant Differences existed between the two samples with regard to
Individualism/Collectivism, particularly among Questions 1, 2
and 4.

(4) A *MANOVA* was used on the aggregate data from both West and East German
companies, with the Masculinity/Femininity Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.08464	2.59968	7.00	215.00	.014
Wilks	.92196	2.59968	7.00	215.00	.014

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00002	3.10236	92.99630	3.10236	.42080	7.37256	.007
VAR00005	4.01139	88.22179	4.01139	.39919	10.04873	.002
VAR00006	.40091	165.24932	.40091	.74773	.53616	.465
VAR00008	2.56306	111.67013	2.56306	.50529	5.07240	.025
VAR00011	.41009	125.78722	.41009	.56917	.72050	.397
VAR00013	.02202	173.48471	.02202	.78500	.02805	.867
VAR00014	.85920	220.98833	.85920	.99995	.85925	.355

Therefore: Significant Differences existed between the two samples with regard to Masculinity/Femininity, particularly with Questions 2, 5 and 8.

(5) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from West German companies, with the Power Distance Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.08445	.95403	9.00	305.00	.478
Wilks	.92069	.96254	9.00	250.83	.472

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00019	2.07954	56.26909	.69318	.53590	1.29349	.281
VAR00020	2.95575	90.27360	.98525	.85975	1.14598	.334
VAR00026	1.05965	78.22475	.35322	.74500	.47412	.701

Therefore: Significant Differences did not exist among companies in the West German sample in regard to Power Distance.

(6) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from West German companies, with the Uncertainty Avoidance Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.34304	3.87507	9.00	305.00	.000
Wilks	.73481	3.76171	9.00	250.83	.000

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00021	3.34064	63.33826	1.11355	.60322	1.84600	.143
VAR00022	12.63878	53.59975	4.21293	.51047	8.25297	.000
VAR00027	3.64124	56.68904	1.21375	.53990	2.24811	.087

Therefore: Significant Differences existed among companies in the West German sample with regard to Uncertainty Avoidance, particularly with Questions 20 and 21.

(7) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from West German companies, with the Individualism/Collectivism Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.05800	.48657	12.00	302.00	.922
Wilks	.94445	.49163	12.00	270.16	.919

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00001	.96339	35.62377	.32113	.33927	.94652	.421
VAR00002	.11338	42.60222	.03779	.40574	.09315	.964
VAR00004	.30380	46.63198	.10127	.44411	.22802	.877
VAR00007	.81131	56.10612	.27044	.53434	.50611	.679

Therefore: Significant Differences did not exist among companies in the West German sample with regard to Individualism/Collectivism.

(8) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from West German companies, with the Masculinity/Femininity Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.24730	1.15014	21.00	293.00	.295
Wilks	.79221	1.14610	21.00	284.82	.300

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00002	.11338	42.60222	.03779	.40574	.09315	.007
VAR00005	.79732	47.45956	.26577	.45200	.58800	.624
VAR00006	1.35501	79.92939	.45167	.76123	.59334	.621
VAR00008	6.22549	58.45341	2.07516	.55670	3.72762	.014
VAR00011	1.62243	72.72619	.54081	.69263	.78081	.507
VAR00013	3.26570	68.38567	1.08857	.65129	1.67140	.178
VAR00014	3.91867	98.81527	1.30622	.94110	1.38798	.251

Therefore: Significant Differences did not exist overall among companies in the West German companies with regard to Masculinity/Femininity, but did so solely pertaining to Question 8.

(9) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from East German companies, with the Power Distance Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.21205	1.86726	12.00	317.00	.038
Wilks	.82118	1.82561	12.00	283.39	.044

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00019	4.27685	59.68806	1.06921	.54760	1.95255	.107
VAR00020	13.51119	101.09408	3.37780	.92747	3.64195	.008
VAR00026	3.71331	141.27792	.92833	1.29613	.71623	.583

Therefore: Significant Differences did exist among companies in the West German sample with regard to Power Distance, particularly among Question 20.

(10) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from East German companies, with the Uncertainty Avoidance Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.37457	3.29833	12.00	317.00	.000
Wilks	.70842	3.28634	12.00	283.39	.000

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00021	8.97865	58.15293	2.24466	.53351	4.20732	.003
VAR00022	4.26440	106.47244	1.06610	.97681	1.09141	.364
VAR00027	14.17143	72.84612	3.54286	.66831	5.30119	.001

Therefore: Significant Differences existed among companies in the East German sample with regard to Uncertainty Avoidance, particularly with Questions 21 and 27.

(11) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from East German companies, with the Individualism/Collectivism Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.29190	1.90647	16.00	418.00	.018
Wilks	.76012	1.90488	16.00	324.47	.019

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00001	3.55732	58.80233	.88933	.53947	1.64852	.167
VAR00002	1.40593	48.87477	.35148	.44839	.78387	.538
VAR00004	3.51580	55.47543	.87895	.50895	1.72699	.149
VAR00007	8.95233	70.20556	2.23808	.64409	3.47481	.010

Therefore: Significant Differences did exist among companies in the East German sample with regard to Individualism/Collectivism, particularly Question 7.

(12) A *MANOVA* was used on the data from East German companies, with the Masculinity/Femininity Questions acting as the dependent variables.

The results are the following:

<i>Test Name</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Exact F</i>	<i>Hypoth. DF</i>	<i>Error DF</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
Hotellings	.40160	1.45581	28.00	406.00	.065
Wilks	.68753	1.45789	28.00	372.79	.065

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Hypoth. SS</i>	<i>Error SS</i>	<i>Hypoth. MS</i>	<i>Error MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig. of F</i>
VAR00002	1.40593	48.87477	.35148	.44839	.78387	.538
VAR00005	1.10368	38.86124	.27592	.35653	.77391	.544
VAR00006	10.09116	73.87376	2.52279	.67774	3.72235	.007
VAR00008	.73303	46.25820	.18326	.42439	.43182	.785
VAR00011	3.42049	48.01811	.85512	.44053	1.94111	.109
VAR00013	4.07939	97.75394	1.01985	.89683	1.13718	.343
VAR00014	10.71888	107.53550	2.67972	.98656	2.71622	.033

Therefore: Significant Differences did exist among companies in the East German companies with regard to Masculinity/Femininity, particularly Questions 6 and 14.

III. FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor Analysis is a term for a general description for several specific computational techniques. All of them have the objective of reducing many variables down to a more manageable number that belong together and that may or may not have overlapping measurement characteristics (Cooper and Emory, 1995, p. 538).

A Principal Component *Factor Analyses* were administered to the data collected. In parenthesis is the number of factors with an Eigenvalue greater than 1.00. The total percentage of variation explained shown for each company is the amount of variance explained for the factors that have an Eigenvalue of greater than 1.00.

A *Factor Analysis* was computed for each company, with the variables within each company being the answers to the 4 sets of questions that specifically determine Hofstede's four cultural dimensions.

