

COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL CULTURE DIMENSIONS ON TRAITS OF ORGANIZATION CULTURE

Dalia ŠTREIMIKIENĖ

Mykolas Romeris University, Faculty of Economics and Finance management
Ateities g. 20, LT-80303, Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: daliastreimikiene@mruni.eu

Asta MIKALOUSKIENĖ

Vilnius University, Kaunas Faculty of Humanities
Muitinės g. 8, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lithuania
E-mail: astam@mail.lei.lt

Abstract. The paper deals with national culture and organizational culture assessment methods and applies the Denison Organization Culture Survey to measure organizational culture in Lithuanian SME in Kaunas region. The paper aims to define the impact of national culture dimensions on organizational culture dimensions by applying comparative analysis for Taiwan, Mexico and Lithuania. The comparative analysis revealed that *power distance* is positively related to *involvement*, but negatively related to the traits of *consistency*, *adaptability* and *mission*. *Individualism vs. collectivism* is negatively related to all the organizational traits except *involvement*. *Masculinity vs. femininity* is positively connected to *involvement*, but negatively to other traits. *Uncertainty avoidance* is positively linked to all the organizational traits except *consistency*. *Long term vs. short term orientation* is positively associated to the organizational traits *involvement* and *consistency*, but negatively related to *adaptability* and *mission*.

JEL classification: Z1.

Keywords: national culture dimensions, organizational culture, Denison Organization Culture Survey.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: nacionalinės kultūros dimensijos, organizacijų kultūros dimensijos, Denisono organizacijos kultūros klausimynas.

1. Introduction

There are several definitions of organizational culture provided by scientific literature. According to G. Johnson & Scholes (1990) and E. Schein (1992), organizational culture includes a collection of the beliefs, values and norms that exist in the organi-

zation. All of this can be expressed in symbols, myths, rituals, languages, histories, which directly affect the behaviour of the organization's staff, so most scientists, such as Chatman (1991), O'Reilly et al. (1991), Schneider and Reichers (1983), argue that organizational culture consists of visible and invisible elements.

Invisible elements of organizational culture, according to Xenikou et al. (1996), Rodsutti (2002), Hofstede et al. (1990), Cooke and Rousseau (1988), are related to the values existing between the members of the organization. Meanwhile, visible elements of organizational culture, according to Cooke and Rousseau (1988) and Hofstede et al. (1990), are expressed in the norms of behaviour and organizational practices. The visible elements may include communication styles, decision-making process of the problems and solutions to others. J. Stoner, R. Ereemen, D. Gilbert, (1999) compare organizational culture compares with an iceberg. In the visible part of iceberg are the open cultural aspects, under the water—invisible, hidden, informal cultural aspects.

Research in the field of organizational culture was widely launched only in the late 1970s, when G. Hofstede arranged a group of experts to conduct a study to determine how work-related cultural differences in more than 50 countries around the world are influenced by organizational management techniques. The research findings (Hofstede, 1983) showed that the organization's management could to adapt to local conditions, the country's cultural and social values and traditions.

In order to formulate a unified concept of organizational culture and assess the organizational culture, it is necessary to examine the dimensions of organizational culture. Hofstede identified 5 cultural dimensions:

1. Power/Distance (PD)
2. Individualism
3. Masculinity
4. Uncertainty/Avoidance Index (UAI)
5. Long Term Orientation (LTO)

Power/Distance (PD)—this refers to the degree of inequality that exists—and is accepted—among people with and without power. A high PD score indicates that society accepts an unequal distribution of power and people understand “their place” in the system. Low PD means that power is shared and well dispersed. It also means that society members view themselves as equals.

Individualism (IDV)—this refers to the strength of the ties people have to others within the community. A high IDV score indicates a loose connection with people. In countries with a high IDV score there is a lack of interpersonal connection and little sharing of responsibility, beyond family and perhaps a few close friends. A society with a low IDV score would have strong group cohesion, and there would be a large amount of loyalty and respect for members of the group. The group itself is also larger and people take more responsibility for each other's well-being.

