1

MicroD

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur (S.C. 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents).

**AN EXAMINATION OF
CROSS-NATIONAL DIFFERENCES
IN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

by

Max A.E. Rossberg, B. Comm. (Honours)

*A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master in Management Studies in Marketing*

School of Business

*Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario.*

July 6, 1989

© copyright
1989, Max A.E. Rossberg

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

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

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

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

ISBN 0-315-54418-X

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

AN EXAMINATION OF
CROSS-NATIONAL DIFFERENCES
IN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

submitted by Max A.E. Rossberg, B. Comm. (Honours)

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master in Management Studies

Thesis Supervisor

Director, School of Business

*Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario*

August 28, 1989

ABSTRACT

The present study reports on differences in organizational culture between a parent and its overseas business units, when they operate in different national cultures. The identified differences are based on Hofstede's organizational cultural dimensions: *power distance*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *masculinity*, and *individualism*. These differences were then related to the cultural factors for the countries in which the companies are operating. The cultural factors were identified with a modified Rokeach Value Scale.

Personal interviews with two hundred and sixteen individuals in Canada and eighty-eight individuals in West Germany provided the data for the national aspect of this study. The Canadian respondents were interviewed by de Camprieu in 1977, while the German respondents were interviewed by the author in 1989.

Personal interviews with thirty-two employees in managerial positions from BMW AG, Munich (FRG), its Canadian subsidiary BMW Canada Ltd., Whitby (Ont.), COGNOS Inc., Ottawa (Ont), and COGNOS GmbH., Frankfurt (FRG) provided the data for the organizational aspect of this study.

Research results indicate a significant difference between the organizational culture of business units of the same multinational organization, if they operate in different national cultures. The analysis also shows that the differences in organizational culture are related to the national cultures.

The thesis supports the culture-bound theory that an organizational culture is distinctively influenced by its surrounding national culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to my thesis committee for their support and advice, especially Professor George Haines Jr. and Professor Ian Lee. Professor Haines was both a father and a teacher. I wish to thank Professor Lee for his valuable time and the great discussions.

The time and support of the company's employees surveyed in this thesis was appreciated. I am indebted to Jörg Hauser, Victor Dooian and Lynne Whitely, Mark Jodoin, and Peter Schmieterdorf for their time and support.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my girlfriend, Anni Henning, my special friend and lover, for enduring and easing the stress in a most pleasant way.

Special gratitude is owed to my brother for allowing me to plunder his bank account to help me finance the thesis.

Although it is impossible to mention everybody, I would like to thank Jean Blair, Janet Jacques, and Elaine Pasch from the secretarial staff of the School of Business for their time and patience with me. I am also grateful to Brian Dodd for his continuing inspiration, advice, and support for the thesis. I also wish to thank the faculty and graduate students for making this an unforgettable year and experience.

Last, but not least, I would like to express my appreciation to the McDiarmid family for offering us refuge when my girlfriend and I needed help.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Helga and Lothar Rossberg, two great friends who were there when I needed them, who corrected me when nobody else would, who believed in me when even I had my doubts, and who supported me whenever I required it. Thanks *Mutti und Papi*, for without you I never could have done it.

Ich werde Euch ewig lieben haben und immer für Euch da sein.

THANK YOU ALL

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Due to the nature of much of the information gathered during this study, the identity of the sample firms and their specific responses must remain confidential. The anonymity of the respondents has been ensured as part of the data collection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
RESEARCH PROBLEM	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
CULTURE-FREE THEORY	6
CULTURE-BOUND THEORY	8
THE SYNTHESIS	15
CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON IN TECHNOLOGY FIRMS	18
RESEARCH DESIGN	22
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	24
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	25
NATIONAL CULTURE	25
Population	27
Sample	27
Sampling Frame	27
Survey Instrument	28
Pretest	28
Fieldwork Tactics	29
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	29
Sample	31
Sample Size	31
Sample Method	31
Survey Instrument	33
Pretest	34
Fieldwork Tactics	35
THE RELATIONSHIP	35

DATA ANALYSIS	37
NATIONAL CULTURE	37
The Data	37
The Methodology	38
Findings	40
Discussion	49
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	51
The Data	51
Methodology	52
Findings	53
Discussion	54
CONCLUSIONS.	61
APPENDICES	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOFSTEDE'S VARIABLES AND QUESTIONNAIRE	34
2	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ROKEACH AND HOFSTEDE SCALE	36
3	CRITICAL VALUES FOR A CORRELATION AT $\alpha = .01$ FOR A TWO-TAILED TEST.	39
4	LOADINGS AND LABELS FROM FOUR STUDIES	42
5	MANOVA CALCULATIONS	53
6	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE ORGANIZATIONAL DATA	57
7	VARIABLE LABELS AND SCALE DEFINITION	57

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	THE POWER DISTANCE DIMENSION	10
2	THE UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE DIMENSION	11
3	THE INDIVIDUALISM DIMENSION	11
4	THE MASCULINITY DIMENSION	12
5	SUMMARY OF THE CULTURAL MAP OF CANADA AND WEST GERMANY	12

LIST OF APPENDICES

66

APPENDIX	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	BMW ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS	64
2	COGNOS ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS	68
3	RVS GERMAN VERSION	73
4	RVS ENGLISH VERSION	79
5	RVS FRENCH VERSION	82
6	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE: ENGLISH VERSION	85
7	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE: GERMAN VERSION	95

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Comparative studies invoking culture are often implicit rather than explicit in their treatment of the concept and are impressionistic rather than based on any measuring instrument that has any intersubjective reliability. Virtually no effort is made to distinguish between an independent measure of culture and an independent measure of organizational behaviour. Instead, culture - without specifying any dimension thereof - tends to be inferred from almost any contrast observed among organizations in different countries. Finally, no systematic comparisons are made between the cultural values of a sample of the population of a country and of a sample of employees of one or more organizations in order to ascertain the impact of 'societal culture' vs 'organizational subculture' on organizational system variables.

William M. Evan, "Measuring The Impact of Culture on Organizations"¹

The purpose of most cross-national organizational studies in the business environment is to understand the relationship between national culture and organizational behaviour (Cray and Mallory, 1987). The importance of this issue as a management problem became even more relevant with the rise of the multinational corporation.

Many management concepts, techniques, and systems developed and taught in North American business schools are based upon North American cultural beliefs, values, and assumptions. These may well work in North America .. [but] ... may not work as intended, however, in other cultures (Lane & DiStefano, 1988, p. 5).

Two opposing views prevail in the literature. At one extreme the 'Culture-Free Theorists' claim that organizational behaviour is virtually independent of national cultural values, whereas the 'Culture-Bound Theorists' argue that the behaviour of an organization is very closely related to the national cultural values of its employees.

1) Evan, 1975, p. 104

The dispute between these two theories inspired this paper in cross-cultural research. The thesis sheds additional light on the 'Culture-Free' versus 'Culture-Bound' discussion by analyzing differences in the organizational culture of a parent company and its overseas business unit and comparing these to the encompassing national cultures.

2.0 RESEARCH PROBLEM

The *lacunae* in the comparative studies identified by Evan provided the cogent rationale for the author to undertake this research. The author researched the differences in organizational culture of two multinational operating firms and their respective overseas business units and related these to differences between the national cultures within which the firms are operating.

To this end, the research identified the national cultural values for the Federal Republic of Germany, the researcher used a modified Rokeach Value Scale questionnaire (de Camprieu, 1979) and related those results to existing Rokeach Value factors for the national culture of Canada. The organizational culture of BMW AG, (hereinafter referred to as BMW FRG), BMW Canada Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as BMW CDN), COGNOS Inc. (hereinafter referred to as COGNOS CDN), and COGNOS GmbH (hereinafter referred to as COGNOS FRG) was investigated, using interviews and questionnaires. Those differences were then related to differences in the national cultures.

Hypotheses

This thesis tests the following hypotheses:

- 1) that the national cultures differ significantly;
- 2) that the organizational culture of the parent company and its overseas business units differ; and
- 3) that the two aforementioned differences are related.

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature indicated that even though organizational culture has become one of the most active fields of research in the area of business (Frost *et al.*, 1985; Ouchi and Wilkins, 1985; Desphande and Webster, 1989), the study of the relationship between national culture and organizational culture has been dealt with less adequately as evidenced by the following remarks:

The field of cross-cultural or comparative management is in an early stage of its scientific development (Kelley and Worthley, 1981, p. 164).

Some writers (Evan, 1975) have, however, moved beyond this stage to conceptual development and hypothesis testing in response to the increased importance of this issue to modern management.

The issue of national culture and organizational behaviour has become increasingly important because of two developments in the international business arena. First, global "optimization" has created new problems for management as multinational corporations shift from an ethnocentric to a polycentric view due to attempts to integrate worldwide operations (Hulbert and Brandt, 1980; Jain, 1989). This transformation is gaining momentum as multinational and global operating companies are no longer exclusively based in North America. This has changed the environment of international managers as revealed by the following remarks:

A fundamental part of any international manager's reality is the intercultural nature of his or her interactions ... [which] ... present a special challenge for the international manager, since there is potential for distortions or misunderstanding in these interactions (Lane and DiStefano, 1988, p. 28).

The second development in the international business arena is the use of corporate culture by management to control employee activities and ensure optimal resource utilization. The use of organizational culture as a control mechanism became

increasingly more important, as managers and researchers attempted to explain differences in competitive effectiveness in cases where few structural differences were evident (Pasquale and Athos, 1981). It is an attempt to duplicate the continuing success of companies from Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and other newly industrialized countries in markets as diverse as automobiles, textiles and fibres, because:

Apparently, the well-run corporations of the world have distinctive cultures that are somehow responsible for their abilities to create, implement, and maintain their world leadership positions (Schwartz and Davis, 1981, p. 30).

The research suggests that organizational models, which do not incorporate organizational culture as a specific variable are incomplete (Ouchi and Wilkins, 1985).

This led to the observation that:

The general evolution of Management Control Systems is seen to be towards a lessening of the importance of rules-based controls and towards an increased reliance on controls imbedded in the organizational culture (Lebas and Weigenstein, 1986, p. 259).

These two developments have permeated the business community, as evidenced by books and articles such as *In Search of Excellence*, (Peters and Waterman, 1982), and "Managing The Borderless World" (Ohmae, 1989). However, these books and the literature do not adequately explain how organizational culture may change in the multinational context. Indeed one can ask if there is a significant interaction between national culture and organizational culture.

To date, the academic community has not reached a consensus on this critical issue. There are two conflicting theories regarding the relationship between national and organizational culture. The two theories are frequently referred to as the Culture-Free Theory and the Culture-Bound Theory. Both theories were inspired primarily by the ideas expressed in *Management In The Industrial World. An International Analysis*, by Harbison and Myers (1959), who argued that there are " ... things which all

societies must do if they hope to conduct a successful march to industrialism." They argued that each culture must go through the same steps on the march to industrialism and this causes national cultures to converge over time.

CULTURE-FREE THEORY

Harbison and Myers' argument, concerning the inevitability of the convergence of national cultures due to industrialization, became the basis of Culture-Free theory. These theorists accepted the convergence of national cultures theory while simultaneously recognizing that differences existed in organization cultures. Thus culture-free theorists postulate that a firm's organizational behaviour is not determined by differences in national culture (for they have converged), but rather is strongly influenced by the organizational structure, which itself is a function of contextual variables such as organizational size, size of parent organization, technology, environment, interdependencies, scale, *etc.* (e.g. Hickson *et al*, 1974; Negandhi, 1975; Horvath *et al*, 1976). This view is supported by the following:

These results indicate that large organizations tend to have similar bureaucratic structures as a basic feature of modern industrialization (McMillan *et al*, 1973, p. 568).

Consequently culture-free theorists attempted to formulate universal concepts and propositions which can be applied cross-culturally (Azumi, 1974).

The culture-free approach has been criticized for several reasons. A fundamental criticism is that organizational behaviour is studied in isolation from the national cultural setting.

This criticism was cogently articulated by Heydebrand, who wrote:

If comparative analysis is to contribute to a theory of organizations, it must do so within the framework of a general and perhaps critical theory society The assumption that organizations can be studied in *statu nascendi*, in isolated 'natural' habitats, or as expressions of universal societal forces and processes must be radically questioned (Heydebrand, 1973, p. 98).

As well, critics have challenged the assumption made by culture-free theorists that national culture can be regarded as 'just' another contingency similar to size, technology, *etc.*, for it underestimates the degree of influence and power, culture can exert on the organization and its individuals. Child (1981) states that culture is too complex and poorly understood to justify comparison with other contingencies. The assumption that contingent variables like size, technology, age, *etc.* are culture-free and can therefore be operationalized (Hickson *et al*, 1974) has also attracted the criticism of Child and Kieser (1979). They claim that the organizational structure may be dependent on such contextual variables as size, but may also be dependent on the cultural background of individual managers applying shared principles and philosophies.

The methodology of culture-free theorists has been criticized, for its assumptions of universal dimensions preclude the testing of national/cultural effects (Maurice, 1976). As Schumpeter once noted, concerning social science, the argument is tautological.