WEST GERMAN COMPANIES:

Company A :

Power Distance = 46.7 % (1)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 81.2 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 70.3 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 62.9 % (3)

Company B :

Power Distance = 81.1 % (2)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 55.2 % (1)

Individualism/Collectivism = 68.1 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 68.4 % (3)

Company C :

Power Distance = 82.0 % (2)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 81.8 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 76.8 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 76.3 % (4)

Company D :

Power Distance = 43.4 % (1)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 40.5 % (1)

Individualism/Collectivism = 56.1 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 78.1 % (4)

EAST GERMAN COMPANIES:

Company Z :

Power Distance = 45.3 % (1)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 81.2 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 73.4 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 57.1 % (2)

Company X :

Power Distance = 48.5 % (1)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 85.3 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 49.6 % (1)

Masculinity/Femininity = 61.7 % (2)

Company Y :

Power Distance = 70.1 % (2)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 82.8 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 65.0 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 60.2 % (2)

Company U :

Power Distance = 48.5 % (1)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 78.4 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 72.2 % (2)

Masculinity/Femininity = 72.1 % (3)

Company V :

Power Distance = 79.9 % (2)

Uncertainty Avoidance = 76.9 % (2)

Individualism/Collectivism = 71.3 % (2)

$$\text{Masculinity/Femininity} = 75.2 \% (3)$$

It will be noticed that on some cultural dimensions the number of factors are up near 3 or 4. These are acceptable because (1) the cultures companies themselves may have affected them (meaning added on a factor or two) and/or (2) as stated in Armstrong, the technique of Factor Analysis itself has a tendency a factor to the results.

CULTURAL DIMENSION INDICES

THE RESULTS USING THE HOFSTEDE FORMULAS (FROM THE "MEASURES" SECTION) ON THE DATA TO CALCULATE THE CULTURAL DIMENSION INDICES ARE THE FOLLOWING:

Cultural Dimension Indices' Tables

Each of the four following tables represent a single cultural dimension and the index scores of the nine German companies involved in this study, as well as the index scores for West Germany (the mean scores of the West German companies), East Germany (the mean index scores for the East German companies) and for "Germany" (the mean index scores for all nine companies together).

(1) *Power Distance Index (PDI) Values by Company Based on the Scores of Questions 19, 20 and 26.*

COMPANY or GROUP	PDI
<i>Company A (West).....</i>	<i>70.04</i>
<i>Company C (West).....</i>	<i>67.79</i>
<i>Company Z (East).....</i>	<i>67.78</i>
<i>West German Companies.....</i>	<i>66.61</i>
<i>GERMANY.....</i>	<i>63.38</i>
<i>Company B (West).....</i>	<i>65.32</i>
<i>Company D (West).....</i>	<i>63.12</i>
<i>Company X (East).....</i>	<i>62.30</i>
<i>East German Companies.....</i>	<i>60.29</i>
<i>Company Y (East).....</i>	<i>57.36</i>
<i>Company U (East).....</i>	<i>55.09</i>
<i>Company V (East).....</i>	<i>53.73</i>

(2) *Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) Values by Company Based on the Scores of Questions 21, 22 and 27.*

COMPANY or GROUP	UAI
<i>Company D (West)</i>	133.08
<i>Company A (West)</i>	108.74
<i>West German Companies</i>	106.33
<i>Company V (East)</i>	102.63
<i>Company C (West)</i>	101.96
GERMANY	95.74
<i>Company U (East)</i>	90.57
<i>Company Y (East)</i>	87.06
<i>East German Companies</i>	85.63
<i>Company B (West)</i>	85.10
<i>Company X (East)</i>	84.26
<i>Company Z (East)</i>	72.31

(3) *Individualism/Collectivism Index (IDV/CLV) Values by Company Based on the Scores of Questions 1, 2, 4 and 7..*

COMPANY or GROUP	IDV/CLV
<i>Company X (East).....</i>	150.00
<i>Company B (West).....</i>	141.96
<i>Company Z (East).....</i>	141.40
<i>West German Companies.....</i>	138.07
<i>Company C (West).....</i>	137.93
GERMANY.....	137.89
<i>East German Companies.....</i>	137.71
<i>Company A (West).....</i>	137.03
<i>Company Y (East).....</i>	136.84
<i>Company D (West).....</i>	134.37
<i>Company V (East).....</i>	128.94
<i>Company U (East).....</i>	127.38

(4) *Masculinity/Femininity Index (MAS/FEM)* Values by Company Based on the Scores of Questions 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 14.

COMPANY or GROUP	MAS/FEM
<i>Company V (East)</i>	48.68
<i>Company X (East)</i>	45.65
<i>Company U (East)</i>	40.47
<i>Company A (West)</i>	36.11
<i>Company B (West)</i>	31.25
<i>East German Companies</i>	29.16
GERMANY	24.88
<i>West German Companies</i>	20.41
<i>Company Z (East)</i>	11.71
<i>Company C (West)</i>	10.34
<i>Company Y (East)</i>	6.57
<i>Company D (West)</i>	3.12

Cultural Dimension Indices' Charts

The forthcoming table of abbreviations and three charts are reproduced from Hofstede's 1980 article titled "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad", pages 50-52 and 54. Hofstede referred to them as "Cultural Maps of the World" because "the vertical and horizontal axes and the circles around

clusters of countries have been drawn subjectively, in order to show the degree of proximity of geographically or historically related countries” (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 48).

However, added onto these original charts of Hofstede’s are the index plots of the nine companies from this study, the two groupings of West and East Germany and the overall index for Germany’97.

In regard to the information illustrated on Charts 1, 2 and 3, one can tell to whether each of the nine German companies, the West and East German groups, and Germany’97 had either (1) a small or large Power Distance, (2) a weak or small Uncertainty Avoidance, (3) an Individualist or Collectivist dominance and (4) a Masculine or Feminine dominance. This is done by looking at the mean score for each of the nine German companies within each Cultural Dimension. If a company, West and East Germany and Germany’97 had a index score above the mean score of that particular dimension in Hofstede’s 1980 study, then it would be designated as having: *Large Power Distance, Strong Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualistic and Masculine*. Likewise, if the company had a index score that was below that of Hofstede’s 1980 mean score for that particular dimension, then it would be designated as having: *Small Power Distance, Weak Uncertainty Avoidance, Collectivistic and Feminine*.

In addition, one can see how the index plots from this study compare and contrast with those plots of Hofstede’s indices from around the world.

Reproduced below, from Hofstede’s 1980 article (page 50), is a chart showing the names for the countries initially used in Hofstede’s study and their abbreviations used in the charts.

THE 40 COUNTRIES

ARG	Argentina	FRA	France	JAP	Japan	SIN	Singapore
AUL	Australia	GBR	Great Britain	MEX	Mexico	SPA	Spain
AUT	Austria	GER	Germany-West	NET	Netherlands	SWE	Sweden
BEL	Belgium	GRE	Greece	NOR	Norway	SWI	Switzerland
BRA	Brazil	HOK	Hong Kong	NZL	New Zealand	TAI	Taiwan
CAN	Canada	IND	India	PAK	Pakistan	THA	Thailand
CHL	Chile	IRA	Iran	PER	Peru	TUR	Turkey
COL	Colombia	IRE	Ireland	PHI	Philippines	USA	United States
DEN	Denmark	ISR	Israel	POR	Portugal	VEN	Veneuela
FIN	Finland	ITA	Italy	SAF	South Africa	YUG	Yugoslavia

ABBREVIATIONS FROM THIS STUDY

E.G.	East Germany	W.G.	West Germany	GER'97	Germany'97
------	--------------	------	--------------	--------	------------

Figure 5
THE POSITION OF THE 40 COUNTRIES
ON THE POWER DISTANCE AND UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE SCALES

Figure 6
THE POSITION OF THE 40 COUNTRIES
ON THE POWER DISTANCE AND INDIVIDUALISM SCALES

• U (55, 127)

• Y (53, 128)

• Y (57, 136) • D (63, 134)

• GER '97 (63, 134)

• EG (60, 137) • C (67, 137) • A (70, 137)

• WG (66, 138)

• B (65, 141) • Z (67, 141)

• X (62, 150)

Figure 7
THE POSITION OF THE 40 COUNTRIES
ON THE UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE AND MASCULINITY SCALES

The *Power Distance* mean score in Hofstede's 1980 study was 51. The nine companies in this study ranged from having mean scores of 53.73 - 70.04. Therefore, all nine companies can be designated as having **Large Power Distances**.