Masculinity (MAS)—this refers to how much of society sticks with, and values, traditional male and female roles. High MAS scores are found in countries where men are expected to be tough, to be the provider, to be assertive and to be strong. If women

work outside the home, they have separate professions from men. Low MAS scores do not reverse the gender roles. In a low MAS society, the roles are simply blurred. You see women and men working together equally across many professions. Men are allowed to be sensitive and women can work hard for professional success.

Uncertainty/Avoidance Index (UAI)—this is related to the degree of anxiety that society members feel when they are in uncertain or unknown situations. High UAI-scoring nations try to avoid ambiguous situations whenever possible. They are governed by rules and order and they seek a collective “truth.” Low UAI scores indicate that society enjoys novel events and values differences. There are very few rules and people are encouraged to discover their own truth.

Long Term Orientation (LTO) refers to how much society values long-standing—as opposed to short term—traditions and values.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) argue that culture is the single most important factor accounting for success or failure in organizations. They identified four key dimensions of culture:

1. *Values*—the beliefs that lie at the heart of corporate culture.
2. *Heroes*—the people who embody values.
3. *Rites and rituals*—routines of interaction that have strong symbolic qualities.
4. *The culture network*—the informal communication system or hidden hierarchy of power in the organization.

According to Bethlem (1999), individuals are culturally different, because they have different effects on different areas of education, and have different motives and goals. However, the organization participating in all of its members have common goals, requiring joint action and the organizational practices, and a unified understanding of organizational values. Regardless, if an organization is to succeed and thrive, a knowledge culture must develop to help it deal with its external environment. But organizational culture is hard to change in the best circumstances. Employees need time to get used to new ways of organizing.

Peters and Waterman (1982) suggest a psychological theory of the link between organizational culture and business performance. Culture can be looked upon as a reward of work; we sacrifice much to the organization and culture is a form of return for the effort.

Kanter (1989) refers to the paradox implicit in linking culture with change. On the surface, culture has essentially traditional and stable qualities, so how can you have a “culture of change?” Yet this is exactly what the innovative organization needs.

According to Schein (1992), culture is the most difficult organizational attribute to change, outlasting organizational products, services, founders and leadership and all other physical attributes of the organization. One way of exploring cultures is to classify them into types.

1. *Role Cultures* are highly formalized, bound with regulations and paperwork; authority and hierarchy dominate relations.
2. *Task Cultures* are the opposite, they preserve a strong sense of the basic mission of the organization and teamwork is the basis on which jobs are designed.

3. *Power Cultures* have a single power source, which may be an individual or a corporate group. Control of rewards is a major source of power.

Handy (1976) points out that these types are usually tied to a particular structure and design of an organization. A role culture has a typical pyramid structure. A task culture has flexible matrix structures. A power culture has a web-like communications structure. Cultural analysis brings to centre stage a rich vein of behaviours and stands on its head much of the conventional wisdom about organizations.

In summary, the organizational culture of the organization recognizes the value system in which the organization and each of its member organizations achieve common objectives of improving the operational performance of organizations. Recently, when, according to Vaitkūnaitė (2006), an organization seen as a living social organism that focus on developed and upcoming models to help organizations evaluate the impact of culture on organizational performance outcomes.

The aim of the paper is to define the impact of impact of national culture dimensions on organizational culture in Lithuania. The main tasks of the paper are:

1. To analyse organization culture assessment methods;
2. To assess organizational culture in selected segment of Lithuanian enterprises;
3. To compare national culture and organizational culture in Lithuania and other countries based on studies conducted in this field;
4. To analyse the impact of national culture dimensions on organizational culture.

2. Organization culture assessment models

There are a number of methodologies specifically dedicated to organizational culture change, such as Peter Senge's Fifth Discipline. These are also a variety of psychological approaches that have been developed into a system for specific outcomes such as the Fifth Discipline's "learning organization" or Directive Communication's "corporate culture evolution." Ideas and strategies, on the other hand, seem to vary according to particular influences that affect culture.

Wallach (1983) provided a practical measurement typology including bureaucratic, innovative and supportive dimensions. The extent to which the organization is bureaucratic refers to the hierarchical, procedural and structured aspects of culture. The innovativeness referred to a creative, results-oriented, challenging work environment. Supportive dimension is expressed by the degree to which employees needs and personality fit the organization's culture.