A recent cross-national study of organizational structure and management style concluded that contingency theory is:

... inadequate and cannot explain the many differences ... [which] ... appear to be more consistent with the general characteristics of the societies in which these organizations operate, and their employees' cultural traits (Tayeb, 1987, p. 259).

CULTURE-BOUND THEORY

The culture-bound or culture-specific theory identifies a close relationship between national culture and organizational behaviour. This school argues that even though the issues faced by organizations and their formal structure may be similar, ingrained cultural forces will result in distinctive organizational behaviour which is dependent on the cultural setting. The culture-bound theorists argue that an organization will reflect the values and beliefs of the culture in which it operates and within which its employees belong (England, 1974; Hofstede, 1980; Kelley and Worthley, 1981). Goodstein supports this position with the following statement:

There are important differences in national culture and ... these differences profoundly affect the way business is conducted in various corners of the world (Goodstein, 1981, p. 50).

The leading proponent of the culture-bound theory is the Dutch researcher Geert Hofstede. He conducted a major research project between 1967 and 1973 to empirically determine the major criteria by which most national cultures differ. The results were published 1980 in his seminal paper, "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?".

For the research project, Hofstede defined culture as:

... 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 (Geert Hofstede, 1980, p. 43).

The data was collected from most of the employees of a large U.S. multinational company operating in forty nations. These nations represented the more prosperous and wealthy countries of the West and the Third World. The Socialist Block countries were, with the exception of Yugoslavia, excluded.

Hofstede discovered four criteria that were common to most cultures. He labelled these dimensions: *power distance*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *individualism-collectivism*, and *masculinity-femininity*. *Power distance* is defined as the extent to which a society accepts that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally. *Uncertainty avoidance* is the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain situations. The dimension, *individualism-collectivism*, describes a society that either favours a loosely knit or a tight social framework. The last dimension, *masculinity*, includes the opposite pole, *femininity*, and describes a group of values, where assertiveness, acquisition of wealth, and not caring for others are labelled masculine. Excerpts from Hofstede's definitions are presented in Figures 1 through 4.

FIGURE 1
THE POWER DISTANCE DIMENSION

<i>Small Power Distance</i>	<i>Large Power Distance</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.
Superiors are accessible.	Superiors are inaccessible.
All should have equal rights.	Power-holders are entitled to privileges.
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.
The way to change a social system is to redistribute power.	The way to change a social system is to dethrone those in power.

FIGURE 2
THE UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE DIMENSION

<i>Weak Uncertainty Avoidance</i>	<i>Strong Uncertainty Avoidance</i>
Time is free	Time is money.
Hard work, as such, is not a virtue.	There is an inner urge to work hard.
More acceptance of dissent is entailed.	A strong need for consensus is involved.
There is more willingness to take risks in life.	There is great concern with security in life.
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
Less showing of emotions is preferred.	More showing of emotions is preferred.
Deviation is not considered threatening; greater tolerance is shown.	Deviant persons and ideas are dangerous; tolerance holds sway.

FIGURE 3
THE INDIVIDUALISM DIMENSION

<i>Collectivist</i>	<i>Individualist</i>
"We" consciousness holds sway	"I" consciousness holds sway.
Identity is based in the social system.	Identity is based in the individual
The involvement with organizations is moral.	The involvement with organizations is calculative.
Belief is placed in group decisions.	Belief is placed in individual decisions
Expertise, order, duty, and security are provided by the organization or clan.	Autonomy, variety, pleasure, and individual financial security are sought in the system.
The emphasis is on belonging to organizations; membership is the ideal.	The emphasis is on individual initiative and achievement; leadership is the ideal.
Service provides the motivation	Ambition provides the drive

FIGURE 4
THE MASCULINITY DIMENSION

<i>Feminine</i>	<i>Masculine</i>
Men needn't be assertive, but can also assume nurturing roles.	Men should be assertive. Women should be nurturing.
There should be equality between the sexes.	Men should dominate in society.
You work in order to live.	You live in order to work.
One sympathizes with the unfortunate.	One admires the successful achiever.
Small and slow are beautiful.	Big and fast are beautiful.
Quality of life is important.	Performance is what counts.
Unisex and androgyny are ideal.	Ostentatious manliness ("machismo") is appreciated.

The countries were then assigned an index value for each culture dimension based on the mean answers of key questions. The countries were then positioned on two-dimensional graphs. These graphs (*Power Distance by Uncertainty Avoidance*, *Masculinity by Uncertainty Avoidance*, *Power Distance by Individualism*) thus present the researcher with three "cultural maps" of the world (summarized in Figure 5).

FIGURE 5
SUMMARY OF THE CULTURAL MAPS OF CANADA AND WEST GERMANY

Ranking out of 40				
Country	Power Distance	Uncertainty Avoidance	Individualism	Masculinity
Canada	14	12	36	23
West Germany	8	20	26	28

According to Hofstede's findings, West German culture is more *masculine* than Canadian culture. West Germans exhibit elevated *uncertainty avoidance* and are less *individualistic* than Canadians. Furthermore, Germans experience a lower *power distance* between those in power and the powerless than Canadians. Based on his personal experiences, the author of this thesis expects that similar differences will be evident in the present research.

Hofstede concluded that national cultural differences have a profound effect on the structure of organizations, the hierarchy of the management, the level of formalization, and the utility of management theories.

Culture-bound theorists have been criticized primarily for their vague definition of culture. Kroeber and Kluckhohn cited one hundred and sixty-four definitions of culture from which they extracted the following common themes:

[Culture] ... is a product; is historical; includes ideas, patterns, and values; is selective, is learned; is based upon symbols; and is an abstraction from behaviour (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952, p. 157, quoted by Berelson and Steiner, 1964).

Definitions range from deterministic to descriptive. Geertz argued that:

... cultural patterns - religious, philosophical, aesthetic, scientific, ideological - are programs; they provide a template or blueprint for the organization of social and psychological processes, much as genetic systems provide a template for the organization of organic processes (Geertz, 1964, p. 51)

This position is disputed by Kroeber who sees culture as: " ... the mass of learned and transmitted motor reactions, habits, techniques, ideas and values" (Kroeber 1951, quoted by Evan, 1975, p. 93). The issue is also problematic because the concept of culture " ... rests entirely upon the vague data provided by the study of values" (Crozier, 1970-71, p. 150). The literature, however, is beginning to attach more significance to the role of personal values in determining behaviour (e.g., Feather and

Cross, 1975). Parsons and Shils (1959) argue that value orientations are strategically the most important parts of culture for the organization of systems of action. In their review of comparative management, Ajiferuke and Boddewyn (1970) discovered that the profound lack of agreement on this fundamental concept has led many theorists to avoid defining it, while simultaneously supporting its importance.

As well, culture is very difficult to measure and presents methodological difficulties because of translation problems and the lack of representative samples (Kelley and Worthley, 1981). These problems resulted in national culture being used as an explanatory variable for the residual factors of the model rather than as a determinant (Maurice, 1976 and 1979). Furthermore, it is well established that national culture is deeply rooted. This is indirectly corroborated by research, which suggests that only radical events, such as war or revolution, may change national cultural value sets more rapidly (Hall, 1976).

To overcome the foregoing difficulties, the thesis uses a definition of culture which is value-oriented and drawn from Hofstede (1985) and Sathe (1983). The definitions provided by Hofstede and Sathe are seen as the most salient for this research. Hofstede describes values as: "... broad preferences for one state of affairs over others" (Hofstede, 1985, p. 347). Sathe echoed Hofstede stating that: "... values ... represent preferences for more ultimate end states" (Sathe, 1983, p. 5).

The synthesis of the two produces the following definition of culture:

Culture is the pattern of shared values and beliefs of a group of individuals which helps them understand their environment and therefore provides them with norms that influence their personal attitudes and behaviour. Values are either instrumental or terminal.

THE SYNTHESIS

The tautological nature of the academic dialogue concerning these divergent and seemingly irreconcilable theoretical viewpoints, led some theorists to question if an organization has a culture or if culture is merely a byproduct of the existence of an organization (Smircich, 1983).

Although both theories have deficiencies, this should not lead to their complete rejection. Cray and Mallory (1987) suggested that it would be more constructive for cross-cultural research if the two are regarded as complementary. Recently, some researchers have attempted to combine the two models, by incorporating cultural variables into a model which systematically links the different analytical levels of context, structure, role, and behaviour (Farmer and Richman, 1965; Child and Kieser, 1979).

Certain of the proposed integrations of cultural and non-cultural variables accept that culture affects the behaviour of individuals and groups, but only within the limits set by the organizational structure, which itself is influenced by non-cultural variables (Cray and Mallory, 1987). These integrations suggest a paradigm which isolates organizational and national cultural variables. It is this line of reasoning which provides the foundation for the proposed research.

For the purposes of this research, it is assumed that employees within organizations have a shared value system which permeate their organizational culture and that these values can be measured. The organizational culture of a firm is shaped by the surrounding national culture, the organization's history, its leadership, and contingencies (Allaire *et al.*, 1984). In the international business context, the critical question concerns whether the organizational cultures of the foreign business units of a

multinational firm will adopt values from the local national culture, within which its employees belong, or reflect the parent company's organizational culture.

Evan identified a need for such a model because:

... organization theory has thus far failed to come to grips with the cultural component of the environments in which organizations are embedded (Evan, 1975, p. 91).

His model isolates both organizational and cultural variables to conceptually link value orientations to organizational behaviour. This is accomplished through the use of independent measures for each variable, which avoid empirical explanations and permit the rigorous testing of hypotheses. Ideally, representative samples are taken from both the organization and the society (national culture) in which it operates. Evan does not believe that the two samples must be tested identically because.

... it is neither necessary nor advisable to use identical sets of questions in diverse cultural settings if they do not have identical meanings (Evan, 1975, p. 102).

The researcher, however, must ensure that different indicators refer to functionally equivalent concepts.

Evan's model is structured as follows:

- 1) a multinational or multicultural research team is necessary to eliminate as many unconscious cultural assumptions as possible;
- 2) a multi-disciplinary team is essential in order to fully determine sources of variation;
- 3) a research instrument which will tap cultural variables with a high level of reliability and validity;
- 4) a representative sample of the population of a society and a representative sample of the members of one or more organizations in order to measure "societal culture" as well as "organizational sub-culture";
- 5) intra-systemic comparisons and intra-organizational comparisons are used to control for various structural and industrial characteristics; and
- 6) the use of alternate research methods is desirable.

The author of the thesis followed this model as closely as time and money constraints allowed in structuring the research.

4.0 CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON IN TECHNOLOGY FIRMS

Financial and time constraints forced the author to limit his representative sample to two companies in two countries. A sample of this size limits the research to a case study. The companies are BMW FRG, BMW CDN, COGNOS CDN, and COGNOS FRG.

BMW FRG, is based in Munich, West Germany. It is a leading automobile producer with 1988 annual sales of approximately 19 billion DM K ($\approx$ \$C 11 billion). Its most important products are luxury automobiles and motorcycles. In 1987, BMW established new standards in the international automobile industry with two new product lines, the 5- and 7-series. BMW has traditionally emphasized the technological sophistication of its products and consistently invested considerable capital resources in research and development programs. BMW has a total of fourteen subsidiaries around the world including Canada. BMW Inc., Whitby, Ont., Canada is a 100% owned subsidiary of the BMW AG. The Canadian subsidiary was established in 1986 as a sales and service organization for Canada and currently employs approximately sixty employees.

COGNOS Inc. is a software company located in Ottawa, Canada specializing in a fourth generation computer language (4GL). Sales for 1988 were \$C 107 million. Its most important product is Powerhouse, with several new products introduced this year (e.g. Starbase, Stargate, etc.). Powerhouse has become one of the most popular fourth generation languages for application purposes. The new Starbase product is rapidly gaining recognition as one of the most advanced products in the market. COGNOS currently operates eleven wholly owned subsidiaries in the world, including COGNOS GmbH located in Frankfurt, West Germany. Founded three years ago, it

acts as the sales and service bureau for COGNOS products in West Germany and currently employs sixteen people.

BMW and COGNOS were chosen for this study, because their respective overseas business units are approximately the same age (three years), same size, of comparable organizational structure, and serve similar functions for their parent company. Organizational size, age, technology, research and development, and structure are contingent factors affecting organizational behaviour and controlling them will facilitate the proposed cross-company comparison (Hickson *et al*, 1974).

Neither subsidiary has reached the mature stage of organizational development, but both have reached comparable stability. Both act as sales and service bureaux for the parent companies, which requires a similar organizational structure (see Appendix 1 and 2). In addition, the parent companies can be classified as technology-oriented companies. Even though one is in the automobile industry and the other is a software company, both companies stress research and development and emphasize on innovation and technology to maintain their competitive edge. COGNOS spends approximately 13% of its revenue on research and development and although the precise percentages of research and technology allocated by BMW could not be determined, because of confidentiality restrictions, it is believed it is not significantly different from COGNOS. Both companies are technology leaders.