The *Uncertainty Avoidance* mean score in Hofstede's 1980 study was 64. The nine companies in this study ranged from having mean scores of 72.31 - 133.08. Therefore, all nine companies can be designated as having **Strong Uncertainty Avoidances**.

The *Individualism/Collectivism* mean score in Hofstede's 1980 study was 51. The nine companies in this study ranged from having mean scores from 127.38 - 150.00. Therefore, all nine companies can be designated as being **Collectivist**.

The *Masculinity/Femininity* mean score in Hofstede's 1980 study was 51. The nine companies in this study ranged from having mean scores from 3.12 - 48.68. Therefore, all nine companies can be designated as being **Feminine**.

Likewise, the sub-groups of "East Germany" and "West Germany", as well as the combination of those two groups dubbed "Germany'97", all fall within the same designations.

CONCLUSIONS & DISCUSSION

The fundamental hypothesis of this thesis, that the organizational cultures of West and East Germany are distinct, was confirmed by the results of the first four *MANOVAs*. Significant differences did appear on all accounts of Hofstede's four different cultural

dimension; *Power Distance*, *Uncertainty Avoidance*, *Individualism/Collectivism* and *Masculinity/Femininity*. This gives support, but of course it can not be conclusively proven, to what Carr and Paul argued in their article titled “Unification and its Aftermath: The Challenge of History” (See Research Objective Section), both evolutionary in nature and difficult to change. Hence, it may be that the communist rule over 25% of the German population from 1945-1990 did create or contribute to a significantly different German culture in the East from that which existed in the West.

The remaining eight *MANOVAs* showed that significant differences existed among both West and East German companies in their respective “national cultures”. The significant differences existed among the East German companies on all accounts of Hofstede’s four cultural dimensions. Likewise, significant differences existed among the West German companies as well, however, it was only in the cultural dimension of *Uncertainty Avoidance* in which they were found.

In looking at the answers to Questions 32 and 33 from the questionnaire (Question 32. *What is your nationality? & Question 33. And, what was your nationality at birth (if different from your present nationality)?*), only 3 non- “Germans” answered questionnaires in the total sample of 223; from the East German companies there was one Austrian and one Irishman, and from the West German companies there was one Austrian. Except for the one Austrian case, all of the remaining West German sample of questionnaires (109 in total), were filled out by present-day Germans citizens that were born in the former West Germany.

However, the distinction between being born in the former West or East Germany becomes more blurred when looking at the answers to Questions 32 and 33 from the East German sample. In only 18 questionnaires, out of the total 114 from the East German companies, did the German citizen acknowledge that the former East Germany was the country in which they were born. The typical response to question 32 was either: *Deutsch* (German) or *BDR (Bundes Republik Deutschland / Federal Republic of Germany)* and nothing was written on the line to question 33 other than a dash-mark.

The responses to the answers to questions 32 and 33 from the East German sample are worthy of comment. There had to have been more than just 12.5% of the workers in these East German companies that were born into East Germany as citizens. This includes the possibility that some of the respondents were West Germans who are now working with East German companies. It might be, because of this low number acknowledged, that many East Germans since re-unification have chosen to reject their former nation in favor of their new nation.

In regard to the Cultural Dimension Indices that were produced from this study for the West and East German samples as wholes, some surprising results were found.

West Germany

A comparison should first be made between the Cultural Dimension indices for West Germany from this study and the those from Hofstede's 1980 study. It is important to remember here again that what constituted as "Germany" in Hofstede's 1980 study was, in fact, only those responses taken from West Germany, since no communist

countries were included in his study. In addition, it should be noted again that Hofstede's mean scores for his cultural dimensions from his 1980 study were the cut-off designation points, both for this section and the *East Germany* section forthcoming. The following is a dual-table of Hofstede's indices for West Germany and this study's indices for West Germany.

HOFSTEDE'S "GERMANY" (WEST GERMANY) CULTURAL SCORES

Power Distance Index	Designation	Uncertainty Avoidance Index	Designation	Individualism/Collectivism Index	Designation	Masculinity/Femininity Index	Designation
35	Small	65	Strong	67	Individualist	66	Masculine

OBSERVED WEST GERMANY CULTURAL SCORES

Power Distance Index	Designation	Uncertainty Avoidance Index	Designation	Individualism/Collectivism Index	Designation	Masculinity/Femininity Index	Designation
66	Large	106	Strong	138	Individualist	20	Feminine

As can be seen from comparing these two charts, two of the Cultural Dimension Indices changed to their opposite poles from Hofstede's study to this study. West Germany's Power Distance index from Hofstede's study almost doubled, it changed from a Small to a Large designation, and in Masculinity/Femininity, it decreased dramatically, thus going from Masculine to Feminine for its designation. The other two Cultural Dimension Indices of Uncertainty Avoidance and Individualism/Collectivism both increased substantially from Hofstede's study to this study, but maintained their respective designations. This leads to the conclusion that either (1) in the years between 1980 and 1997, things have changed in West Germany and/or (2) that the differences that

exist in the organizational cultures (proven with the MANOVA) are real. Contrary to this, however, could be the case that the sample used for this study, because of the sampling method (explained further in the *Limitations* section) was not at all truly representative of East German companies.

In regard to the first conclusion, because of almost two decades having past and the changes that happen naturally in a country's life in any period of that length, attitudes and the culture may have deviated enough to produce these varied results in this 1997 study. In regard to the second conclusion, "organizational" cultural differences existing within the framework of the "national" cultural differences between the East and West Germanies may provide the explanation for the changed indices. However, if one takes into account the argument that cultures are supposed to be stable over time, this would not hold sway. Unless, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the re-unification of Germany had a two-way cultural effect on both former German cultures. The view most predominantly taken is that the fall of the Berlin Wall set East Germany on a drastically different cultural road leading it inevitably with *Anschluss* (connection) with the dominant West German culture. However, maybe because of the changes in designation of West Germany's *Power Distance* and *Uncertainty Avoidance*, that the fall of the Berlin Wall possibly had a significant impact on West German "national" culture.

Another argument for the changes in all the indices, and specifically for the two designations of *Power Distance* and *Uncertainty Avoidance* for West Germany, could be because significant differences existed between the companies used in this study and IBM; the company from which Hofstede derived his 1980 results for West Germany.

Indeed, this study has shown that significant differences exist between organizations. None of the companies in this study from West Germany were high-technology computer companies. But, the Fax capability of the German companies from the East may mean that they (meaning the East German companies) are highly technical compared to the typical East German company. It was beyond the scope of this study to ascertain whether this was the case. Along these lines, maybe the discrepancies came about as a result of industry and company differences, rather than a change in the “national” culture of West Germany.

East Germany

With the East German Cultural Dimension Indices, the comparison between Hofstede’s results and the results of this study can not be made as sharply. This is again because of the absence of any communist countries in Hofstede’s original 1980 study. In the *East Germany - An Overview* section, this study relied on historical reference to try to estimate where approximately East Germany’s Cultural Dimension Indices would have been designated. “Designated” is the key word because any attempt to try to actually produce a real numerical index for the East German Cultural Dimensions would have proved to be impossible. The following is a dual-table of the estimated Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension designations from the *East Germany - An Overview* section and the actual Cultural Dimension Indices and designations that came out of this study.