Reynolds (1986) developed an instrument to capture aspects of organizational culture and the perceived work context of the individual. Cooke and Rousseau (1988) proposed the Organizational Culture Inventory as an instrument to profile organizational culture in terms of behavioural norms and expectations. Goll and Sambharya (1990) developed a model focused on the fit of culture and strategy, with special focus on the influence of corporate ideology.

According to B. H. Takeda (2007) employee values are measured against organizational values to predict employee intentions to stay, and predict turnover; this is done through instruments like the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) to measure employee commitment.

According to G. Hofstede (1990), in describing organizations cultures, the additional dimensions are necessary:

Process-oriented versus results-oriented. Process-oriented cultures are dominated by technical and bureaucratic routines, results-oriented by common a concern of outcomes. In results-oriented organizations, everybody perceives their practices in about the same way; in process-oriented organizations the vast differences in perception among different levels and parts of the organizations exist.

Job-oriented versus employee-oriented. The former assume responsibility of the organization for the employee's job performance only, and nothing more; employee-oriented cultures assume a board responsibility for their members' well-being. Therefore the job versus employee orientation is part of a culture of organization and not a choice of individual manager;

Professional versus parochial. In the former, the usually highly educated members identify primarily with their profession; in the latter, the members derive their identity from the organization for which they work.

Open system versus closed systems. This cultural dimension refers to the common style of internal and external communication, and to the ease with which outsiders and newcomers are admitted. Therefore the organizational cultures also contain elements from national cultures dimensions;

Tight versus loose control. This dimension provides a degree of formality and punctuality within the organization; it is partly a function of the organization technology. However, with the same technology, some organizations may be tighter or looser in control than others.

Pragmatic versus normative. This cultural dimension presents the prevailing way of flexible or rigid dealing with the environment, in particular with customers, The dimension measures the degree of customer orientation, which is a highly popular topic in the management literature.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) defined organizational culture as the way things get done. Deal and Kennedy created a model of culture that is based on 4 different types of organizations. They each focus on how quickly the organization receives feedback, the way members are rewarded, and the level of risks taken. Deal and Kennedy's Four Cultures (Deal T. E. and Kennedy, A. A. (1982, 2000)) are:

- *Work-hard, play-hard culture.* This has rapid feedback/reward and low risk, resulting in stress coming from the quantity of work, rather than uncertainty. High-speed action leading to high-speed recreation. Examples: Restaurants, software companies.
- *Tough-guy macho culture.* This has rapid feedback/reward and high risk, resulting stress coming from high risk and potential loss/gain of reward. Focus on the present rather than the longer-term future. Examples: police, surgeons, sports.

- *Process culture*. This has slow feedback/reward and low risk, resulting in the following: Low stress, plodding work, comfort and security. Stress that comes from internal politics and stupidity of the system. Development of bureaucracies and other ways of maintaining the status quo. Focus on security of the past and of the future. Examples: banks, insurance companies.
- *Bet-the-company culture*. This has slow feedback/reward and high risk, resulting in the following: Stress coming from high risk and delay before knowing if actions have paid off. The long view is taken, but then much work is put into making sure things happen as planned. Examples: aircraft manufacturers, oil companies.

Cameron and Quinn (1999) suggested the quantitative approach as suitable for establishing a relationship between the national dimensions of culture and management practices in organizations and countries. There are a few instruments developed to assess culture quantitatively. Cameron and Quinn (1999) developed the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI). This tool is based on the competing values framework which is based on underlying value orientations that characterize organizations. These value orientations are usually competing and contradictory. The Assessment Instrument distinguishes four culture types. Competing values produce polarities like flexibility vs. stability and internal vs. external focus—these two polarities were found to be most important in defining organizational success. The polarities construct a quadrant with four types of culture:

- *Clan culture* (internal focus and flexible)—A friendly workplace where leaders act like father figures.
- *Adhocracy culture* (external focus and flexible)—A dynamic workplace with leaders that stimulate innovation.
- *Market culture* (external focus and controlled)—A competitive workplace with leaders that are hard drivers
- *Hierarchy culture* (internal focus and controlled)—A structured and formalized workplace where leaders act like coordinators.