COGNOS has developed a fourth generation computer language, called Powerhouse, which is seen by the industry as one of the most advanced in the world. BMW FRG recently launched a new generation of automobiles, coded the M5 and the 750iL. Both models contain such advanced technology that only specially trained automotive technicians are able to provide service and maintenance. The automotive

industry regards these vehicles as unparalleled in terms of technological sophistication. BMW has also invested in excess of \$C 1 billion in a new research and development centre called the *Forschungs- und Industrie Zentrum* (FIZ). This new centre will assist BMW in maintaining a technology edge over its major competitors. Thus, it is justified to assume that the contingent variable, technology, and its importance to operation and strategy, is very similar for both companies thereby allowing the author to conduct the comparison between the two companies.

The international market for both companies is crucial. BMW exports approximately 70% of its products, while COGNOS exports approximately 50% of its total production. These figures are expected to remain the same for BMW in the future and to increase for COGNOS as they plan to expand their international market presence.

The two companies are involved in the alternate home country in order to escape the limited size of the respective domestic markets and to increase direct control over foreign distribution and sales. The two companies had little previous experience with the national culture in which the foreign business unit is now operating. Before establishing their foreign business units, BMW and COGNOS exported to local distributors. Thus both companies have the same minimal experience in dealing with the different national cultural values.

Another reason for this choice was because the author was unable to identify two other international operating companies which had foreign business units of approximately the same size, age, structure, and in the same industry and who were willing to participate in the research. Time and financial constraints also prevented the author from considering companies beyond his Canadian and German places of

residence. A final reason is that there has been no cross-cultural research involving Canadian and West German companies.

5.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design has two foci. The first focus is concerned with the analysis of the different national cultures, while the second focus is the analysis of the organizational behaviour of two multinational companies.

Rokeach (1968-1969) constructed a model which posited a fully-integrated cognitive system linking beliefs, attitudes, and values. Values are seen as a singular belief which guide actions and judgments across situations and goals and can be divided into means and ends (or what Rokeach calls "instrumental" and "terminal" values).

The Canadian and West German national culture sets were researched using a modified Rokeach Value Scale (RVS) developed by Renaud de Camprieux (1979). The RVS is a methodology for investigating the instrumental and terminal value sets of individuals. Two sets of eighteen values were ranked or scaled and the results interpreted using *principal component* and *factor analysis* procedures. The RVS effectively differentiates individuals on their value sets in terms of their race, occupation, political ideology, and culture (Robinson and Shaver, 1971; Rokeach, 1973; Vinson *et al*, 1977). De Camprieux used a modified RVS for his research on the value sets of female Canadian citizens using *Likert-type* scales in addition to the original ranking scales. It is the same RVS, translated into German, that has been administered to a personal referral sample of German citizens.

Organizational cultures have a national cultural component which can be found in the work-related values of the employees. The value set of an organizational culture can therefore be regarded as a subset of the national cultural value set (Hofstede, 1985). Using *factor analysis*, Hofstede identified four value dimensions to describe

organizational culture: *power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity and individualism*. These dimensions account for a large portion of the differences among work-related value sets in forty different countries. It is these four value dimensions which formed the basis of the questionnaire administered to a sample of managers of the two companies and their foreign business units. A total of seventeen questions were designed to identify the value sets of the respondents. At least three questions were asked for each cultural dimension.

The results of the RVS for Canada and Germany, and the results of the organizational culture questionnaire for the two companies, were combined. Factors common to the Hofstede value factors (identified in the parent/subsidiary company operating in that country) and the RVS were identified and isolated. These pairs of corresponding factors for one country and one company were then compared to the set of corresponding factors for the respective business unit in the other country. Table 2 shows the RVS value factors corresponding to the Hofstede value factors. From this, it is possible to see whether the differences between the national value systems of the two countries can also be found between the organizational cultures of the companies under investigation.

6.0 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research design permits the following research questions:

- i) What are the value factors for the national culture of Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany, using a modified Rokeach Value Scale?
- ii) What are the work-related values of individuals employed by BMW, CDN and COGNOS, CDN, using Hofstede's four-value dimensions?
- iii) What are the work-related values of individuals employed by BMW, FRG and COGNOS, FRG, using Hofstede's four value dimensions?
- iv) Are there any significant differences in the identified work-related value sets between each parent company and its foreign business unit?
- v) After identifying the corresponding sets of national and organizational value factors, what are the similarities and do they explain the differences in organizational culture exhibited by the parent and subsidiary firm?

7.0. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

NATIONAL CULTURE

Studies of national differences and their effect on organizational behaviour are marred by poor experimental designs as illustrated by the following:

They have not, however, ascertained whether the differences are a function of organizational subculture or societal culture (Evan, 1975, p. 106).

These problems are further aggravated by the use of survey instruments which lack the necessary validity and reliability for meaningful interpretation of cultural variables.

Rokeach (1973) developed a survey instrument using the concept of values and was able to identify people on the basis of race, sex and religion and a variety of other characteristics. Similar results were reported by other researchers using the same instrument (Vinson *et al*, 1977; de Camprieux, 1979). Vinson *et al* concluded their study with the following remarks:

The results of this study also indicate that personal values, or factors derived from personal values, are useful for differentiating between particular groups of people (Vinson *et al*, 1977, p. 354).

Rokeach (1973) and Robinson and Shaver (1971) reported high test-retest reliability coefficients for the Rokeach Value Scale instrument. It can therefore be assumed that the RVS satisfies Evan's demand (1975) for a research instrument which captures cultural variables with a high degree of reliability and validity.

The author employed a modified Rokeach Value Scale questionnaire applying a *Likert-type* scaling developed by Renaud de Camprieux (1979) for his doctoral dissertation on cross-cultural consumer analysis research. This modified RVS used interval scales in addition to the original rank ordering ratings. The questionnaire consisted of thirty-six variables that each respondent rated on a nine-point scale ranging from

extremely important to not important. De Camprieu administered the questionnaire to a female sample of the Canadian population in English and French and identified eleven Canadian value factors of which ten were easily interpretable. He also compared his findings with similar studies by Rokeach and Vinson *et al.* De Camprieu's findings have been used and augmented with research on the West German culture (see Table 4).

Circumventing the language barrier is problematic for cross-cultural research. To obtain a translation-equivalent instrument, the researcher used 'back-translation'. Back-translation is recommended by those who have empirically examined the issue of equivalence of multi-language research instruments (Brislin, 1970; Brislin *et al.* 1973). The questionnaire was translated into German by two independent translators. The resulting translations were then synthesized into a final text and translated back into English. This procedure guaranteed that the questions were not altered in their meaning and ensured that both versions of the questionnaire measured the same variables and values (Brislin, 1970).

A personal referral method was employed to determine the sample of West German nationals. This course of action was selected because time and money constraints did not allow a simple random selection procedure. Personal referral sampling introduces a bias, but one of the primary benefits of this type of sampling is the expected excellent response rate. Even though simple random sampling techniques would have produced more general results, it is not clear that the increase in quality of results justifies the additional time and money (Greeno, Sommers, Haines, 1976). Of the two hundred questionnaires distributed, ninety-two were returned. Of these, eighty-eight were usable. This number seemed acceptable based on other studies

(Rokeach, 1970; Vinson *et al.*, 1977; de Camprieu, 1979).

Data gathering consisted of the following steps:

Population

Element: Every West German national
Extent: In the Federal Republic of Germany
Time: December, 1988 to May, 1989.

Sample

Element: West German Nationals
Size: 200 individuals
Extent: Lindau, Osterode, Munich, and Kassel (FRG)
Time: December, 1988, to May, 1989

Sampling Frame

The individuals were selected using a personal referral method. As discussed previously, personal referral methods may introduce a degree of bias. The sample therefore included a representative number of males and females, different social classes, and age groups. The bias is not a problem to the extent one is willing to assume Canadian-German similarity since the nature of the bias is demonstrated in Greeno, Sommers, and Haines (1976).

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used a RVS questionnaire designed by de Camprieu (1979) for his cross-cultural consumer behaviour study. It is modified by the addition of a *Likert-scale* used with the original ranking scale (which consisted of eighteen instrumental and eighteen terminal values). The Canadian data can be broken down into eleven factors. These factors have proven to be excellent predictors for the differentiation of individuals according to their race, political orientation, cultural background, and occupation (Rokeach, 1973; Vinson *et al*, 1977). The questionnaire in all its language versions is included in the appendix.

Pretest:

The survey instrument in the English and French version was tested in de Camprieu's dissertation on consumer buying behaviour. The translated German version was tested by a selected group of academics and other individuals.

The pretest supplied information on the following items:

- * verify that the wording is not ambiguous; and
- * identify any language inconsistencies.

The questionnaire was translated into German and back into English to ensure that the questions were not altered in their meaning and to ensure that both versions of the questionnaire measured the same variables (Brislin 1970). Both translations were combined and the resulting questionnaire was then submitted to several German academics for verification.

Fieldwork Tactics

- i) The individuals were contacted personally or by telephone to confirm their participation and their acceptability for the sample.
- ii) If acceptable, an interview was scheduled or the questionnaire was administered immediately.
- iii) A follow-up telephone call reminded the respondent to complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.
- iv) After receiving the questionnaires or the interviews a "Thank You" note was delivered personally.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Organizational culture has a powerful impact on managers and their organizations; however, it is not clear why this is the case and what can be done about it (Sathe, 1983). Comprehensive research on this subject was conducted by Hofstede (1980) who used results from 116, 000 respondents in forty countries to identify four dimensions of organizational culture.

BMW is the primary organization under study while COGNOS was used to provide a basis for comparison. BMW was chosen because senior management agreed to support the research without onerous restrictions.

This thesis researched the work-related values of the organizations using Hofstede's critical organizational cultural dimensions to determine the differences between the organizational cultures of a parent company and its subsidiaries. This goal was accomplished by using a questionnaire based on these cultural dimensions.

A two-part survey instrument was designed consisting of a structured interview section, and a questionnaire (see Appendix 6 and 7) in order to identify the work-related organizational value factors of the organizations. This can be done because:

Using a survey technique to study organizational culture has both advantages and disadvantages ... the key strength is that the same method can be applied to many organizations in the same way ... results provide a basis for comparison (Denison, 1984, p. 7).

The questionnaire section of the survey instrument contained seventeen questions, which were based on the four Hofstede cultural value dimensions. The responses provided the data for comparison of organizational culture. The questionnaire was provided in German and English.

The questionnaire was translated into German and back into English by two independent translators. This procedure ensured that the questions were not altered in their meaning and that both versions of the questionnaire measured the same variables (Brislin, 1970).

A total of thirty-two managers were interviewed from both companies. The majority of the managers were from BMW, as BMW was the primary focus of the study. The relatively small number of nine managers, interviewed from COGNOS, was regarded as sufficient for comparison purposes. Time and money constraints prevented the author from including more managers from either company in the sample.

The data for each company was then analyzed using *Multivariate Analysis of Variance* (MANOVA), which indicated the significance of the differences between the organizational cultures of the parent and subsidiary companies on the four Hofstede value dimensions.

The data gathering consisted of six steps.

Sample

The sample can be described as follows:

Element:	Employees who manage a group of people
Unit:	BMW FRG, BMW CDN, COGNOS CDN, COGNOS FRG
Extent:	Federal Republic of Germany, and Canada
Time:	December, 1988, March and April, 1989.

Sample Size

The sample size differs for the two organizations. Twenty-three BMW managers were interviewed to supply the majority of the data, while a total of nine managers from COGNOS provided the necessary data for comparison.

BMW FRG	12 managers
BMW CDN	11 managers
COGNOS FRG	5 managers
COGNOS CDN	4 managers

Sample Method

The managers were chosen from a group provided by senior executives within each organization. Both groups were drawn predominantly from the sales divisions of the two companies to facilitate comparison. Simple random sampling techniques were ruled out because of time, organizational and money constraints. For example, the companies demanded some control over the selection process. Personal referral

sampling by the senior executives could introduce a bias, which can be partially controlled. The selection process of the final respondent sample was dependent upon the individuals made available by the company, and several criteria which each individual had to fulfil.

It is important that the respondent was a member of management, because it has been shown that the value sets differ with the level of hierarchical status (Hofstede, 1979). The nationality of the respondent was also important, as it was one of the primary focii of the study to identify national values. The last criterion was the length of employment with the company. It was the goal of the researcher to limit the sample to employees who had been with their present employer for a period of not less than two years. The process of identification with organizational culture is lengthy and marked by various stages (Gagliardi, 1986). The socialization process is reflected by company policies requiring the completion of formal training within two years of hiring.

The selection criteria can be summarized as follows:

- i) Generate a list of all possible candidates from the list provided by the senior executives.
- ii) Collect data on the potential respondents who preferably:
 - * managed more than two people
 - * were of either German or Canadian background
 - * had been with the company for at least two years
- iii) The final sample has been obtained from a list of individuals who most closely fulfilled the above mentioned criteria.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument selected was a two-part questionnaire consisting of an interviewer-completed section, a structured interview section, and a questionnaire.

The structured interview section included questions concerning the respondents' experience and relationship with and to the company. Also included in this section were questions pertaining to the relationship between the parent and subsidiary organizations concerning variables such as communication and personal visits.