ESTIMATED EAST GERMANY CULTURAL DESIGNATIONS

Power Distance Designation	Uncertainty Avoidance Designation	Individualism/Collectivism Designation	Masculinity/Femininity Designation
Large	Strong	Collectivist	Feminine

OBSERVED EAST GERMANY CULTURAL SCORES

Power Distance Index Designation	Uncertainty Avoidance Index Designation	Individualism/Collectivism Index Designation	Masculinity/Femininity Index Designation
60 Large	85 Strong	137 Individualist	29 Feminine

As can be seen from comparing these two charts, three of the Cultural Dimension Designations was predicted correctly and only one was not. Most surprisingly, the *Individualism/Collectivism* was the cultural dimension predicted by this author with the most confidence to be proven *Collectivist*. *Collectivism* was thought to be dominant over *Individualism* in East Germany because so much of the former communist states relied on socialist societies and the interdependence of the populations within them. Obviously, the results from this study did support this claim. Perhaps because companies were used in this study, and companies in a capitalistic economy and market such as that of present-day united Germany tend to be competitive in nature, that this accounted for the *Individualist* designation in the results. Hofstede stated that “the emphasis is on individual initiative and achievement” in a *Individualist* society. This emphasis on achievement, meaning growth and profits in a capitalist market, may have accounted for the change in designation.

In the *East Germany - An Overview* section of this thesis, it was noted how the Communist states would “dictate” the lives the of the people living under them and did

not tolerate deviant ideas and behavior; which are common characteristics of “strong” *Uncertainty Avoidance*. The results from this study supported that assessment.

In addition it had also been predicted that since inequality was so pronounced in the former Communist countries (i.e. party officials and loyalists reaping benefits not open to the general public) East Germany would have had large *Power Distance* designation. The results of this study showed that East Germany that this was case.

Lastly, the *Feminine* designation for East Germany proved to be true as well. It was estimated that sex roles in East German society were more loosely defined, and that those “feminine” characteristics of a society that Hofstede stated were more pronounced than those of his “masculine” characteristics.

Germany

When taking the results of all nine German companies together from this study, thus making up “Germany ‘97”, one can determine just how differently it would have ranked among the other 39 countries in Hofstede’s 1980 study. In Hofstede’s 1980 book titled Culture’s Consequences, he ranks the 39 countries that participated in his study for each of his four cultural dimensions. The cultural dimensions’ ranking tables for the 39 countries are and appear on, respectively: *Power Distance*, p. 77, *Uncertainty Avoidance*, p. 122, *Individualism/Collectivism*, p. 158 and *Masculinity/Femininity*, p. 189. Of course, in comparing “Germany” from this study, to the countries of the 1980 study, is analogous to comparing apples and oranges, it is nonetheless interesting to at least note the changes that have taken place since 1980.

In regard to Power Distance in Hofstede's 1980 study, Germany ranked 29th out of the 39 countries and had an index of 35. The mean score of the 39 countries (which determined a large or small designation) was 51. In this study, Germany had an index of 63, which means that it would have increased to a ranking of 13 out of 39, tying it with Chile and Portugal and of course giving it a "large" Power distance designation.

In Hofstede's study, Germany was ranked in 20th place, with an index of 65, for *Uncertainty Avoidance*. The cut-off for a "strong" or "weak" Uncertainty Avoidance was the mean score of the 39 countries, which was 64. The Germany from this study would have ranked third, only behind Greece and Portugal, with an index of 95.

With respect to Individualism/Collectivism, Germany in Hofstede's study ranked 15th, with an index of 67 and the cut-off between being Masculine or Feminine being greater or lower than 51. The Germany from this study would have ranked off the chart in Hofstede's original study. With an index of 137, Germany would be in the first ranking with the USA following behind with an index of 91.

Lastly, in regard to Masculinity/Femininity, Germany in Hofstede's 1980 study ranked 9th out of 39, with an index of 66, and the mean score for the cut-off of being either Masculine or Feminine at 51. The Germany of this study would be ranked 36th out of the possible 39, falling in between Finland and Denmark, with an index of only 24.

Again, taking "Germany" from this study and comparing it with data from countries that, in a sense, have remained "frozen" with the 1980 data is not that beneficial. It may be provocative, however, for others to provide updated values from

other countries. Further, it does illustrate how Germany may have ranked differently, had Hofstede included the former East Germany in his make-up of "Germany" as a whole.

The factor analysis results, which should only show one factor for each of the four dimensions, clearly show that Masculinity/Femininity measures more than just one concept at present. This is because six out of the nine times, the Masculinity/Femininity scales produce three or four factors.

LIMITATIONS

One limitation of this thesis was the lack of a solid basis to which the results from the East German companies can be compared. Unlike the West German companies from whose results can be compared with Hofstede's 1980 results, the East German companies were lacking a similar basis. Hofstede's results for what he dubbed as "Germany" were in actuality, only those results of West Germany. Hofstede did not include any communist countries either in his original study or his follow-up 1994 study. That means that this author had to rely on cultural and historical reference in the *East Germany - An Overview* section of this thesis, in order to best estimate where East Germany *would* have been on Hofstede's cultural dimension indices had he included them in his original study.

An additional limitation that could have possibly affected this study was the non-random distribution of the questionnaires within the German companies - in other words *bias*. The German contact people that the questionnaires were sent to were given instructions asking them nicely to please hand out the questionnaires in a random method,

to get the proper effect. Of course, there is no guarantee that the German contact person did that. As a method of convenience to either him or her, they may have just handed the questionnaires out to those people who work closely with them, acquaintances or even friends at the company. This could have created bias because those people will mostly likely share the same attitudes, opinions and feeling that the contact person has because they interact so much. But again, there was no way for this researcher to know whether the act of random distribution to the workers was done or not.

Lastly, a limitation would be the non-randomness of the sample method, thus creating a lack a generalizeability with the results of this study. To be included in this study, the German companies were screened by three types of criteria. When the author found a German company in the index books at the German Embassy, the company first had to (1) fit into the region of Germany that was desired (meaning West or East), and (2) the company had to have at least 200 employees to designate it a “large” company, and (3) the company had to have a fax number listed with it. These three criteria obviously created a non-random sample being picked of German companies. Any generalizeability ensuing from the results of this study can only be made within the framework of the 9 German organizations, anything made beyond that realm should be treated with caution.

The minimum number of employees chosen to be at 200 to designate a “large” company comes from the work of researchers Herbert A. Simon and Charles P. Bonini, titled The Size Distribution of Business Firms and Bertil Naslund (1977) . This research argues that small businesses have cultures that are very different than those of large businesses. And that, above a critical minimum (taken as 200 employees for purposes of

this research), there exist approximately constant returns to scale. It is natural to expect large firms to have the same chance on the average of increasing or decreasing in size in proportion to their present size. (Simon and Bonini, 1958, p. 609).

RESEARCH BENEFITS

Since the expected differences between West and East German organizational cultures did appear, one of the research benefits that will result from this thesis is a better understanding both on the theoretical level and on the empirical level of how organizational cultures can differ between former Socialist block countries and present capitalist countries. On the theoretical level, the understanding derived from this study is that the cultures of organizations operating in the western countries are fundamentally different than those of organizations operating in the former Soviet Union. On the empirical level, the indices compiled for the nine companies that resulted from this study show that a common thread that may exist now for all companies, no matter where they operate; in the former Soviet Union or not, is that of *Individualism*. That is because the numerical indices for West and East Germany were closest among all the cultural dimensions in *Individualism*. This is explained further in the following paragraph.