Cameron & Quinn designated six key aspects that will form organizational culture, which can be assessed in the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) thus producing a mix of the four archetypes of culture. Each organization or team will have its unique mix of culture types.

Schein's (1992) organizational model illuminates culture from the standpoint of the observer, described by three cognitive levels of organizational culture. Using Schein's model, understanding paradoxical organizational behaviours becomes more apparent. For instance, an organization can profess highly aesthetic and moral standards at the second level of Schein's model while simultaneously displaying curiously opposing behaviour at the third and deepest level of culture. Superficially, organizational rewards can imply one organizational norm, but at the deepest level imply something completely different. This insight offers an understanding of the difficulty that organizational newcomers have in assimilating organizational culture and why it takes time to become acclimatized. It also explains why organizational change agents

usually fail to achieve their goals: underlying tacit cultural norms are generally not understood before would-be change agents begin their actions. Merely understanding culture at the deepest level may be insufficient to institute cultural change because the dynamics of interpersonal relationships (often under threatening conditions) are added to the dynamics of organizational culture while attempts are made to institute desired change.

Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) developed the Competing Values Model, which has been used to examine various organizational phenomena, including culture (e.g. Deshpande; Quinn & McGrath, 1985; Zammuto & Krakower, 1991). The competing values model incorporates two sets of competing values along two axes: 1) the control/flexibility dilemma which refers to preferences about structure, stability, and change, and 2) the people/organization dilemma which refers to differences in organizational focus. From these two axes emerge four quadrants which reflect four types of culture, namely rational, hierarchical, developmental and group (Quinn, 1988; Quinn & Kimberly, 1984). Despite its use to study different organizational phenomena, the competing values model has not been used extensively in accounting settings (notable exceptions are Dunk & Lysons, 1997; Bhimani, 2003).

Stephen McGuire (2003) defined and validated a model of organizational culture that predicts revenue from new sources. An Entrepreneurial Organizational Culture (EOC) is a system of shared values, beliefs and norms of members of an organization, including valuing creativity and tolerance of creative people, believing that innovating and seizing market opportunities are appropriate behaviours to deal with problems of survival and prosperity, environmental uncertainty, and competitors' threats, and expecting organizational members to behave accordingly.

Burman and Evans (2008) argue that it is "leadership" that affects culture, rather than "management," and describe the difference. When one wants to change an aspect of the culture of an organization one has to keep in consideration that this is a long term project. Corporate culture is something that is very hard to change and employees need time to get used to the new way of organizing. For companies with a very strong and specific culture it will be even harder to change.

Prior to a cultural change initiative, a needs assessment is needed to identify and understand the current organizational culture. This can be done through employee surveys, interviews, focus groups, observation, customer surveys when appropriate, and other internal research to further identify areas that require change. The company must then assess and clearly identify the new, desired culture, and then design a change process.

Two common models and their associated measurement tools have been developed by O'Reilly et al. and Denison. O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell (1991) developed a model based on the belief that cultures can be distinguished by values that are reinforced within organizations. Their Organizational Profile Model (OPM) is a self-reporting tool which makes distinctions according to seven categories—Innovation, Stability, Respect for People, Outcome Orientation, Attention to Detail, Team Orientation, and Aggressiveness. The model is not intended to measure how organizational culture ef-

fects organizational performance, rather it measures associations between the personalities of individuals in the organization and the organization's culture.

Denison with co-authors has developed Organizational Culture Survey methodology (Denison, 1984; 1990; Denison, Mishra, 1995; Denison, Neale, 1996). D. Denison's model (1990) asserts that organizational culture can be described by four general dimensions—Mission, Adaptability, Involvement and Consistency. Each of these general dimensions is further described by the following three sub-dimensions:

- *Involvement*—Empowerment, Team Orientation and Capability Development;
- *Consistency*—Core Values, Agreement, Coordination/Integration;
- *Adaptability*—Creating Change, Customer Focus and Organizational Learning;
- *Mission*—Strategic Direction and Intent, Goals and Objectives and Vision.