The questionnaire focused on the organizational culture of the company under investigation and the responses provided the majority of the data for research purposes. The survey used open-ended and nominal questions in the first part and rating scales in the second part of the survey instrument. The open-ended questions provided descriptive data concerning the organizational culture of the organization. The questions identified the company's specific and idiosyncratic symbols, symbolic anecdotes, and the working climate. The final part of the questionnaire consisted of seventeen questions based upon Hofstede's four value dimensions: *power distance*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *masculinity*, and *individualism* (Table 1). This was seen as sufficient to provide a working indicator for each specific factor. The final analysis was based on the mean of the questions for each specific cultural dimension. The questions were ranked on a seven-point scale. A minimum of three questions were asked for each value dimension (Table 1).

TABLE 1
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOFSTEDE'S VARIABLES
AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Cultural Dimensions	# of questions	Questions
Power Distance	3	4, 8, 11
Uncertainty Avoidance	5	3, 12, 13, 14, 16
Masculinity	4	5, 6, 9, 10
Individualism	5	1, 2, 7, 15, 17

Pretest

A pretest was completed with two executives from BMW excluded from the sample, two researchers from the Max Planck Institute in West Germany, and two professors from Carleton University.

The purpose of the pretest was to identify:

- i) awkward wording and ambiguous questions;
- ii) redundancy or additional questions; and
- iii) length of the administration of the survey instrument (set at a maximum of one hour).

The pretest also prepared the interviewer for the administration of the questionnaires and interviews. The results of the pretest are reflected in the questionnaire. The questionnaire incorporated the changes identified.

Fieldwork Tactics

The screening of the respondents and the administration of the survey instrument was accomplished as follows:

- 1) The executives were contacted and an interview date agreed upon;
- 2) Carleton University's School of Business and the author mailed letters to express appreciation for the cooperation of the executives and to provide assurance of the confidential treatment of the respondents, their data, and the findings;
- 3) The interview was conducted and the questionnaire administered; and
- 4) An expression of gratitude was hand-delivered to the contact executives after the interviews had been completed.

THE RELATIONSHIP

It is clear that the two scales overlap. It is because of this overlap that it is possible to establish a relationship between the two scales, and hence, a relationship between the organizational culture (Hofstede) and national culture (Rokeach). Furthermore, Hofstede and Beyer (1984) have shown that the work-related value sets are in fact a subset of the national culture value sets. The exact link between the organizational questionnaire and the Rokeach value scale can be seen in Table 2.

TABLE 2
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ROKEACH AND HOFSTEDE SCALE

Hofstede Dimension	Rokeach Factor	Question
Power Distance	5	4, 8, 11
Uncertainty Avoidance	1	3, 12, 13, 14, 16
Masculinity	4	5, 6, 9, 10
Individualism	2	1, 2, 7, 15, 17

Hofstede's work-related value dimension are congruent with de Camprieu's Canadian factors 1, 2, 4, and 5: *masculinity* corresponds to *achievement values*, *power distance* corresponds to *pacifist and egalitarian values*, *uncertainty avoidance* corresponds to *religious/moral values*, while *individualism* corresponds to *intellectual values* (see also Table 4).

The linkage between the Rokeach Value Scale and the organizational questionnaire enabled the author to establish the crucial link between the organizational culture and the national culture. The author could then test whether the value systems of the national cultures are reflected in the value systems of the organizational cultures.

8.0 DATA ANALYSIS

NATIONAL CULTURE

The Data

The data for Canada was collected by de Camprieu employing a systematic sampling method which produced a sample which he argued was representative of the population under study (de Camprieu, 1979). A total of four hundred and twenty-five respondents were selected during the months of May and July, 1977 of which two hundred and sixteen were accepted by the researcher for the national culture data analysis. The respondents were asked to scale and rank the same questionnaire that was later used for the West German sample (see Appendix 3, 4, and 5).

The data for West Germany was compiled from a systematic personal referral sampling of citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany during the months December, 1988, to May, 1989. A total of two hundred and fifty individuals were asked to answer a modified Rokeach Value Scale questionnaire (which was translated into German as previously described). The response rate after several follow-ups to the initial distribution, was ninety-two of which eighty-eight had completed all questions correctly.

The Rokeach Value Scale measures responses on eighteen terminal and eighteen instrumental value variables. The respondents have to scale each variable on a nine-point *Likert-type* scale, with eight indicating the highest importance and zero the lowest importance of the variable to the respondent.

The Methodology

Principal component analysis and *common factor analysis* with an *oblique rotation* were selected as the primary methods of analysis using the program FACTOR of the SPSS-X package (Version 2.1 1983). The *principal components analysis* converts correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables (also referred to as the components). The aim of the procedure is the reduction of the initial variables into components that will account for most of the variance. It also facilitates the interpretation of the interrelationships between the variables. These components are then interpreted using the factor loadings which are simply the *Pearson correlations* between the variable and the extracted component.

The interpretability of the components can further be increased with the help of an *oblique rotation* of the factors. This procedure essentially reallocates the loadings of the components so that each factor tends to load higher on a smaller number of variables and lower on the remaining variables than the simple *principal component analysis* and may define better the interrelated clusters of variables.

The decision concerning the retention of the component for the analysis was based on the Kaiser (1960) criterion, which specifies that those components that have an *eigenvalue* larger than unity must be retained. This is also the default procedure used by the SPSS-X package. This procedure usually leads to the retention of the most important components, but the researcher must verify the practical significance of the individual components in terms of their contribution to the variance accounted for by the *factor analysis*.

The loadings must also be scrutinized for significance. This is of increased importance for small or moderate samples and large numbers of variables, which is

the case in the present research. A stringent *alpha* level will be used to reduce the possibility of random errors of the first type. The critical values for testing the significance of a loading are taken from Table 3 (Stevens, 1986, p. 344).

TABLE 3
CRITICAL VALUES FOR A CORRELATION AT $\alpha = .01$ FOR A TWO-TAILED TEST.

n	C.V.	n	C.V.	n	C.V.
50	.361	180	.192	400	.129
80	.286	200	.182	600	.105
100	.256	250	.163	800	.091
140	.217	300	.149	1000	.081

The critical values from Table 3 have to be doubled for a *one-tailed* test and it is that doubled value which should then be used to determine the significance of the loading. Generally, researchers want a variable to share at least 15% of its variance with the factor. According to Stevens (1986), this implies factor loadings of approximately .40 for the interpretation of the factors.

The *factor analysis* for the Canadian sample was completed by de Camprieu in his 1979 study of cross-cultural consumer behaviour. A *factor analysis* with the *oblique rotation* was therefore necessary for the West German data.

Once the loadings and the factor structure for the West German data were determined, the Canadian factor structure and the German factor structure had to be compared to determine the degree of congruence in value structure between the two national cultures.

A powerful, albeit tedious procedure, exists to solve this type of problem. LISREL® (Version VI, 1986) permits the testing of the hypothesis that both cultures share the same underlying value structure using *Confirmatory Factor Analysis*. If both national cultures share the same values, the extracted factor structure and the factor loadings from the *oblique rotation* should be highly congruent. *Confirmatory Factor Analysis* accomplishes this comparison by using the factor structure and the corresponding factor loadings of one national culture as a model, which in turn is forced onto the data of the other culture. The program then computes a *goodness of fit* value to indicate how well the model from one sample fits the data from the other sample.

In the present research, the Canadian factor structure and its loadings, were used to construct the model. The German data was then subjected to this model and the *Confirmatory Factor Analysis* then calculated the *goodness of fit* of the German data against the Canadian model. A low *goodness of fit* value would indicate that the Canadian model does not fit the German data due to differences in the value structure of the national culture, whereas a high *goodness of fit* value would support the hypothesis that both national cultures share the same values.

Findings

The *principal components analysis* for the Canadian data extracted eleven factors explaining 63% of the variance with an *eigenvalue* greater than one. From the *factor analysis* with the *oblique rotation*, de Camprieux obtained eleven factors, of which he was able to readily interpret ten factors. These were then compared to other studies completed by Rokeach and Vinson *et al* (see Table 4).

The *principal components analysis* for the West German data, extracted twelve factors, explaining 70.7% of the variance with *eigenvalues* greater than unity. The *factor analysis* with the *oblique rotation* extracted twelve factors, all of which were interpretable. The factor structure and the factor loadings are presented in Table 4.² The factor loadings are approximately .40. This general value was chosen in contrast to specific critical values for each sample because of the differences in sample sizes. Taking the dissimilar sample sizes into account, would have produced critical values for the test of significance for the factor loadings of .54 for the present research, compared to .28 for the Vinson study. The difference in critical values was regarded as too high and a common critical value of .40 was chosen to ensure that each variable would share at least 15% of its variance with its construct.

Table 4 reveals that even though the dimensions extracted (with *factor analysis*) on three different North American populations are remarkably similar, the dimensions for the German data apparently differs considerably.

The *factor analysis* extracted twelve significant and interpretable constructs for the West German data in comparison to only ten for the Canadian data. The factor structures and the factor loadings also seemed to differ significantly.

2) The complete statistical results are available from the author upon request

TABLE 4
LOADINGS AND LABELS FROM FOUR STUDIES

FACTOR 1				
	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Helpful	.39	.77	.67	
Forgiving	.64	.61	.82	.38
Clean	.34	.40		
Courageous		.37		.37
Loving		.37	.37	
Salvation	.56	.36		
Cheerful			.42	
Friendship				.92
LABEL	Religious Morality	Religious/ Moral Values	Compassion	Social- orientation

FACTOR 2				
	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Intellectual	.44	.73	.65	
Logical	.53	.59	.46	
Independent	.43	.50	.63	
Freedom		.50	.63	
Imaginative	.45		.55	
Capable			.49	
LABEL	Competence	Intellectual values	Competence	ncf

- (1) RVS = Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973, p. 249)
 (2) D.C. = De Camprieu (de Camprieu, 1979, p. 225)
 (3) VMN = Vinson, Munson & Nakanishi (1977, p. 249)
 (4) PR = Present Research
 ncf = non comparable factor

TABLE 4
(Continued)

FACTOR 3

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Exciting life	.41	.62	.31	
Pleasure	.62	.56	.50	.76
Comfortable life	.69	.37	.59	.78
Clean	.47			
Social recognition			.69	
A sense of				
Accomplishment			.38	
Logical				.49
Helpful				-.46
LABEL	Immediate	Hedonistic	Personal	Self-
	Gratification	values	Gratification	gratification

FACTOR 4

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Ambitious	.43	.75	.43	-.66
Capable	.32	.55	.49	
Imaginative	.30	.40	.55	
Logical				
Family				
Security	.50			
Responsible	.33			-.44
Independent			.63	
Intellectual			.65	-.74
Broadminded				.69
Cheerful				-.33
Equality				-.38
LABEL	Family	Achievement	Competence	Achievement
	Security	values		values

- (1) RVS = Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973, p. 249)
 (2) D.C. = De Camprieux (de Camprieux, 1979, p. 225)
 (3) VMN = Vinson, Munson & Nakanishi (1977, p. 249)
 (4) PR = Present Research

TABLE 4
(Continued)

FACTOR 5				
	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
World of Peace	.61	.74	.76	.80
National Security	.58	.54	.48	
Equality	.43	.50	.53	
Freedom	.40		.51	.50
Sanctity			.48	
World of Beauty				.66
LABEL	Social Orientation	Pacifist/ Egalitarian	Social Harmony	Idealistic

FACTOR 6				
	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Polite	.50	.73	.70	
Obedient	.52	.67	.69	
Clean	.50	.48		.69
Comfortable life		.44		
Social Recognition		.34		
Self-controlled		.37		
Honest	.34			.81
Imaginative				.47
LABEL	Self- construction	Sociable values	Sociability	Self-Actual- ization

- (1) RVS = Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973, p. 249)
 (2) D.C. = De Camprieu (de Camprieu, 1979, p. 225)
 (3) VMN = Vinson, Manson & Nakanishi (1977, p. 249)
 (4) PR = Present Research

TABLE 4
(Continued)

FACTOR 7				
	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
A sense of accomplishment		.64	.38	-.50
Self-respect		.62	.44	-.73
Wisdom	.56	.62	.48	
Inner Harmony	.41	.40	.46	
A world of beauty			.61	
Logical	.34			
Self-controlled	.33			
Loving				.55
LABEL	Delayed gratification	Self-Actualization values	Self-Actualization	Desire for affection

FACTOR 8				
	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Mature Love	.68	.60	.52	-.48
Inner Harmony		.41		
Loving	.60	.40		
True Friendship			.48	
An exciting life			.37	
Happiness				-.87
LABEL	Love	Love values	Love and affection	Affect

- (1) RVS = Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973, p. 249)
 (2) D.C. = De Camprieu (de Camprieu, 1979, p. 225)
 (3) VMN = Vinson, Munson & Nakanishi (1977, p. 249)
 (4) PR = Present Research

TABLE 4
(Continued)