Some unexpected results came out of this study as well. One was the fact that the East German national culture turned out to have an *Individualistic* designation, as opposed to *Collectivistic*. As stated before, due to the collectivistic ideals that are so inherent in socialism, this result was quite surprising. Coupled with this, is the fact that

even though the national cultures of West and East Germany had Individualism indices that were 138.7 and 137.71 respectively, the MANOVA proved that there was a significant difference between them. Thus, the *Individualism/Collectivism* proved to be the closest cultural dimension shared between the two Germanies. As suggested previously in the *Conclusions and Discussion* section, this may be due to the fact that all nine of the companies in this study are competing in a capitalistic market, in which elements such as company growth, market share and profits (meaning *Individualist* characteristics) determine whether a company is to going to survive or not.

In addition, the results centering around the West German cultural indices of past and present spawned some interesting results. West Germany went from a small to large Power Distance designation, as well as from a Masculine to a Feminine designation, from Hofstede's 1980 study to this study. As suggested earlier, this may be because the fall of the Berlin Wall did not just have a one-way cultural effect on East Germany, but also effected West Germany's culture more than anyone might have suspected.

What this author would like to know now, given the results from this study, is what are the true reasons for the discrepancies among cultural indices from Hofstede's 1980 study to this study. At this point, only speculation can be made as to how these changes came about; no doubt that multi-reasons do exist and contributed to them. But it would be very interesting to know what aspects contributed the greatest to the change of West Germany from a small to a large Power Distance and from Masculine to Feminine. As well as, why exactly the a *Collectivist* designation for East Germany, which was predicted with so much confidence, proved to be actually *Individualist* in this study.

By studying the differences that exist between the former West and East Germany, this research will allow managers to gain better knowledge and be better prepared for business opportunities in Germany. Managers will be able to see that although significant differences did exist on all of Hofstede's four cultural dimensions between the two Germanies, the common thread between them was their Individualism cultural dimension, which their indices were so close to one another. This will add to their chances of success in business endeavors in this market..

Lastly, this thesis has developed new scores for evaluating former Socialist block countries will be developed from this thesis. As stated earlier in this thesis, there is a lacking of solid base of comparison for doing studies concerning organizational cultures in former communist countries. This thesis will provide such a basis.

Future research that could be done is for this measure (Hofstede's questionnaire) to be applied to other former communist countries. This would enable academics and researchers to see if the results of East Germany from this study are isolated in nature, or whether they are quite common among some or all former communist countries. Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria etc., all represent countries to which the results of this study could be compared and a great deal more from could be learned to better the understanding of organizational culture as a whole.

APPENDIX 1

WEST GERMAN

(1) *Christmann & Pfeifer Möbelsysteme GmbH & Co. KG*

Address: Postfach 1161
D-35233, Breidenbach
Number of Employees: 540
Type: Electrical Product Manufacturer
Fax Number: 011-49-064654491

(2) *Hüttinger Elektronik GmbH*

Address: Elsaßer Straße 8
D-79110, Freiburg
Number of Employees: 242
Type: Electrical Equipment
Fax Number: 011-49-0761-806372

(3) *ABBSchalt-und Steuerungstechnik GmbH*

Address: Eppelheimer Straße 82
D-69123, Heidelberg
Number of Employees: 400
Type: Electrical and Motor Equipment
Fax Number: 011-49-06221-777111

(4) *Luehr Staubtechnik GmbH & Co. KG*

Address: Enzer Straße 26
D-31655, Stadthagen
Number of Employees: 354
Type: Pharmaceuticals and Pesticides
Fax Number: 011-49-05721-708214

EAST GERMAN

(1) *Ceram Tec AG*

Address: Bahnhofstraße 5
D-95631, Wunsiedel
Number of Employees: 1,500
Type: Textile and Polyester Manufacturer
Fax Number: 011-49-923250106

(2) *Brandenburgische Tuchfabriken GmbH*

Address: Inselstraße 30/31
D-03149, Forst
Number of Employees: 220
Type: Clothing Manufacturer
Fax Number: 011-49-0356298816

(3) *Deutsche Telekom Computer Service*

Address: Lübecker Straße 2
D-39124, Magdeburg
Number of Employees: 840
Type: Computer Manufacturer
Fax Number: 011-49-0391222523

(4) *Erdöl-Erdgas Gommern GmbH*

Address: Postfach 21
D-39241, Gommern
Number of Employees: 572
Type: Gas & Electrical Equipment
Fax: 011-49-3920051295

(5) *MTW Schiffswerft GmbH*

Address: Wendorfer Weg 5
D-23966, Wismar
Number of Employees: 2,300
Type: Chemical Producer
Fax Number: 011-49-3841-763624

APPENDIX 2

PRELIMINARY LETTER TO BE FAXED (ENGLISH VERSION)

German Company's Name
Street Address
Postal Code City, Germany

Date

Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Kyle Knapp and I am an American graduate student of International Business at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. I am currently writing my thesis titled "Organizational Culture in Germany: A Comparison Between West and East German Companies". For this thesis, I am conducting a study that requires me to send out questionnaires to German companies operating in both the former West and East Germanies.

I would like to include your company in my study. I wish to send 30 questionnaires to a specific person in your company, who can then distribute them to 30 workers in the company. It does not matter as to the level of the employees within the company they are distributed to, meaning that a questionnaire could be given to a factory-floor worker or a high ranking manager. Each questionnaire will take less than ten minutes to fill out. Then when all 30 questionnaires are collected, the contact person will place them in the self-addressed return envelope that will be included in the initial package (German postage already paid). The whole process should take less than 15 minutes.

If you are willing to participate in my study, please provide me with the name of a person (and the department he or she is in) to whom I could address the questionnaires. This person can expect to receive the questionnaires approximately in the first week of November, 1996.

Please advise me if you are willing to participate in my study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much,

Kyle Knapp

Fax Number: 001-613-520-4427
or E-mail: kknapp@business.carleton.ca

PRELIMINARY LETTER TO BE FAXED
(GERMAN VERSION)

Firmas Name
Straße Adresse
Postfach Stadt, Deutschland

Datum

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

Mein Name ist Kyle Knapp. Ich bin ein amerikanischer Universitätsstudent in der Fakultät für Internationale Wirtschaft und Handel an der Carleton Universität in Ottawa, Kanada. Zur Zeit schreibe ich eine Dissertation über "Organisatorische Kultur in Deutschland: ein Vergleich zwischen Westdeutschen und Ostdeutschen Betrieben". Teil dieses Arbeit ist eine Studie, die erfordert, dass ich Fragebögen an deutsche Firmen schicke, die in den beiden ehemals deutschen Staaten in Betrieb sind.

Ich würde gern Ihre firma in meine Studie aufnehmen. Das erfordert, dass ich 30 Fragebögen an eine Kontaktperson in Ihrer firma schicke, die sie dann an 30 Angestellte verteilen kann. Es ist egal, ob es Angestellte in höheren administrativen Positionen oder Fabrikarbeiter sind, die den Fragebogen erhalten. Mehr als 10 Minuten sind nicht notwendig, um den Fragebogen auszufüllen. Die Kontaktperson sollte dann die 30 Bögen einsammeln und in den bereits frankierten Briefumschlag legen, den ich dem ersten Paket beifüge. Der ganze Vorgang sollte weniger als eine Viertelstunde in Anspruch nehmen.

Sollten Sie bereit sein, an meiner Studie teilzunehmen, so schicken Sie mir doch bitte den Namen einer Kontaktperson in Ihrer Firma und deren Abteilung, damit ich die Fragebögen der Person zuschicken kann. Die Fragebögen sollten vorraussichtlich in der letzten Novemberwoche, 1996 eintreffen.

Bitte teilen Sie mir so bald wie möglich mit, ob sie bereit sind, an dieser Studie teilzunehmen. Ihre Mitwirkung wurde mir sehr helfen.