Denison's model also allows cultures to be described broadly as externally or internally focused as well as flexible vs. stable. The model has been typically used to diagnose cultural problems in organizations. This methodology explores the relationship between organizational culture and effectiveness, claiming the certain cultural characteristics that have positive impact on organizational performance. These elements are called traits. The following traits are being evaluated: involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission.

Involvement reflects the degree of how much the organization focuses on developing, informing, involving people and getting them engaged in creating a commitment to the organization and growing capacity to operate under conditions of autonomy. This trait includes three dimensions:

- *Empowerment*—referring to employee's responsibility where the individuals have the authority, initiative and ability to manage their own work. It provides a sense of ownership and responsibility toward the organization;
- *Team orientation*—a value placed on working cooperatively towards common goals for which all employees feel mutually responsible;
- *Capability development*—continuous investment in the development of employee's skills and meeting their desires of learning and development.

Consistency examines whether the organization has a strong and cohesive internal culture based on its values being more effective means of achieving coordination and integration than external control system based on explicit rules and regulations. There are three sub-dimensions in this trait:

- *Coordination and integration*—the degree at which different functions of an organization are able to work together to achieve common goals of organization;
- *Agreement*—the degree at which the organization is able to reach an agreement on a critical issue;
- *Core values*—the ability of members of an organization to share a set of values that create a strong sense of identity and clear set of expectations among them.

Adaptability reflects the capacity of an organization for internal change and quick adaptation in response to the signals from the external environment, including customers and market place. This trait has 3 sub-dimensions:

- *Creating change*—the degree at which an organization is able to take risks to meet the changing needs;
- *Customer focus*—how an organization understands and reacts to the customer's needs;
- *Organizational learning*—how an organization receives, translates and interprets signals from the environment into opportunities for encouraging the innovations.

Mission provides purpose and meaning to the organization by defining a social role and external goals for the organization. The trait has three sub-dimensions:

- *Vision*—core values, and captures the understanding and sharing view of a desired future among organization members;
- *Strategic direction* and *intent* clears the strategic intensions and express the organization's purpose and how everyone can contribute to it;
- *Goals and Objectives*—clear goals and objectives that can be linked to mission, vision and strategy and provide everyone with clear directions in work.

Several studies were performed trying to link national culture with organizational culture however these studies (Brron, 2010; Hofstede, 1980) provided the limited information on comparison between countries national cultures and organizational cultures.

3. Assessment of organizational culture in Lithuania

Daniel Denison's model was applied for the assessment of organizational culture in small and medium enterprises in Kaunas region in April, 2012. Four general dimensions—Mission, Adaptability, Involvement and Consistency—were assessed. The Denison Organization Culture Survey (DOCS) measures 12 indexes of organizational culture using five questions each. Total 60 questions are included in questionnaire. All items used a five-point Likert scale, with response categories ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The twelve indexes were used to measure the four main cultural traits defined by the model: involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission. The questionnaires were addressed to senior managers or directors of enterprises. The general set is 1848 enterprises. In assessing the organizational culture in Lithuanian SMS operating in Kaunas region, the survey bias was assessed based on Table 1, if the general set is over 5000.

Table 1. Measurement bias for the different samples in the case of a total set higher than 5000

The sample size at the general set >5000	25	45	100	123	156	204	400	625
Measurement bias,%	20	15	10	9	8	7	5	4

Source: (Kardelis, 2002)

Questionnaires with 60 questions have been sent to 150 enterprises. The feedback has been received from 46 enterprises. Therefore the confidence intervals are +15%. To assess if the items in the questionnaire provided accurate assessment of organizational culture, the Denison Organization Culture Survey was subjected to Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability Test to delete inconsistent items. The statistical computer package SPSS was applied to analyse the Survey data.

The index scores to assess organizational culture in Lithuanian SMS were derived from the mean scores on the questions for sample of respondents (46 enterprises). The mean scores were applied assess results in answering questions in five-point Likert scale.

In Table 2 the results of to Cronbach's Test and mean values for organizational culture dimensions are presented.

Table 2. The mean values of organizational culture and the results of the Cronbach Test.