FACTOR 9

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Responsible		.76	.72	
Self-controlled	.37	.46	.44	.82
Wisdom		.40		
Honest	.34		.44	
Polite	.50		.43	
Obedient	.52		.43	
LABEL	Self-constriction	Trustworthiness values	Integrity	Self-Control

FACTOR 10

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Loving		.45		
Family security	.50	.38	.61	-.35
Clean		.38		
Salvation			.38	
Ambitious	.43			
Responsible	.33			
Capable				-.82
LABEL	Family security	Familial values	Security	Vulnerability

- (1) RVS = Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973, p. 249)
 (2) D.C. = De Camprieu (de Camprieu, 1979, p. 225)
 (3) VMN = Vinson, Munson & Nakanishi (1977, p. 249)
 (4) PR = Present Research

TABLE 4
(Continued)

FACTOR 11

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
National Security				.72
Salvation				.67
Politeness				.47
LABEL	ncf	ncf	ncf	Security

FACTOR 12

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Wisdom				-.86
Independence				-.49
Exciting life				-.13
LABEL	ncf	ncf	ncf	Spontaneity

FACTOR 13

	RVS(1)	D.C.(2)	VMN(3)	PR(4)
Harmony				.74
Recognition				-.52
LABEL	ncf	ncf	ncf	Esteem

- (1) RVS = Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973, p. 249)
 (2) D.C. = De Camprieu (de Camprieu, 1979, p. 225)
 (3) VMN = Vinson, Munson & Nakanishi (1977, p. 249)
 (4) PR = Present Research
 ncf = non comparable factor

The LISREL® *Confirmatory Factor Analysis* substantiated the hypothesized differences. The LISREL® procedure was initially run with a diagonal specification for the *phi-matrix*.³ This procedure calculated the following indices:

CHI square	= 1360.36 with 580 d.f.
p.- value	= .000
Goodness of fit	= .497
Adjusted goodness of fit	= .422

The LISREL® procedure was then rerun with the symmetric specification for the *phi-matrix*. This program was unable to calculate *CHI-square* values.⁴ It failed to overcome the problem of a non-positive definite *phi-matrix*. The results indicated that factors 6 and 8 are the source of the computational difficulties. It may be seen from Table 4 that the factor structure of the West German data differed from that reported by de Camprieu on those two factors. This problem did not occur when the *phi-matrix* specification was set to be diagonal. Consequently, for the final analysis the research used the interpretable result from the first LISREL® run.

The low *CHI-square* value and the low *goodness of fit* indices clearly indicated that the Canadian factor structure from de Camprieu did not fit the West German data and that they share few, if any values, with Canadians.

- 3) This specifies an orthogonal factor structure. In many cases a factor structure produced by a factor analysis with an oblique rotation (such as that reported by de Camprieu) will be very close to being orthogonal
- 4) After spending \$3,000 on a LISREL® run it was concluded the computational difficulties were substantial.

Discussion

The LISREL® *Confirmatory Factor Analysis* indicated that the two national cultures differ significantly. The factor structures and the loadings show that the Canadian data has ten interpretable factors, while the *oblique rotation* extracted twelve factors from the West German data. Closer examination revealed that the Canadian factor, *intellectual values* (2), had no German equivalent and that the German factors, *security* (11), *spontaneity* (12), and *esteem* (13) had no Canadian match. It also became clear that all other Canadian factors shared very few value variables with the corresponding German factors. Furthermore, the factor loadings for the few matching value variables differed considerably. The difference in value systems identified with the LISREL® procedure can be found in almost every factor.

Examination of the factors which corresponded to Hofstede's organizational value dimension, revealed significant differences between the national cultures. The factor, *intellectual values*, which corresponded to the *individualism* dimension in the organizational context, showed the largest differences between the two cultures; it simply did not exist in the German data. The Canadian variable structure for *religious/moral values* factor differed significantly from the West German culture. This indicated that both cultures exhibit different *uncertainty avoidance* behaviour. Similar findings were also evident for the Canadian *achievement* and *pacifist/egalitarian factors*, which signified differences in the *masculine values* and the *power distance* of the two cultures.

The LISREL® procedure confirmed Hofstede's findings by showing that the Canadian and West German national cultures differed on the four value dimensions, *individualism*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *masculinity*, and *power distance*. To summarize

Hofstede's findings, West German culture is more *masculine* than Canadian culture. They have an elevated *uncertainty avoidance* and are more *consensus* oriented. Furthermore, the West German respondents enjoy a lower *power distance* than their Canadian counterparts

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The Data

The data for the organizational culture comparison was collected during the months of December, 1988 for the West German companies and March to April, 1989 for the Canadian companies. From the list of managers made available, twelve managers from BMW FRG, four managers from COGNOS FRG, eleven managers from BMW CDN, and five from COGNOS CDN were interviewed. Each of the interviews lasted approximately one hour. Of the thirty-two managers interviewed, three from BMW Canada were not of Canadian descent, but all have lived at least three years in Canada. There was not enough evidence to dismiss the answers of the three who were not of Canadian descent. It was therefore decided to retain their answers for the final analysis.

The respondents were asked to describe their position within their organization and the organizational culture. These qualitative questions were administered by the interviewer to clarify possible questions. The final part of the questionnaire was completed by the respondents themselves, wherein they indicated their views regarding the organizational culture on a seven point scale. The answers to these seventeen questions were then compiled into the aforementioned four cultural dimensions on which they were based: *power distance*, *uncertainty avoidance*, *masculinity*, and *individualism* (Table 1).

Methodology

The answers from the questionnaire were subjected to a *Multivariate Analysis of Variance Program* (MANOVA) using the SPSS-X (Version 2.1, 1983) statistical computer package. MANOVA is recommended to compare more than two groups of respondents on several variables simultaneously, where the variables are correlated and together as a group share a common conceptual meaning. The groups were the respondents from the four different organizations, while the variables were the four Hofstede cultural value dimensions.

Wilk's lambda (Δ) statistic was used to determine the significance of the *multivariate analysis of variance* across all groups. The *level of significance* for the overall multivariate test was set at $\alpha = .05$. A significant overall multivariate test was then followed by all pairwise multivariate tests using *Hotelling's T^2* to determine which groups and which variables contributed to the overall significance. This determined which pair of groups differed significantly on the sets of variables. A significant pairwise multivariate test was followed by univariate *t* tests to determine which of the variables contributed significantly to the significant pairwise difference.

To maintain a reasonable overall low chance of rejection of the null hypothesis when it is true (*Type I* error), the *level of significance alpha* must take into consideration the six pairwise multivariate *Hotelling's T^2* tests. An overall *level of significance* of 15% was chosen to keep the overall *alpha* under control without reducing unreasonably the power of the multivariate statistic. Therefore, for the four groups there were six pairwise *Hotelling's T^2* tests, and each T^2 was tested at the $.15/6 = .025$ *level of significance alpha*. The univariate *t* tests were tested at the 5% *level of significance* to determine the significant variables. This method effectively

controlled the *Type I* error while maintaining a reasonable level of power.

Findings

The MANOVA procedure supported the null hypothesis that there is a significant overall difference between the four groups on the variables *individualism* and *power distance*; *Wilk's lambda* was highly significant (Table 5).

TABLE 5
MANOVA CALCULATIONS

	GROUP PAIRS*							
	1,2,3,4	1 vs 2	1 vs 3	1 vs 4	2 vs 3	2 vs 4	3 vs 4	1,2 vs 3,4
Wilk's Lambda $\alpha = .05$	.000							
Hotelling's T $\alpha = .025$		.002	.531	.002	.010	.006	.003	.460
Sig. of Variables $\alpha = .05$								
Individualism	.000	.061		.000	.005	.002	.000	
Power Distance	.000	.000		.019	.013	.141	.006	
Uncertainty A.	.093	.214		.113	.064	.546	.048	
Masculinity	.327	.466		.204	.968	.138	.038	

- * 1) = BMW AG, West Germany
 2) = BMW Inc., Canada
 3) = COGNOS GmbH, West Germany
 4) = COGNOS Inc., Canada

With the exception of one pair, the follow-up pairwise multivariate tests were consistent with the null hypothesis. The multivariate tests revealed that there was a significant difference between BMW FRG and BMW CDN on the variable, *power distance*, and that COGNOS FRG differed from COGNOS CDN on the variables, *individualism*, *uncertainty avoidance*, and *masculinity* (Table 5). Furthermore, there was no significant difference between BMW FRG and COGNOS FRG, although a difference was discovered between BMW CDN and COGNOS CDN on the variable, *individualism*. The data from the two BMW organizations (BMW FRG and BMW CDN) were pooled with the data from the two COGNOS' organizations (COGNOS CDN and COGNOS FRG). When the pooled data from the two organizations were compared, no significant difference was discovered between BMW and COGNOS. This confirmed the suggestion at the outset, that BMW and COGNOS were technology oriented companies and exhibit similar organizational behaviour. The remaining pairwise matches were all significantly different (*i.e.* BMW FRG vs COGNOS CDN and BMW CDN vs COGNOS FRG).

Discussion

The significant difference between BMW FRG vs BMW CDN and COGNOS FRG vs COGNOS CDN support the null hypothesis that the organizational cultures differ on one or more of the four variables. It is interesting to note that COGNOS FRG differed on more variables from COGNOS CDN, than was the case for the two BMW organizations. A possible explanation for this may lie in the amount of communication with the parent company and the use of expatriates from the parent company.

As Sathe explains:

Culture is communicated via both explicit and implicit forms. The former include announcements, pronouncements, memos, and other explicit communications (Sathe, 1983, p. 19).

He goes on to state that:

Both explicit and implicit communications must be relied on to nullify external justifications for the new behaviour and persuade people to adopt new cultural beliefs and values (Sathe, 1983, p. 19).

BMW FRG communicates extensively with its Canadian subsidiary. BMW CDN is in contact with BMW FRG on numerous occasions daily by telephone, facsimile, and/or telex. The Canadian entity also regularly receives visitors from and frequently sends its employees to BMW FRG. In addition, nearly every manager interviewed at BMW FRG was also fluent in the English language. Communication between the two organizations is therefore frequent and without the typical language barriers. One senior manager from BMW FRG observed that communications and regular visits are a means to ensure that BMW CDN employees internalize and share the same values as the parent company's employees. Recently, BMW FRG posted a senior executive to the Canadian subsidiary, who assumed the position of Vice President, Finance and Treasurer. He not only reports to the President of BMW Canada Inc., but also to the German headquarters of BMW in Munich. An expatriate in such a controlling position is regarded by many as a measure to ensure the subsidiary's conformity to the parent company's organizational culture. This belief is supported by the informal duties the expatriate has assumed since being posted to Canada. He is not only the Vice President, Finance and Treasurer, but is also informally involved with the administration of the company and has assumed the unofficial role of the Vice President, Personnel, a position currently not filled. This further enhances the span of

control of the Vice President, Finance over the organizational culture.

This interpretation is confirmed by Sathe:

A final set of processes that are important to consider if culture change is being attempted is (1) the hiring and socialization of newcomers to fit into the intended culture and (2) the "weeding out" and removal of existing members who do not conform (Sathe, 1983, p. 21).

This is evidenced by the high turnover of employees who did not conform to the organizational culture subsequent to BMW's acquisition of the Canadian distributorship in 1986. Approximately sixty percent of the employees at the time of the acquisition have since left the company. The most common complaint was that the organizational culture had changed. People were expected to work longer and harder (*masculinity*), their private life was increasingly influenced by the company (*individualism*), and stress increased to almost intolerable levels (*uncertainty avoidance*). All of these changes reflect a tendency towards congruence with the parent company's organizational culture, which reflects German national cultural values.

These measures drastically changed the organizational culture of BMW CDN and it is therefore remarkable that it still significantly differs from the organizational culture of its parent company. The significant difference between the two organizations can be explained by the influence of the surrounding Canadian culture. The Canadian culture is more *individualistic*, has a larger *power distance*, has a lower *uncertainty avoidance* and is more *feminine* than the West German culture. The evaluation of the means (Table 6 and 7) indicate that BMW CDN in comparison with BMW FRG shares these preferences with the Canadian culture.

TABLE 6
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
THE ORGANIZATIONAL DATA

Variables	BMW FRG		BMW CDN		COGNOS FRG		COGNOS CDN	
	x	s.d.	x	s.d.	x	s.d.	x	s.d.
Individualism	4.05	.86176	3.4	.73212	4.75	.52599	2.16	.08944
Power Distance	5.00	.55958	3.30	1.13485	5.00	.36004	4.17	.68718
Uncertainty A.	4.43	.68402	4.06	.69896	4.90	.73937	3.84	.59414
Masculinity	4.28	.87690	3.96	1.19185	3.93	.35787	4.86	.64653

TABLE 7
VARIABLE LABELS AND SCALE DEFINITION

Individualism	Individualistic	1.....7	Consensus
Power Distance	Large Power Distance	1.....7	Small Power Distance
Uncertainty Avoidance	Weak Uncertainty A.	1.....7	Strong Uncertainty A.
Masculinity	Feminine	1.....7	Masculine

Even though BMW's management changed the organizational culture of BMW CDN, its efforts fell short in overcoming the influence of the extant Canadian culture. BMW CDN is still more *individualistic*, more *feminine*, exhibits weaker *uncertainty avoidance*, and has a larger *power distance* than its German counterpart - the same factors on which the Canadian culture differs from the West German culture.