Mir herzlichen Dank im Voraus,

Kyle Knapp

Fax Nummer: 001-613-520-4427 oder
E-Mail: kknapp@business.carleton.ca

APPENDIX 3

INSTRUCTIONAL COVER-LETTER TO ACCOMPANY QUESTIONNAIRES (ENGLISH VERSION)

Contact Person's Name
German Company's Name
Street Address
Postal Code City, Germany

Date

Dear Contact Person,

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in my study, your contribution is greatly appreciated. What is required of you is to distribute each one of these questionnaires in a random order to any 30 of your co-workers in your company. It does not make any difference as to the level that any employee holds in the company, meaning that it could be a factory-floor worker that fills out a questionnaire or a high ranking manager.

Thank you very much for taking time out of your schedule to help me in this study, again it is very appreciated. I wish you and your company well in all your future endeavors.

Again, Thank You!

Kyle Knapp
School of Business
7th Floor
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
Canada

INSTRUCTIONAL COVER-LETTER TO ACCOMPANY
QUESTIONNAIRES
(GERMAN VERSION)

Kontaktpersons Name

Datum

Firmas Name

Straße Adresse

Postfach Stadt, Deutschland

Sehr geehrter Kontaktperson,

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Bereitwilligkeit, an meiner Studie teilzunehmen. Für Ihre Mitwirkung bin ich Ihnen sehr dankbar. Würden Sie bitte diese 30 Fragebögen zufällig an irgendwelche Angestellten oder Mitarbeiter in Ihrem Betrieb weitergeben. Für meine Zwecke ist es unwichtig, welchen Stand oder welche Stufe diese Personen in der Firma haben. Das heisst, es könnten Fabrikarbeiter, sowohl als auch Betriebs- oder Abteilungsleiter sein.

Noch einmal vielen Dank im Voraus für Ihre Bereitwilligkeit, sich die Zeit zu nehmen um mir mit meiner Studie zu helfen. Ich wünsche Ihnen und Ihrer Firma alles Gute für Ihre zukünftigen Bestreben.

Mit freundlichem Gruss,

Kyle Knapp
School of Business
7th Floor, Dunton Tower
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
Canada

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please think of an ideal job - disregarding your present job. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you to (please circle one answer number in each line across):

	UTMOST IMPORTANCE	VERY IMPORTANT	MODERATE IMPORTANCE	LITTLE IMPORTANCE	VERY LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
1. Have sufficient time left for your personal or family life?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Have challenging tasks to do, from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Have little tension and stress on the job?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Have a good working relationship with your direct superior?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Have security of employment?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Have considerable freedom to adapt your own approach to the job?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Work with people who cooperate well with one another?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decisions?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Make a real contribution to the success of your company or organization?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Have an opportunity for high earnings?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Serve your country?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Live in an area desirable to you and your family?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs?	1	2	3	4	5

	UTMOST IMPORTANCE	VERY IMPORTANT	MODERATE IMPORTANCE	LITTLE IMPORTANCE	VERY LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
15. Have an element of variety and adventure in the job?	1	2	3	4	5
16. Work in a prestigious, successful company or organization?	1	2	3	4	5
17. Have an opportunity for helping other people?	1	2	3	4	5
18. Work in a well-defined job situation where the requirements are clear?	1	2	3	4	5

The descriptions below apply to four different types of managers. Please read through these descriptions:

MANAGER 1: Usually makes his/her decisions promptly and communicates them to his/her subordinates clearly and firmly. Expects them to carry out the decisions loyally and without raising difficulties.

MANAGER 2: Usually makes his/her decisions promptly, but, before going ahead, tries to explain them fully to his/her subordinates. Gives them the reasons for the decisions and answers whatever questions they may have.

MANAGER 3: Usually consults with his/her subordinates before he/she reaches his/her decisions. Listens to their advice, considers it, and then announces his/her decision. He/she then expects all to work loyally to implement it whether or not it is in accordance with the advice they give.

MANAGER 4: Usually calls a meeting of his/her subordinates when there is an important decision to be made. Puts the problem before the group and invites discussion. Accepts the majority viewpoint as the decision.

19. Now, for the above types of manager, please mark the *one* which you would prefer to work under (circle one answer number only):

1. MANAGER 1
2. MANAGER 2
3. MANAGER 3
4. MANAGER 4

20. And, to which *one* of the above four types of managers would you say your own superior *most closely corresponds*?

1. MANAGER 1
2. MANAGER 2
3. MANAGER 3
4. MANAGER 4

21. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?

1. I ALWAYS FEEL THIS WAY
2. USUALLY
3. SOMETIMES
4. SELDOM
5. I NEVER FEEL THIS WAY.

Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
22. A company or organization's rules should not be broken - even when the employee thinks it is in the organization's best interests.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Most people can be trusted.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Quite a few employees have an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if they can.	1	2	3	4	5
25. A large corporation is generally a more desirable place to work than a small company.	1	2	3	4	5
26. How frequently, in your work environment, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?					
1. VERY FREQUENTLY					
2. FREQUENTLY					
3. SOMETIMES					
4. SELDOM					
5. VERY SELDOM					
27. How long do you think that you will continue working for this company or organization?					
1. TWO YEARS AT THE MOST					
2. FROM TWO TO FIVE YEARS					
3. MORE THAN FIVE YEARS (BUT I PROBABLY WILL LEAVE BEFORE I RETIRE)					
4. UNTIL I RETIRE					
28. Are you:					
1. MALE					
2. FEMALE					
29. How old are you:					
1. UNDER 20					
2. 20-24					
3. 25-29					
4. 30-34					
5. 35-39					
6. 40-49					
7. 50-59					
8. 60 OR OVER					

30. How many years of formal school education did you complete? (Starting with primary school; count only the number of years each course should officially take, even if you spent less or more years on it; if you took part-time or evening courses, count the number of years the same course would have taken you full-time).

1. 10 YEARS OR LESS
2. 11 YEARS
3. 12 YEARS
4. 13 YEARS
5. 14 YEARS
6. 15 YEARS
7. 16 YEARS
8. 17 YEARS
9. 18 YEARS OR MORE

31. What kind of work do you do?

- a. I am a manager (that is, I have at least one hierarchical subordinate) - GO TO F.
- b. I am not a manager and I work most of the time in an office - GO TO E.
- c. I am not a manager and I do not work most of the time in an office - GO TO D.
- d. If you are not a manager and you do *not* work most of the time in an office, what do you do:
 1. Work for which normally no vocational training, other than on-the-job training, is required (unskilled or semi-skilled work).
 2. Work for which normally up to four years of vocational training is required (skilled worker, technician, non-graduate engineer, nurse, etc.)
 3. Work for which normally a higher-level professional training is required (graduate engineer, doctor, architect, etc.)
- e. If you are not a manager and you work most of the time in an office, what do you do:
 4. Work for which normally no higher-level professional training is required (clerk, typist, secretary, non-graduate accountant)
 5. Work for which normally a higher-level professional training is required (graduate accountant, lawyer, etc.)
- f. If you are a manager, are you:
 6. A manager of people who are not managers themselves (that is, a first-line manager)
 7. A manager of other managers

32. What is your nationality? _____

33. And what was your nationality at birth (if different from your present nationality)?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

FRAGEBOGEN

Bitte denken Sie an eine ideale Arbeit. Lassen Sie dabei Ihre gegenwärtige Arbeit ausser acht. Beim Wählen Ihrer idealen Arbeit, wie wichtig sind für Sie die folgenden Ausserungen? (bitte umkreisen Sie die entsprechende Nummer in jeder Zeile)