	Mean value	t
Involvement	3.967	-8.2
Consistency	4.002	-4.4
Adaptability	3.862	-3.5
Mission	4.102	-1.1

As one can see from the results provided in Table 3 the Lithuanian SMS have quite high scores of Mission and Consistency, showing that employees of SMS are strongly engaged with organization and their behaviour is easy to shape according to the organization's desired future and employees are well-integrated into the organization's internal culture.

4. The relationship between culture dimensions in the country and organizational culture dimensions

According to G. Hofstede (1980), the national culture has an impact on organizational culture as the culture of individuals working in organization affect many organizational issues, such as empowerment, motivation, values and perception. According to G Hofstede (2001) the organizational culture, including strategic decision-making, leadership style and human resource management differ by national culture. Earley (1994) indicated that national culture implies the way of acting or set of outcomes. On the one hand, when organizational culture is inconsistent with national culture, employees feel unsatisfied, distracted, uncomfortable and without commitment. On the other hand, organizational culture that reinforces national culture values is more likely to yield predictable behaviour, self-efficacy and high performance, because congruent organizational culture is congruent with existing behavioural expectations and routines of organization.

As there is a limited number of studies comparing the national cultures with organizational culture values, based on the study for Taiwan and Mexico, the national culture and organizational culture values for these countries will be compared with Lithuanian national culture values and organization culture values obtained by applying The Denison Organization Culture Survey for SMS in Kaunas region.

In Table 3 the national culture dimensions are provided for Lithuania, Taiwan and Mexico, seeking to compare their culture dimensions with organizational dimensions. Lithuanian cultural dimensions (Huettinger, 2008) and Taiwan and Mexico cultural dimensions were obtained from G. Hofstede's national culture dimensions website (<http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html>).

Table 3. National culture dimensions for Lithuania, Taiwan, and Mexico

National culture dimensions	LITHUANIA	TAIWAN	MEXICO
Power distance (PDI)	42	58	81
Uncertainty avoidance (UAI)	65	69	82
Individualism (IDV)	60	17	30
Masculinity (MAS)	19	45	69
Long-term orientation (LOI)	30	87	-

As one can see from Table 4, Mexico has the highest score on PDI dimension (score of 81) which means that people accept a hierarchical order in which everybody has a place and which needs no further justification. Taiwan, with the lowest score of 17 for *individualism*, is a collectivistic society. This is manifested in a close long-term commitment to the “member” group, be that family, extended family or extended relationships. Loyalty in a collectivist culture is paramount and overrides most other societal rules and regulations. Mexico scores 69 in the *masculinity* dimension and thus is considered as masculine society. Lithuania has very low score of Masculinity and is considered a feminine society. In feminine countries the focus is on “working in order to live,” managers strive for consensus, people value equality, solidarity and quality in their working lives. Conflicts are resolved by compromise and negotiation. Incentives, such as free time and flexibility, are favoured. Focus is on well-being, but the status is not shown. Mexico has the highest *uncertainty avoidance* score (82) and thus has a high preference for avoiding uncertainty. Countries exhibiting high uncertainty avoidance maintain rigid codes of belief and behaviour and are intolerant of unorthodox behaviour and ideas. In these cultures there is an emotional need for rules (even if the rules never seem to work) time is money, people have an inner urge to be busy and work hard, precision and punctuality are the norm, innovation may be resisted, security is an important element in individual motivation. Taiwan scores 87, making it a long term orientation culture. Societies with a long-term orientation show an ability to adapt traditions to a modern context i.e. pragmatism, a strong propensity to save and invest, thriftiness, perseverance in achieving results and an overriding concern for

respecting the demands of Virtue. The countries of South East Asia and the Far East are typically found at the long-term end of this dimension. Lithuania has a low score in *Long-term orientation* and for Mexico these culture dimensions haven't been assessed by G. Hofstede.

In Table 4 the organizational dimensions were compared for Lithuania, Taiwan and Mexico. The results for Taiwan and Mexico were obtained by applying Denison Organization Culture Survey test for 168 and 161 employees in respective countries.