The communication link as a tool to change and control organizational culture, is not as developed between COGNOS and its German subsidiary. COGNOS CDN communicates with its subsidiary only once to twice a week, and the communication is usually limited to facsimile and/or electronic mail. Furthermore, the language barrier between the two organizations is considerably higher than with BMW, because very

few individuals in a managerial position from COGNOS CDN speak German, while the managers from its German subsidiary experience difficulty conversing in English. This is evidenced by the enrolment of several German managers in English courses.

The lack of communication is further aggravated by its reporting relationship to COGNOS Great Britain (GBR), because the latter serves as European headquarters responsible for the European COGNOS subsidiaries. Therefore, the direct communication link to the company's headquarters is not as extensive and rich in information because of language and logistical problems. Furthermore, there are no Canadian expatriates working in the German subsidiary, further limiting the direct influence of the parent company on the organizational culture of COGNOS FRG. There exists no Canadian 'idea and value champion' within the German subsidiary who can persuade the employees to adopt the parent company's cultural values and beliefs. As well, its German employees seldom travel to the Canadian headquarters. The German employees are aware of the lack of communication between the two organizations and have expressed the need to establish more extensive communications with their parent company. More frequent travel and increased telecommunication is favoured by most German managers, to overcome some of the problems.

COGNOS FRG is isolated from its parent company because of communications problems. Superficially, the two organizations have little else in common other than the name and the product. It is therefore no surprise that the organizational cultures of the two organizations differ significantly on almost all of Hofstede's cultural values. COGNOS CDN's organizational culture is more *individualistic*, has a larger *power distance*, and has a lower *uncertainty avoidance* level compared to the organizational culture of its German business unit. This reflects the identified differences in national

culture between the two countries.

The difference in *masculinity* is slightly different than expected. According to Hofstede, West Germany is typically more masculine than Canada, but the univariate *t* test and the mean value for the variable *masculinity* indicate that COGNOS CDN is more masculine than COGNOS FRG (Table 6). The primary difference between the two organizations in regard to the *masculinity* variable, can be attributed to the amount of overtime and company influence on the private life of the employee. German employees are subjected to less overtime than their Canadian colleagues and less company influence on their private lives. The stress level is considerably lower for German employees of COGNOS than for employees of the Canadian parent. This is primarily due to the smaller market in Germany and the attitude of the German general manager that private life and business should be separate. In contrast, COGNOS CDN is currently undergoing major restructuring to prepare it for the expected growth in the coming years. The company is planning to increase annual revenues from \$C 107 million to more than \$C 500 million by 1992. These plans have affected the Canadian employees and consequently many employees are experiencing high levels of stress. The turnover rate of employees is therefore very high. In addition, COGNOS is experiencing increasing difficulties in meeting its increased demand for qualified personnel. This has further increased the expected output of employees and exacerbated stress levels. Long overtime hours and the adverse effect on the private lives of the employees is the inevitable result of these pressures. COGNOS FRG has not experienced these changes to the same degree due to its position on the outer perimeter of the COGNOS corporation. Its German employees are aware of the changes affecting COGNOS CDN, but are currently more concerned with their own

problems.

In retrospect it is no surprise that COGNOS CDN reveals more masculine traits than its West German subsidiary, which is contrary to the national cultural differences between Canada and West Germany.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

The thesis showed that the hypotheses stated at the outset are valid. The organizational cultures of the parent company and its subsidiary differ, The Canadian and West German culture differ, and the two differences are related.

The results support the culture-bound theory that a relationship between organizational cultures and the encompassing national cultures exists.

There are a number of factors limiting the generalization of the research findings. These limiting factors are recognized but can not be removed due to financial, organizational and time constraints. It is nevertheless expected that the research will provide enough information to encourage future researchers with the necessary resources to continue with the research and expand the model.

The first limitation is the selection of only two companies, in conjunction with the limited number of interviews in both organizations. This problem cannot be alleviated and limits the research to a case study. Further research is required incorporating a larger sample.

The second limitation is the personal referral sampling method used for the national culture factor identification for West Germany. While more time and money would have permitted a simple random selection procedure, it is not clear that a simple random selection procedure justifies the additional time and money. Further research is required to clarify this issue.

The third limitation involves comparing companies from two different industries. BMW produces luxury automobiles, while COGNOS produces advanced computer software. Even though the research indicated that BMW and COGNOS can be classified as high technology companies, further research is required to conclusively determine differences and whether they introduce a bias.

The fourth limitation concerns the exclusive sample of females in de Camprieux's data. The full effect of this bias is not fully understood. Further research should employ a random sampling techniques to ensure a representative sample.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

PMW ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS

kurierung der Niederlassungen

BMW Canada Inc.

APPENDIX 2

COGNOS ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS

SALES DIVISIONS - EUROPE

Christian Lahondes
Geschäftsführer
Germany

—SALES

FRANKFURT

Peter Schmietendorf
(Acting General Mgr)
W.D. Neumeier

DUESSELDORF

C. Brockmeyer

—SUPPORT

FRANKFURT

R. Klein
Karl Roentgen
Robert Dauter
Wilhelm Rammer
Rainer Larterbach

DUESSELDORF

Erich Leitner

—ADMIN

FRANKFURT

K. Schuenemeier
Jutta Kuhn

DUESSELDORF

Renate Buescher-Jahnke

APPENDIX 3

RVS GERMAN VERSION

FRAGEBOGEN

- 1) Geschlecht
- 2) Geburtstag(jahr)
- 3) Nationalität
- 4) Nationalität der Eltern

A N L E I T U N G

Sie werden eine Liste mit 18 Wertvorstellungen finden, und wir bitten Sie, zwei getrennte Wahlen mit diesen Werten durchzuführen.

1. Aufgabe:

Einordnung der Eigenschaften in eine numerische Reihenfolge gemäß deren Wichtigkeiten als Prinzip für Sie in IHREM Leben.

Bitte durchdenken Sie die Liste recht sorgfältig und identifizieren Sie den für Sie wichtigsten Wert. Schreiben Sie eine 1 in das entsprechende Kästchen links von der Liste. Nun nehmen Sie den zweiten Wert in der Reihenfolge seiner Bedeutung für Sie, und schreiben Sie eine 2 in das entsprechende Kästchen. Verfahren Sie so mit den anderen Werten, so daß die Nummer 8 in dem entsprechenden Kästchen zu dem am wenigsten bedeutsamen Wert für Sie geschrieben steht.

2. Aufgabe:

Nachdem alle Werte numeriert sind, bitten wir Sie, den Grad der Bedeutung jedes dieser Werte als Leitfaden in Ihrem Leben anzugeben. Nehmen Sie den Wert, dem Sie die Nr. 1 zugeordnet haben, und markieren Sie seinen Grad der Bedeutung für Sie, indem Sie einen Kreis um eine der Zahlen der Gradeinteilung ziehen, die Sie rechts in der Liste finden. Je bedeutsamer der Wert für Sie ist, desto höher soll die umkreiste Nummer sein.

Um Ihnen zu helfen, sind einige Nummern dieser Wertungstabelle mit Text versehen. Verfahren Sie entsprechend mit den Werten, denen Sie die Nr. 2 bis 18 zugeordnet haben.

Rang		EXTREM WICHTIG		SEHR WICHTIG		MÄSSIG WICHTIG		WENIG WICHTIG		NICHT WICHTIG
	Ein bequemes Leben (ein Leben in Wohlstand)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Ein aufregendes Leben (anregendes, aktives Leben)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2		0
	Gefühl von Erfüllung (dauerhafte Verwirklichung)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Eine Welt des Friedens (ohne Krieg oder Konflikte)	8		6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Eine Welt der Schönheit (Schönheit in der Natur und in den Künsten)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Gleichheit (Brüderlichkeit, gleiche Möglichkeiten für alle)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Familiäre Sicherheit (sich um seine Lieben kümmern)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Freiheit (Unabhängigkeit, freie Wahl)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Glück (Zufriedenheit)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2		0
	Innere Ausgeglichenheit (frei von inneren Konflikten)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Eine reife Liebe (sexuelle u. geistige Intimität)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Nationale Sicherheit (Schutz gegen Angriffe)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Vergnügen (ein genüßreiches, gemächliches Leben)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Seelenheil (Erlösung, ewiges Leben)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Respekt vor sich selbst (Selbstachtung)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Öffentliche Anerkennung (Respekt, Bewunderung)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Echte Freundschaft (intime Freunde)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Weisheit (ein gereiftes Lebensverständnis)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

ANLEITUNG

Sie werden eine Liste mit 18 Wertvorstellungen finden, und wir bitten Sie, zwei getrennte Wahlen mit diesen Werten durchzuführen.

1. Aufgabe:

Einordnung der Eigenschaften in eine numerische Reihenfolge gemäß deren Wichtigkeiten als Prinzip für SIE in IHREM Leben.

Bitte durchdenken Sie die Liste recht sorgfältig und identifizieren Sie den für Sie wichtigsten Wert. Schreiben Sie eine 1 in das entsprechende Kästchen links von der Liste. Nun nehmen Sie den zweiten Wert in der Reihenfolge seiner Bedeutung für Sie, und schreiben Sie eine 2 in das entsprechende Kästchen. Verfahren Sie so mit den anderen Werten, so daß die Nummer 18 in dem entsprechenden Kästchen zu dem am wenigsten bedeutsamen Wert für Sie geschrieben steht.

2. Aufgabe:

Nachdem alle Werte numeriert sind, bitten wir Sie, den Grad der Bedeutung jedes dieser Werte als Leitfaden in Ihrem Leben anzugeben. Nehmen Sie den Wert, dem Sie die Nr. 1 zugeordnet haben, und markieren Sie seinen Grad der Bedeutung für Sie, indem Sie einen Kreis um eine der Zahlen der Gradeinteilung ziehen, die Sie rechts in der Liste finden. Je bedeutsamer der Wert für Sie ist, desto höher soll die umkreiste Nummer sein.

Um Ihnen zu helfen, sind einige Nummern dieser Wertungstabelle mit ☐ xt versehen. Verfahren Sie entsprechend mit den Werten, denen Sie die Nr. 2 bis 18 zugeordnet haben.

Rang		EXTREM WICHTIG		SEHR WICHTIG		MASSIG WICHTIG		WENIG WICHTIG		OHNE BEDEUTUNG
	EHRGEIZIG (fleißig, strebsam)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	KOMPETENT (fähig, effektiv)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	FRÖHLICH (lebenslustig, froh)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	ORDENTLICH (gepflegt, auf sich achtend)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	MUTIG (für seine Überzeugungen ein- treten)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	VERSÖHNLICH (bereit, anderen zu vergeben)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	HILFSBEREIT (zum Wohl anderer arbeiten)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	EHRLICH (aufrichtig, zuverlässig)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	ERFINDUNGSREICH (kühn, kreativ)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	UNABHÄNGIG (selbständig, nicht auf fremde angewiesen)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	INTELLEKTUELL (intelligent, nachdenkend)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	LOGISCH (vernünftig, beständig)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	LIEBEND (herzlich, zärtlich)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	JEHORSAM (pflichtgetreu, respektvoll)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	HÖFLICH (gewandt, mit guten Manieren)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	VERANTWORTUNGSBEWUSST (verantwortungsbewusst, zuverlässig)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	SELBSTBEHERRSCHT (diszipliniert, zurückhaltend)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	POSSIBILITÄT (offener Geist)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

APPENDIX 4**RVS ENGLISH VERSION**

INSTRUCTIONS

Below are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. We would like you to perform two separate tasks with respect to them.

FIRST TASK: Rank number the values in order of their importance to YOU as a guiding principle in YOUR life.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important to you; write "1" in the corresponding box on the left of the value list. Then pick out the value which is second most important to you and write "2" in the corresponding box. Continue with the other values until the number "18" is written in the box corresponding to the value least important to you.

SECOND TASK: Now that the 18 values have been ranked, we would like you to indicate HOW important each value is to you as a guiding principle in your life. Take the value that you ranked first and indicate HOW important it is to you by drawing a circle around a number in the scale appearing on the right of the value list. The greater the number circled, the more important the value to you. In order to help you, labels have been specified for some numbers at the top of the scale. Do the same thing with the value you ranked second. Continue until all values have been rated.

		<div>Extremely Important</div> <div>Very Important</div> <div>Moderately Important</div> <div>Slightly Important</div> <div>Not Important at All</div>																			
col. 17	4-7																			col. 18	4-7
		A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0										
8-9		AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating active life)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									43	
10-11		A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									44	
12-13		A WORLD OF PEACE (free of war and conflict)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									45	
14-15		A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									46	
16-17		EQUALITY (brotherhood equal opportunity for all)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									47	
18-19		FAMILY SECURITY (caring care of loved ones)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									48	
20-21		FREEDOM (Independence, free choice)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									49	
22-23		HAPPINESS (contentedness)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									50	
24-25		INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									51	
26-27		MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									52	
28-29		NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									53	
30-31		PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									54	
32-33		SALVATION (saved, eternal life)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									55	
34-35		SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									56	
36-37		SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									57	
38-39		TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									58	
40-41		WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0									59	

When you have finished, go to the next page

INSTRUCTIONS

81

Below is another set of 18 values listed in alphabetical order. We would like you to perform the same two tasks as with the previous set.