	ÄUSSERST WICHTIG	ZIEMLICH WICHTIG	EINIGERMASSEN WICHTIG	NICHT SEHR WICHTIG	UNWICHTIG
1. Genügend Zeit für Ihr Familien-oder persönliches Leben übrig zu haben?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Herausfordernde Aufgaben zu haben, die Ihnen einen persönlichen Erfüllung- ssin gibt?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Wenig Stress oder Spannung am Arbeit- splatz zu haben?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gute Arbeitsbedingungen zu haben (gute Entlüftung, Beleuchtung, ausreichend Platz zu arbeiten, usw.)?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Ein gutes Arbeitsverhältnis mit dem unmittelbaren Vorgesetzten zu haben?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Arbeitssicherheit zu haben?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Freiheit zu haben, die eigene Arbeitsweise oder Methode anzuwenden?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Mit Kollegen zu sein, die gut zusammen Arbeiten können?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Von den unmittelbar Vorgesetzten bei Entscheidungen konsultiert zu werden?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Einen wirklichen Beitrag zu dem Erfolg des Betriebes oder der Organisation zu liefern?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Die Möglichkeit, ein hohes Gehalt zu bekommen?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Seinem Land zu dienen?	1	2	3	4	5
13. In einer für Sie und Ihrer Familie wün- schenswerten Gegend zu wohnen?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Die Gelegenheit haben, eine höhere Stellung zu bekommen?	1	2	3	4	5

	ÄUSSERST WICHTIG	ZIEMLICH WICHTIG	EINIGERMASSEN WICHTIG	NICHT SEHR WICHTIG	UNWICHTIG
15. Abenteuer und Abwechslung in der Arbeit zu haben?	1	2	3	4	5
16. In einer angesehenen und erfolgreichen Firma oder Organisation zu arbeiten?	1	2	3	4	5
17. Die Gelegenheit zu haben, Anderen zu helfen?	1	2	3	4	5
18. In einer Stellung zu arbeiten, wo die Erwartungen klar und genau bezeichnet sind?	1	2	3	4	5

Die folgenden Beschreibungen beziehen sich auf vier verschiedene Typen von Betriebsleitern. Bitte lesen sie diese vier Beschreibungen sorgfältig durch, und beantworten Sie dann die Fragen.

Betriebsleiter 1: Trifft seine/ihre Entscheidungen gewöhnlich schnell und teilt sie seinen/ihren Untergeordneten deutlich und bestimmt mit. Er/sie erwartet, dass Entscheidungen treu und ohne Widersprüche ausgeführt werden.

Betriebsleiter 2: Trifft seine/ihre Entscheidungen gewöhnlich schnell, aber bevor sie ausgeführt werden, versucht er/sie sie den Untergeordneten ausführlich zu erklären. Er/sie gibt die Gründe für Entscheidungen an und beantwortet alle Fragen.

Betriebsleiter 3: Konsultiert gewöhnlich mit seinen/ihren Untergeordneten bevor er/sie Entscheidungen trifft. Hört auf ihre Vorschläge, erwägt sie und gibt dann seine/ihre Entscheidungen bekannt. Dann erwartet er/sie, dass alle seine/ihre Entscheidung treu ausführen, ob sie dafür waren oder nicht.

Betriebsleiter 4: Hat gewöhnlich eine Konferenz mit seinen/ihren Untergeordneten, wenn es eine wichtige Entscheidung zu treffen gibt. Das Problem wird von der Gruppe besprochen. Die Meinung der Mehrheit wird als die Entscheidung akzeptiert.

19. Für welchen dieser Betriebsleiter würden Sie am liebsten arbeiten? (Bitte umkreisen Sie eine Nummer)

1. BETRIEBSLEITER 1
2. BETRIEBSLEITER 2
3. BETRIEBSLEITER 3
4. BETRIEBSLEITER 4

20. Welcher dieser Betriebsleiter Typen ist Ihrem eigenen Vorgesetzten am ähnlichsten?

1. BETREIBSLEITER 1
2. BETREIBSLEITER 2
3. BETREIBSLEITER 3
4. BETREIBSLEITER 4

21. Wie oft sind Sie nervös oder gespannt an Ihrem Arbeitsplatz?

1. IMMER
2. MEISTENS
3. MANCHMAL
4. SELTEN
5. NIE

Bitte geben Sie an wie stark sie mit den folgenden Angaben übereinstimmen.

	NACHDRÜCKLICH DAFÜR	DAFÜR	UNENTSCHIEDEN	DAGEGEN	ENTSCHIEDEN DAGEGEN
22. Die Regeln einer Firma oder einer Organisation sollten nicht gebrochen werden, auch nicht wenn der Angestellte meint, dass das in Interesse der Organisation sein würde.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Den meisten Menschen kann man vertrauen.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Ziemlich viele Angestellte haben eine angeborene Abneigung gegen Arbeit und vermeiden sie wenn es möglich ist.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Eine gross Korporation ist im allgemeinen ein wünschenswerterer Arbeitsplatz als ein kleiner Betrieb.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Wie oft, in Ihrer Arbeitsumgebung, haben Untergeordnete Angst Ihren Vorgesetzten direkt zu sagen, dass sie mit ihren Entscheidungen oder Massnahmen nicht einverstanden sind?					
1. SEHR HÄUFIG					
2. HÄUFIG					
3. MANCHMAL					
4. SELTEN					
5. FAST NIE					
27. Wie lange haben Sie vor, für Ihren gegenwärtigen Betrieb oder Ihre Organisation weiterhin zu arbeiten?					
1. HÖCHSTENS 2 JAHRE					
2. ZWISCHEN 2 UND 5 JAHREN					
3. LÄNGER ALS 5 JAHRE (aber ich werde wahrscheinlich den Arbeitsplatz wechseln, bevor ich in den Ruhestand trete)					
4. BIS ICH IN DEN RUHESTAND TRETE					
28. Sind Sie:					
1. MÄNNLICH					
2. WEIBLICH					
29. Wie alt sind Sie?					
1. UNTER 20					
2. 20-24					
3. 25-29					
4. 30-34					
5. 35-39					
6. 40-49					
7. 50-59					
8. 60 UND ÄLTER					

30. Wie viele Ausbildungsjahre haben Sie abgeschlossen? (Beginnen Sie mit der Grundschule und zählen Sie nur die Anzahl der Jahre, die jeder Lehrgang offiziell dauern sollte, auch wenn Sie weniger Zeit dafür beansprucht haben. Wenn Sie nicht vollzeitig studiert oder Abendkurse belegt haben, zählen Sie die Anzahl der Jahre, die der selbe Kurs in einem ganztägigen Lehrgang gedauert hätte)

1. 10 JAHRE ODER WENIGER
2. 11 JAHRE
3. 12 JAHRE
4. 13 JAHRE
5. 14 JAHRE
6. 15 JAHRE
7. 16 JAHRE
8. 17 JAHRE
9. 18 JAHRE ODER MEHR

31. Was für eine Arbeit haben Sie?

a. Ich bin Betriebsleiter (das heisst, ich habe wenigstens einen untergeordneten Angestellten.)
BEANTWORTEN SIE NUN FRAGE "F".

b. Ich bin kein Betriebsleiter und ich arbeite meistens in einem Büro.
BEANTWORTEN SIE NUN FRAGE "E".

c. Ich bin kein Betriebsleiter und ich arbeite meistens nicht in einem Büro.
BEANTWORTEN SIE NUN FRAGE "D".

d. Wenn Sie kein Betriebsleiter sind und meisten nicht in einem Büro arbeiten, was machen Sie?