Table 4. The organizational dimensions assessed in Lithuania, Taiwan and Mexico

Organizational culture dimensions	LITHUANIA	TAIWAN	MEXICO
Involvement	3.767	3.8663	3.0745
Consistency	3.799	3.6544	3.1072
Adaptability	3.553	3.5083	3.1217
Mission	4.102	3.6742	3.2841

As one can see from Table 5 Lithuania has the highest values for all organizational culture dimensions except Involvement. The lowest organizational culture values were obtained for Mexico.

The Involvement score is the highest for Taiwan and the lowest for Mexico. As Taiwan has the highest scores for UAI, LOI and the lowest scores for IDV, the UAI and LOI has positive impact on *involvement* and IDV and MAS has negative impact on *involvement*. The highest score for *masculinity* is obtained in Mexico. Mexico has the lowest score in *involvement*.

The Consistency score is the highest for Lithuania. As Lithuania has the lowest scores for PD, LTO UAI and MAS and the highest score for IDV it is possible to state that PD, UAI and MAS has negative impact on *consistency* and IDV has positive impact on *consistency*. LTO has also positive impact on *consistency* as Taiwan has the highest score in LTO and quite high *consistency* trait score.

The Adaptability score is the highest for Lithuania. As Lithuania has the lowest scores for PD, LTO UAI and MAS and the highest score for IDV it is possible to state that PD, UAI and MAS has negative impact on *adaptability* and IDV has positive impact on *adaptability*. LTO has also positive impact on *consistency* as Taiwan has the highest score in LTO and quite high *adaptability* trait score similar to Lithuanian score.

The Mission means value for Lithuanian employees is the highest between compared countries. For Taiwan, the mission scores are higher than Mexico, works showing that behaviour of employees are more flexible to address the future development strategy of organization. Lithuania has the lowest scores for PDI, LTO and MAS and the highest scores for IDV therefore it is possible to state that PDI and LTO has negative impact on *mission* and IDV has positive impact on *mission*. Regarding MAS it is obvious that high MAS in Mexico and low MAS in Lithuania provides for Lithuanian high scores of *mission* trait and low Mexican scores for *mission* trait.

In Table 5 the impact of national culture dimensions of G. Hofstede (PDI, UAI, LTO, MAS, UAI) on cultural traits according to Denison model (involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission) is assessed.

Table 5. The impact of national culture dimensions on organizational culture traits

	Involvement	Consistency	Adaptability	Mission
Power distance (PDI)	+	-	-	-
Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV)	-	+	+	+
Masculinity vs. Femininity (MAS)	+	-	-	-
Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)	+	-	+	+
Long term Orientation vs. Short Term Orientation (LOI)	+	+	-	-

As one can see from the information provided Table 5 *power distance* is positively related to the Involvement, but negatively related to *consistency*, *adaptability* and *mission*. *Individualism vs. collectivism* is negatively related to all the organizational traits except *involvement*. *Masculinity vs. femininity* is positively connected to *involvement*, but negatively to other traits. *Uncertainty avoidance* is positively linked to all the organizational traits except *consistency*. *Long term vs. short term orientation* is positively associated to the organizational traits *involvement* and *consistency*, but negatively related to *adaptability* and *mission*.

5. Conclusions

1. The Denison Organization Culture Survey measures organizational culture in Lithuanian SME in the region of Kaunas.
2. The comparative analysis of the impact of national culture dimensions on organizational culture dimensions was assessed based on studies conducted in Taiwan, Mexico and Lithuania.
3. Lithuania has the lowest scores for all national culture dimensions compared to Taiwan and Mexico, except *individualism* and *long-term orientation*. Mexico has the highest score for all national culture dimensions except *individualism*. The values of national culture dimensions of Taiwan are in-between Lithuanian and Mexico scores.
4. Lithuania has the highest values for all organizational culture dimensions except *involvement*, which is the highest for Taiwan. The lowest organizational culture values were obtained for Mexico.
5. Comparative analysis revealed that *power distance* is positively related to *involvement*, but negatively related to *consistency*, *adaptability* and *mission* traits.