FIRST TASK: Rank number the values in order of their importance to YOU as a guiding principle in YOUR life.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important to you; write "1" in the corresponding box on the left of the value list. Then pick out the value which is second most important to you and write "2" in the corresponding box. Continue with the other values until the number "18" is written in the box corresponding to the value least important to you.

SECOND TASK: Now that the 18 values have been ranked, we would like you to indicate HOW important each value is to you as a guiding principle in your life. Take the value that you ranked first and indicate HOW important it is to you by drawing a circle around a number in the scale appearing on the right of the value list. The greater the number circled, the more important the value to you. In order to help you, labels have been specified for some numbers at the top of the scale. Do the same thing with the value you ranked second. Continue until all values have been rated.

		<div>Extremely Important</div> <div>Very Important</div> <div>Important</div> <div>Less Important</div> <div>Not Important</div>								
col. 1/60-61	AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspirational)	5	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
62-63	BROADMINDED (openminded)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
64-65	CAPABLE (competent, effective)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
66-67	CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
68-69	CLEAN (neat, tidy)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
70-71	COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
72-73	FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
74-75	HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
76-77	HONEST (sincere, truthful)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
78-79	IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
col. 2/ 6-7	INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
8-9	INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
10-11	LOGICAL (consistent, rational)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
12-13	LOVING (affectionate, tender)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
14-15	OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
16-17	POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
18-19	RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
20-21	SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-discipline)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

When you have finished, go to the next page.

APPENDIX 5

RVS FRENCH VERSION

INSTRUCTIONS

83

Vous trouverez ci-dessous une liste de 18 valeurs. Nous aimerions que vous classiez deux choses séparément avec ces valeurs.

Première tâche: numérotez les valeurs par ordre de leur importance pour VOUS, comme guide dans VOTRE VIE : lisez la liste avec soin et identifiez la valeur la plus importante pour vous; écrivez "1" dans la case correspondante, à la gauche de la liste de valeurs. Ensuite, prenez la deuxième valeur en ordre d'importance pour vous et écrivez "2" dans la case correspondante. Continuez ainsi avec les autres valeurs jusqu'à ce que le nombre "18" soit inscrit dans la case correspondant à la valeur la moins importante pour vous.

Deuxième tâche: maintenant que toutes les valeurs sont numérotées, nous aimerions que vous indiquiez le DEGRÉ d'importance de chacune de ces valeurs, comme guide dans votre vie: Prenez la valeur à laquelle vous avez donné le numéro "1" et indiquez son degré d'importance pour vous en traçant un cercle autour d'un des nombres de l'échelle figurant à droite de la liste.

Plus la valeur est importante pour vous, plus le nombre encadré doit être élevé. Pour vous aider, la signification de quelques uns de ces nombres, a été indiquée en haut de l'échelle. Procédez de la même façon avec la valeur à laquelle vous avez donné le numéro "2". Continuez ainsi jusqu'à ce que toutes les valeurs aient été évaluées.

		<div><div>Extrêmement important</div><div>Très important</div><div>Modérément important</div><div>Peu important</div><div>Aucun importance</div></div>										
col.1/6-7		8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	col.1/42	
	UNE VIE AISEE (une vie prospère)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0		
8-9	UNE VIE EXCITANTE (une vie stimulante, active)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	43	
10-11	UN SENS D'ACCOMPLISSEMENT (de réalisation durable)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	44	
12-13	UN MONDE EN PAIX (sans guerre ni conflit)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	45	
14-15	UN MONDE DE BEAUTE (beauté dans la nature et dans les arts)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	46	
16-17	L'EGALITE (fraternité, chances égales pour tous)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	47	
18-19	LA SECURITE FAMILIALE (prendre soin des êtres chers)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	48	
20-21	LA LIBERTE (indépendance, libre choix)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	49	
22-23	LE BONHEUR (contentement)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	50	
24-25	L'HARMONIE INTERIEURE (libre de conflit intérieur)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	51	
26-27	UN AMOUR MUR (intimité sexuelle et spirituelle)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	52	
28-29	LA SECURITE NATIONALE (protection contre des attaques)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	53	
30-31	LE PLAISIR (une vie de loisirs, de jouissances)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	54	
32-33	LE SALUT (sauvé, vie éternelle)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	55	
34-35	LE RESPECT DE SOI-MEME (estime de soi)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	56	
36-37	LA CONSIDERATION SOCIALE (respect, admiration)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	57	
38-39	UNE AMITIE VERITABLE (des amis intimes)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	58	
40-41	LA SAGESSE (une saine compréhension de la vie)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	59	

Deuxième tâche: maintenant que toutes les valeurs sont numérotées, nous aimerions que vous indiquiez le DEGRÉ d'importance de chacune de ces valeurs, comme guide dans votre vie. Prenez la valeur à laquelle vous avez donné le numéro "1" et indiquez son degré d'importance pour vous en traçant un cercle autour d'un des nombres de l'échelle figurant à droite de la liste.

Plus la valeur est importante pour vous, plus le nombre encerclé doit être élevé. Pour vous aider, la signification de quelques uns de ces nombres, a été indiquée en haut de l'échelle. Procédez de la même façon avec la valeur à laquelle vous avez donné le numéro "2". Continuez ainsi jusqu'à ce que toutes les valeurs aient été évaluées.

		<div> <div>Extrêmement important</div> <div>Très important</div> <div>Moderatement important</div> <div>Légerement important</div> <div>Sans aucune importance</div> </div>									
col.1/60-61	AMBITIEUX (qui travaille fort, qui aspire à quelque chose)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	col.2/22
62-63	LARGE D'ESPRIT (à l'esprit ouvert)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	23
64-65	COMPÉTENT (capable, efficace)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	24
66-67	GAI (au cœur léger, joyeux)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	25
68-69	PROPRE (soigné, bien tenu)	8	7	5	5	4	3	2	1	0	26
70-71	COURAGEUX (qui défend ses croyances)	8	7	6	5	4		2	1	0	27
72-73	CLEMENT (disposé à pardonner aux autres)	8	7	6	5	4		2	1	0	28
74-75	SERVIALE (qui agit pour le bien-être des autres)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	29
76-77	HONNÊTE (sincère, véridique)	8		6	5	4	3	2		0	30
78-79	IMAGINATIF (audacieux, créatif)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		31
col.2/ 6-7	INDÉPENDANT (qui se fie à lui-même, qui se suffit à lui-même)	8	7	6	5		3	2	1	0	32
8-9	INTELLECTUEL (intelligent, penseur)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	33
10-11	LOGIQUE (rationnel, consistant)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	34
12-13	AIMANT (affectueux, tendre)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	35
14-15	OBEISSANT (souris, respectueux)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	36
16-17	POLI (courtois, qui a de bonnes manières)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	37
18-19	RESPONSABLE (digne de confiance, fiable)	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	38
20-21	MAÎTRE DE SOI (qui se contrôle, qui se discipline)	8	7	5	5	4	3	2	1	0	39

APPENDIX 6**ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE:
ENGLISH VERSION**

2

OF/DE

2

MicroD

14) The company expects a written report for:

Every Event 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Event

15) How important is individual initiative for getting promotions.

Not Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Important

16) The company rewards managers who take care of their subordinates:

Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Considerably

17) I do my best for the company doing my best personal performance:

True 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 False

RESPONDENT

- 1) Sex
- 2) Birthdate (year)
- 3) Nationality
- 4) Nationality of parents

RESPONDENTS POSITION WITHIN THE ORGANIZATIONS

- 1) How long have you been with the company?
- 2) What is your current position?
- 3) What are your duties and responsibilities?
- 4) When were you appointed to this position?
- 5) Where do you position yourself graphically within the company (Draw a Triangle)?
- 6) Were you ever on an overseas assignment/posting for longer than three months?
Where were you, with what company, and for how long?
- 7) Would you like to be posted abroad? Where would you like to go and for how long?

8) How important are the foreign operations for

a) the company

b) your department

9) What are the chances for expansion into overseas markets for

a) the company

b) your department

10) How often do each of the following staff members visit corporate headquarters/foreign business units in an average year?

VP Personnel_____

VP Research and Development_____

VP Finance_____

VP Production_____

Marketing Director_____

Chief Engineer_____

11) Does anyone from your department make regular visits to corporate headquarters/foreign business units? Yes_____ No_____.

If yes, what position do they hold?_____

How often do they go in an average year?_____

12) How often in an average week, is your business unit as a whole in touch with corporate headquarters/foreign business units by telephone?_____

by telex/facsimile?_____

13) How many visits, in an average month, does your business unit receive visits from

- a) other companies? _____
- b) other company business units? _____
- c) foreign business units? _____

14) How many of these visits are concerned with the following functions (in percent)?

- a) Administration _____
- b) Research and Development _____
- c) Finance _____
- d) Data Processing _____
- e) Personnel _____
- f) Marketing _____
- g) other (please specify) _____

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

- 1) Does the working climate of BMW/COGNOS differ from that of other companies? If yes, how does it differ? (please name 2 to 5 significant differences?)
- 2) Could you please name 3 to 5 cultural values that BMW/COGNOS employees share or believe in?
- 3) Are there any specific mannerisms that you have noticed as being typical or representative for BMW/COGNOS? If yes, could you please name 3 to 5 of them.
- 4) From the employees' perspective, Are there any articles, objects, or symbols representative of BMW/COGNOS? If yes, please name and describe them:
- 5) Does BMW/COGNOS have any official symbols that it would like its employees to share? If yes, what are they and what is their purpose?
- 6) Are there any stories or anecdotes that are important for the company?

QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1) The company expects from job applicants an employment commitment of:

2 3 4 6 8 10 15+ Years

- 2) The manner of working that the company would like to see from its employees is best described as:

Individual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Teamwork

- 3) The corporate etiquette expects the employees to be dressed:

Casual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Formal

- 4) The corporate etiquette expects interpersonal manners with:

Superiors to be

Formal/Distance Preserving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Personal/Friendly
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Fellow colleagues to be

Formal/Distance Preserving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Personal/Friendly
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

- 5) The average work week includes overtime of:

0 2 5 8 10 15 20 Hours.

- 6) How much does the company influence the private life of its employees?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Considerably

- 7) Does the company expect its employees to attend company functions?

Expected 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Individual discretion

8) The leadership style of the company is best described as being:

Authoritarian 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Consensus

9) The company's attitude towards mistakes of its employees is by

<u>Small mistakes</u>	Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant
<u>Medium mistakes</u>	Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant
<u>Serious mistakes</u>	Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant

10) The expected work performance of the employees is:

Low 1 2 3 5 6 7 Very High

11) How important is for the company its employees' attitude to important decisions:

Not Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Important

12) The decision making process of the company is best described as:

Flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inflexible
Creative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Conservative

13) Important organizational decisions usually take:

<u>Operative Decisions</u>								
Days	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Weeks
<u>Strategic Decisions</u>								
Weeks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Years

14) The company expects a written report for:

Every Event 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 No Event

15) How important is individual initiative for getting promotions:

Not Important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Important

16) The company rewards managers who take care of their subordinates:

Not At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Considerably

17) I do my best for the company doing my best personal performance:

True 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 False

APPENDIX 7**ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE:
GERMAN VERSION**

FRAGEBOGEN

- 1) Geschlecht
- 2) Geburtstag(jahr)
- 3) Nationalität
- 4) Nationalität der Eltern

STELLUNG INNERHALB DES UNTERNEHMENS

- 1) Wie lange gehören Sie diesem Unternehmen schon an?
- 2) Welche Stellung haben Sie im Unternehmen?
- 3) Welche Pflichten und Aufgaben beinhaltet Ihre Stellung?
- 4) Wann sind Sie zu dieser Stellung befördert worden?
- 5) Wie schätzen Sie selbst Ihre Stellung im Unternehmen ein?

- 6) Haben Sie berufliche Auslandserfahrung mit diesem oder einem anderen Unternehmen?
- 7) Sind Sie an einem beruflichen Auslandsaufenthalt interessiert? Wo würden Sie gerne hingehen?
- 8) Wie wichtig ist das Auslandsgeschäft des Unternehmens in ihrem Geschäftsbereich?
- 9) Wie groß sind die Chancen für das Auslandsgeschäft?

- 10) Wie oft besuchen die folgenden Personen das Stammhaus oder ausländische Geschäftsstellen?

Personalvorstand_____	Forschungs- und Entwicklungsvorstand_____
Finanzvorstand_____	Produktionsvorstand _____
Marketing Direktor_____	Erster Ingenieur_____

- 11) Gibt es außerdem noch Personen, die regelmäßig ausländische Geschäftsstellen besuchen? Nein_____ Ja_____.
 Welche Stellung hat diese Person_____. Wie oft macht dann diese Person im Durchschnitt diese Besuche?_____

12) Wie oft steht Ihre Geschäftsstelle telefonisch_____ per telex _____ mit dem Stammhaus in Verbindung?