1. Arbeit, für die keine besondere Ausbildung notwendig ist, abgesehen von der Ausbildung, die ich am Arbeitsplatz bekomme. (ungelehrte oder angelehrte Arbeit)
2. Arbeit, die gewöhnlich eine Berufsausbildung erfordert, die bis zu 4 Jahren dauert. (gelernte Arbeit, Facharbeit, Techniker, nicht absolviertes Ingenieur Studium, Krankenschwester, usw.)
3. Arbeit, für die gewöhnlich eine höhere Ausbildung erforderlich ist (absolviertes Ingenieurstudium, Arzt, Architekt, usw.)

e. Wenn Sie kein Betriebsleiter sind und meistens in einem Büro arbeiten, was machen Sie?

4. Arbeit, für die gewöhnlich keine höhere Berufsausbildung erfordert wird (Büroangestellte/r, Stenotypist/in, Sekretär/in, nicht absolviertes Buchhalter-Studium, usw.)
5. Arbeit, für die gewöhnlich eine höhere Berufsausbildung erforderlich ist (absolviertes Buchführer-Studium, Rechtsanwalt, usw.)

f. Wenn Sie Betriebsleiter sind, sind Sie:

6. Ein Leiter von Angestellten, die selbst keine Betriebsleiter sind?
7. Ein Leiter von anderen Betriebsleitern?

32. Was ist Ihre Staatsangehörigkeit? _____

33. Hatten Sie eine andere Staatsangehörigkeit von Geburt? Wenn ja, welche? _____

Vielen Dank für Ihre Beteiligung an dieser Umfrage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaker, David A. and George S. Day, Marketing Research, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1983.
- Allaire, Yvan and Mihaela E. Firsirotu, "Theories of Organizational Culture", *Organization Studies*, 1984, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 193-226.
- Armstrong, Scott J., "Derivation of Theory by Means of Factor Analysis Or Tom Swift and His Electric Factor Analysis Machine", Working Paper, Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Brislin, Richard W., "Back-Translation for Cross-Cultural Research", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 1, No. 3, September 1970, pp. 189-216.
- Burns, Rob (Ed.), German Cultural Studies: An Introduction, New York, Oxford University Press Inc., 1995.
- Child, John, "Culture, Contingency and Capitalism in the Cross-National Study of Organizations", in L.L. Cummings and B. Staw (Ed.), Research in Organizational Behaviour, Vol. 3, Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1981.
- Child, John and Alfred Kieser, "Organizational and Managerial Roles in British and West German Companies: An Examination of the Culture-Free Thesis", in C.J. Lammers and D.J. Hickson (Ed.), Organizations Alike and Unlike, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Cooper, D.R. and C. William Emory, Business Research Methods, London, Irwin Publishing, 1995.
- Craig, Gordon A., The Germans, New York, Meridian Publishing, 1991.
- Denison, Daniel R., "Bringing Corporate Culture To the Bottom Line", *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn 1984, pp. 4-22.
- Deshpande, Rohit and F.E. Webster, Jr., "Organizational Culture and Marketing: Defining the Research Agenda", *Journal of Marketing*, January 1989, Vol. 53, pp. 3-15.
- Dillman, Don A., Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Evan, W.M., "Measuring the Impact of Culture on Organizations", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Spring 1975, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 91-113.

- Fisher, Marc, After the Wall: Germany, the Germans and the Burdens of History, New York, Simon and Schuster Publishing, 1995.
- Goodstein, L.D. and J.W. Hunt, "American Business Values and Cultural Imperialism / Applying American Behavioral Science: Some Cross-Cultural Problems", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1981, pp. 49-54.
- Harbison, F., and C.A. Myers (Ed.), Management in the Industrial World: An International Analysis, New York, McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1959.
- Hickson, D.J., C.R. Hinings, C.J. McMillan and J. Schwitter, "The Culture-Free Context of Organization Structure: A Tri-National Comparison", *Sociology*, 1974, Vol. 8, pp. 59-80.
- Hofstede, Geert, "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1980a, pp. 42-63.
- Hofstede, Geert, "The Business of International Business is Culture", *International Business Review*, 1994a, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Hofstede, Geert, "The Interaction Between National and Organizational Value Systems", *Journal of Management Studies*, July 1985, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 347-357.
- Hofstede, Geert, "Management Scientists Are Human", *Management Science*, January 1994b, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 4-13.
- Hofstede, Geert, "Do American Theories Apply Abroad? A Reply to Goodstein and Hunt", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1981, pp. 63-68.
- Hofstede, Geert, "Inside Story: The Conception of O.S.", *Organization Studies*, 1993 Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 593-595.
- Hofstede, Geert, "Hierarchical Power Distance in Forty Countries", in C.J. Lammers and D.J. Hickson (Ed.), *Organizations Alike and Unlike*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Hofstede, Geert, Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values, Sage Publications, London, 1980b.
- Hofstede, Geert, Michael Harris Bond and Chung-leung Luk, "Individual Perceptions of Organizational Culture: A Methodological Treatise on Levels of Analysis", *Organization Studies*, 1993, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp.483-503.

- Horvath, D., K. Azumi, D.J. Hickson, and C.J. McMillan, "The Cultural Context of Organizational Control: An International Comparison", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1984, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 417-433.
- James, Harold, A German Identity - 1770 To The Present Day, Butler & Tanner Ltd., London, 1994.
- Kelley, Lane and Reginald Worthley, "The Role of Culture in Comparative Management: A Cross-Cultural Perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, 1981, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 164-173.
- Kroeber and Kluckhohn, Culture: A Critical review of Concepts and Definitions, cited in Evan, W.M., "Measuring the Impact of Cultures on Organizations", *International Studies of Management & Organizations*, Spring 1975, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 91-113.
- McMillan, C.J., D.J. Hickson, C.R. Hinings and R.E. Schneck, "The Structure of Work Organizations Across Societies", *Academy of Management Journal*, 1973, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 555-569.
- Naslund, Bentil, An Analysis of Economic Size Distributions, Berlin: Springer-Venlag, 1977.
- Norusis, Marija J., SPSS - Professional Statistics 6.1, SPSS Statistics Inc., Chicago, 1994.
- Noyes, Christopher M., *Creativity, Change and Culture: An Investigation into the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Innovation*, M.M.S. Master's Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 1992.
- Orlow, Dietrich, A History of Modern Germany: 1871 to Present, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Ouchi, William G. and Alan L. Wilkins, "Organizational Culture", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1985, Vol. 11, pp. 457-483.
- Punnett, Betty Jane and Sirinimal Withane, "Hofstede's Value Survey Module: To Embrace or Abandon?", *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 1990, Vol. 5, pp. 69-89.
- Reading, Brian, The Fourth Reich, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London 1995.
- Sathe, Vijay, "Implications of Corporate Culture: A Manager's Guide to Action", *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn 1983, pp. 5-23.

- Schwartz, Howard and Stanley M. Davis, "Matching Corporate Culture and Business Strategy", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1981, pp. 30-48.
- Simon, H.A. and C.P. Bonini, "The Size Distribution of Business Firms", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 4, September 1958.
- Stevens, J., Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992.
- Stevens, J., Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1986.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G. and Linda S. Fidell, Using Multivariate Statistics - Second Edition, Harper & Row, New York, 1989.
- Tull, Donald S. and Del I. Hawkins, Marketing Research - Measurement and Method, Fourth Edition, Macmillan, New York, 1987.
- Tse, David K., Kam-hon Lee, Ilan Vertinsky and Donald A. Wehrung, "Does Culture Matter? A Cross-Cultural Study of Executives' Choice, Decisiveness, and Risk Adjustment in International Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, October 1988, Vol. 52, pp. 81-95.
- Weber, Max, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Free Press. New York, 1947.
- Weber, Max, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Charles Scribner & Sons, New York, 1958.
- Weber, Max, The Sociology of Religion, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964.