13) Wie oft erhält ihr Geschäftsbereich Besuch von:

Anderen Firmen_____

Anderen Geschäftsbereichen_____

Ausländischen Geschäftstellen_____

14) Wieviele Besuche betreffen davon:

a) Verwaltung_____

b) Forschung und Entwicklung_____

c) Finanzwesen_____

d) EDV_____

e) Personal_____

f) Marketing_____

g) andere_____

UNTERNEHMENSKULTUR

Der Begriff Kultur ist normalerweise definiert als ein Muster von Gedanken, Umgangsformen und Werten, die Mitglieder einer Gruppe gemeinsam haben und teilen

- 1) Unterscheidet sich das Arbeitsklima Ihres Unternehmens von anderen Unternehmen?
Wenn ja, wie?
- 2) Bitte nennen Sie drei bis fünf Werte die von der Belegschaft allgemein akzeptiert werden.
- 3) Sind Ihnen spezifische Umgangsformen aufgefallen, die typisch oder kennzeichnend für Ihr Unternehmen sind? Wenn ja, welche?
- 4) Gibt es Gegenstände, Objekte oder Symbole, die in den Augen der Belegschaft für das Unternehmen stehen? Wenn ja, welche?
- 5) Hat das Unternehmen offizielle Symbole, die es gerne von der Belegschaft akzeptiert sehen würde?
- 6) Gibt es Geschichten oder Anekdoten die bedeutend für das Unternehmen sind?

FRAGEBOGEN

- 1) Das Unternehmen erwartet von Berufsbewerbern, daß sie mindestens ein:

2 3 4 6 8 10 15+ jähriges

Arbeitsverhältnis eingehen.

- 2) Die Arbeitsweise, die das Unternehmen wünscht ist:

Einzelarbeit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Teamarbeit

- 3) Das Erscheinungsbild der Beschäftigten sollte sein:

Legere 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Formell/Anzug

- 4) Das Unternehmen erwartet bei:

Vorgesetzten

Formale/Distanz wahrende Umgangsformen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Persönliche, freundschaftliche Umgangsformen
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

Kollegen

Formale/Distanz wahrende Umgangsformen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Persönliche, freundschaftliche Umgangsformen
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

- 5) Der wöchentliche Arbeitsrhythmus beinhaltet im Durchschnitt:

0 2 5 8 10 15 20 Überstunden.

- 6) Inwieweit beeinflußt das Unternehmen bewußt das Privatleben der Mitarbeiter?

Gar Nicht 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Erheblich

- 7) Inwieweit wird erwartet, daß die Belegschaft an Veranstaltungen des Unternehmens teilnimmt?

Vorausgesetzt 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Freigestellt

8) Der Führungsstil des Unternehmens ist am besten beschrieben als:

Autoritär	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Konsens Orientiert.
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------

9) Die Einstellung des Unternehmens gegenüber Fehlern der Mitarbeiter ist bei:

<u>Leichten</u>	Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant
<u>Mittleren</u>	Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant
<u>Schweren Fehlern</u>	Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant

10) Die Erwartung an die Arbeitsleistung der Mitarbeiter ist:

Gering	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sehr hoch
--------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

11) Wie wichtig ist für die Unternehmensführung die Einstellung der Mitarbeiter zu Unternehmen betreffenden Entscheidungen?

Unwichtig	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sehr Wichtig
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------

12) Der Entscheidungsprozeß des Unternehmens kann am besten beschrieben werden als:

Flexibel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unflexibel
Kreativ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Konservativ

13) Wichtige Entscheidungen des Unternehmens tendieren bei:

Operativen Entscheidungen in
Tage 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Wochen

bei Strategischen Entscheidungen in
Wochen 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Jahren

gemessen zu werden (hier ist nicht die exakte Dauer in Tagen oder Wochen von Interesse, sondern ob es "Tage" oder "Wochen" dauert bevor eine Entscheidung gefällt wird).

14) Das Unternehmen erwartet eine schriftliche Niederlegung von:

Jedem Vorgang 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Keinem Vorgang

15) Inwieweit bestimmt der persönliche Einsatz die berufliche Beförderung?

Gar nicht 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Erheblich

16) Man wird vom Unternehmen belohnt, wenn man Fürsorge für seine Untergebenen zeigt:

Gar nicht 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Erheblich

17) Ich leiste für das Unternehmen am meisten, wenn ich persönliche Bestleistung zeige

Richtig 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Falsch

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ajiferuke, M. and J.J. Boddewyn, "Culture and other Explanatory Variables in Comparative Management Studies", *Academy of Management Journal*, 1970, 35 (June), pp. 153-163.
- Allaire, Y. and M.E. Firsirotu, "Theories of Organizational Culture", *Organization Studies*, 1984, 5/3: pp. 193-226.
- Azumi, J., "Japanese Society: A Sociological View", in A.E. Tiedemann (ed.), *An Introduction to Japanese Civilization*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Berelson, B., and G.A. Steiner, *Human Behaviour: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.
- Brislin, R.W., "Back Translation for Cross-Cultural Research", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Sept. 1970, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 185-216.
- Brislin, R.W., W.J. Lonner, and R.M. Thorndike, *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Learning*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.
- Budde, A., J. Child, A. Francis, and A. Kieser, "Corporate Goals, Managerial Objectives, and Organizational Structures in British and West German Companies", *Organizational Studies*, 1982, Vol. 3, No. 1.
- Child, J., "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, J., and A. Kieser, "Organizational and Managerial Roles in British and West German Companies: An Examination of the Culture-Free Thesis", in C.J. Hammers and D.J. Hickson (ed), *Organizations Alike and Unlike*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Cray, D., "Control and Coordination in Multinational Corporations", *Journal of International Business Studies*. Fall 1984, pp. 85-98.
- Cray, D., and G. Mallory, "A Comparative Examination of Organizational Decision-Making", Paper presented to the *Administrative Sciences Association of Canada*, Toronto, Ont., 1987.
- Crozier, M., "Sentiments, Organizations et Systemes", *Revue Francaise de Sociologie*, Vol. 11-12, 1970-71, pp. 149-50.

- De Camprieu, R.M., *Personal Values as a Potential Basis for Cross-Cultural Segmentation*. Doctoral thesis submitted to the Faculty of Management Studies, University of Toronto, 1979.
- Desphande, R., and F.E. Webster Jr., "Organizational Culture and Marketing: Defining the Agenda", *Journal of Marketing*, January 1989, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 3-15.
- Denison, D.R., "Bringing Corporate Culture To The Bottom Line", *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn 1984, pp. 4-22.
- England, G.W., and R. Lee, "The Relationship Between Managerial Values and Managerial Success in the United States, Japan, India, and Australia", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1974, 59 (4), pp. 411-419.
- Evan, W.M., "Measuring The Impact of Culture On Organizations", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Spring 1975, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 91-113.
- Feather, N.T., and D.G. Cross, "Value Systems and Delinquency: Parental and Generational Discrepancies in Value Systems for Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys", *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, June 1975, pp. 119-129.
- Farmer, R., and B.M. Richman, *Comparative Management and Economic Progress*. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965
- Frost, P.J., L.F. Moore, M.R. Louis, C. Lundberg, and J. Martin, *Organizational Culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1985.
- Gagliardi, P., "The Creation and Change of Organizational Cultures: A Conceptual Framework", *Organization Studies*, 1986, 7/2:, pp. 117-134.
- Geertz, C., "Ideology as a Cultural System", in David E. Apter (ed), *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: The Free Press, 1964, pp. 47-76.
- Greeno, D.W., M.S. Sommers, and G.H. Haines Jr., "What Kind of Subject can a Referral System Generate? A Case Analysis", *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 1976, Vol 18, No. 4, pp. 207-210.
- Goodstein, L.D., "American Business Values and Cultural Imperialism", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1981, pp. 49-54.
- Hall, E.T., *Beyond Culture*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Harbison, F., and C.A. Myers (ed.), *Management in the Industrial World: An International Analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Heydebrand, W.V. (ed.), *Comparative Organizations: The Results of Empirical Research*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

- 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.
- Hickson, D.J., C.J. McMillan, K. Azumi, and D. Horvath, "Grounds for Comparative Organization Theory: Quicksands or Hard Core?", in C.J. Lammers and D.J. Hickson (ed), *Organizations Alike and Unlike*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Hofstede, G., "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, G., "Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer 1980, pp. 42-63.
- Hofstede, G., "The Interaction Between National and Organizational Value Systems", *Journal of Management Studies*, 1985, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 347-357.
- Hofstede, G., and M.H. Bond, "Hofstede's Culture Dimensions: An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Scale", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1984, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 417-33.
- Horvath, D., K. Azumi, D.J. Hickson, and C.J. McMillan, "The Cultural Context of Organization Control: An International Comparison", *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 1976, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 60-86.
- Hulbert, J.M., and W.K. Brandt, *Managing the Multinational Subsidiary*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1980.
- Jain, S.C., "Standardization of International Marketing Strategy: Some Research Hypotheses", *Journal of Marketing*, January 1989, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 70-79.
- Kaiser, H.F., "The Application of Electronic Computers to Factor Analysis", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1960, Vol. 20, pp. 141-151.
- Kelley, L., and R. Worthley, "The Role of Culture in Comparative Management: A Cross-Cultural Perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, 1981, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 164-173.
- Kerr, C., J.T. Dunlop, F. Harbison and C.A. Myers. *Industrialism and Industrial Man*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Kroeber, A.L., and C. Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1952.

- Lane, H.W., and J.J. DiStefano, *International Management Behaviour: From Policy to Practice*. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada, 1988.
- Lebas, M., and J. Weigenstein, "Management Control: The Rules, markets, and Culture", *Journal of Management Studies*, 1986, Vol. 23, pp. 259-272.
- Mallory, G.R., R.J. Butler, D. Cray, D.J. Hickson, and D.C. Wilson, "Implanted Decision-Making: American Owned Firms in Britain", *Journal of Management Studies*, 1983, Vol 20, No. 2, pp. 191-211.
- Maurice, M., "For a Study of 'The Societal Effect': Universality and Specificity in Organization Research", in C.J. Lammers and D.J. Hickson (ed), *Organization: Alike and Unlike*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Maurice, M., "Introduction: Theoretical and ideological Aspects of the Universalistic Approach to the Study of Management and Organizations", *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 1976, Vol. 6, pp. 3-10.
- 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.
- Negandhi, A.R., "Comparative Management and Organization Theory: A Marriage Needed", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 18, 1975.
- Negandhi, A.R., and S.B. Prasad, *Comparative Management*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.
- Ohmae, K., "Managing in a Borderless World", *Harvard Business Review*, 1989, Vol. 3, pp. 152-161.
- Ouchi, W.G., and A.L. Wilkins, "Organizational Culture", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1985, Vol. 11, pp. 457-485.
- Parsons, T., and E.A. Shils, "Values, Motives and Systems of Action", in Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds), *Toward a General Theory of Action*. 1951, pp. 47-109.
- Pascale, R.T. and A.G. Athos, *The Art of Japanese Management*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- Peters, T., and R. Waterman, *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper & Row publisher, 1982.
- Roberts, K.H., "On Looking at an Elephant: An Evaluation of Cross-Cultural Research Related to Organizations", *Psychological Bulletin*, 1970, Vol. 74, No. 5, pp. 327-350.

- Robinson, J.P., and P.R. Shaver, *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1971, pp. 13-22.
- Rokeach, M.J., "The Role of Values and Consumer Behaviour", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Winter 1968-69, pp. 547-559.
- Rokeach, M., and S. Parker, "Values as Social Indicators of Poverty and Race Relations in America", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1970, 388, pp. 97-111.
- Rokeach, M.J., *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Sathe, V., "Some Action Implications Of Corporate Culture: A Managers Guide To Action", *Organizational Dynamics*, 1983, Vol. 12, Autumn, pp. 4-23.
- Smirnich, L., "Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1983, Vol. 28, pp. 339-358.
- Stevens, J., *Applied Multivariate Statistic For The Social Sciences*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1986.
- Schwartz, H., and S.M. Davis, "Matching Corporate Culture and Business Strategy", *Organizational Dynamics*, 1981, Vol. 10, pp. 30-48.
- Tayeb, M., "Contingency Theory and Culture: A Study of Matched English and Indian Manufacturing Firms", *Organizational Studies*, 1987, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 241-261.
- Tse, D.K., K. Lee, I. Vertinsky, and D.A. Wehrung, "Does Culture Matter? A Cross-Cultural Study of Executives' Choice, Decisiveness, and Risk Adjustment in International Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, 1988, Vol 52, pp. 81-95.
- Vinson, D.E., J.M. Munson, and M. Nakanishi, "An Investigation of the Rokeach Value Survey for Consumer Research Applications", in W.C. Perreault (Ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. 4). Chicago: Association for Consumer Research, 1977.

END

18/09/90

FIN