Individualism vs. collectivism is negatively related to all the organizational traits except *involvement*. *Masculinity vs. femininity* is positively connected to *involvement*, but negatively to other traits. *Uncertainty avoidance* is positively linked to all the organizational traits except *consistency*. *Long term vs. short term orientation* is positively associated to the organizational traits: *involvement* and *consistency*, but negatively related to *adaptability* and *mission*.

References

1. Becky, H. Takeda. "Investigation of employee tenure as related to relationships of personality and personal values of entrepreneurs and their perceptions of their employees." *Pro Quest*, 2007, p. 2.
2. Bethlem, Agrícola de Souza. (1999). *Gestão de negócios: uma abordagem brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Campos.
3. Bhimani, A. (2003). "A study of the emergence of management accounting system ethos and its influence on perceived system success." *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28(6), pp. 523–638.
4. Burman, R.; Evans, A.J. (2008). "Target Zero: A Culture of Safety." *Defence Aviation Safety Centre Journal*, pp. 22–27.
5. Cameron, K.S.; Quinn, R.E. (1999). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework*. Prentice Hall, reprinted John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
6. Chatman, J.A. (1991). "Matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms. Journal Article." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36.
7. Cooke, R.; Rousseau, D. (1988). "Behavioral norms and expectations: A qualitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture." *Group & Organization Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 245–273.
8. Deal, T. E.; Kennedy, A. A. (1982, 2000). *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982; reissue Perseus Book.
9. Denison, Daniel R. (1990). *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. Wiley.
10. Denison, D.R.; Mishra, A.K. (1995). "Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness." *Organization Science*, 6 (2): pp. 204–223.
11. Denison, D.R.; Neale, W.S. (1996). *Denison organizational culture survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Aviat.
12. Deshpande, R.; Farley, J.U.; Webster, F. E. (1993). "Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: A quadrad analysis." *Journal of Marketing*, 57, pp. 23–27.
13. Dunk, A.S.; Lysons, A.F. (1997). "An analysis of departmental effectiveness, participative budgetary control processes and environmental dimensionality within the competing values framework: A public sector study." *Financial Accountability, Management*, 13(1), pp. 1–15.
14. Earley. (1994). "Self or group? Cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1), pp. 89–117.
15. Goll, I.; Sambharya, R.B. (1990). "The effect of organizational culture and leadership on firm performance." In P. Shrivastava & R. Lamb (Ed.), *Advances in strategic management*, 6: pp. 183–200. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
16. Handy, Charles B. (1976). *Understanding Organizations*. Oxford University Press.

17. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Difference in Work Related Value*. London and Sage Publication.
18. Hofstede, G. (1983). *Culture e-management development*. Genebra ILO, Management Development Branch, Training Department.
19. Hofstede, G.; Neuijen, B.; Ohayv, D.D.; Sanders, G. (1990). "Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, pp. 286–316.
20. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
21. Huettinger, M. (2008). "Cultural dimensions in business life: Hofstede's indices for Latvia and Lithuania." *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol. 3 Iss: 3, pp. 359–376.
22. Johnson, G.; Scholes, K. (1999). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*. 5th Ed, Prentice Hall, Hemel Hempstead.
23. Kanter, R.M. (1989). *When Giants Learn to Dance: Mastering the challenges of strategy, management, and careers in the 1990s*. Routledge, London.
24. Kardelis, K. (2002). *Mokslinių tyrimų metodologija ir metodai*. Kaunas: Judex.
25. Mc Guire, S.J.J. (2003). "Entrepreneurial Organizational Culture: Construct Definition and Instrument Development and Validation." Ph.D. Dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, DC.
26. O'Reilly, C. A.; Chatman, J. A.; Caldwell, D. F. (1991). "People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit." *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, pp. 487–516.
27. Peters and Waterman (1982). "In Search of Excellence. Harper & Row (New York). A competing values approach to organizational analysis." *Management Science*, 29, pp. 363–377.
28. Quinn, R.E. (1988). *Beyond rational management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
29. Quinn, R.E.; Kimberly, J. R. (1984). "Paradox, planning, and perseverance: Guidelines for managerial practice." In J. R. Kimberly & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Managing organizational translations*. pp. 295–313.
30. Rodsutti M.C. (2002). "Organizational effectiveness and multinational management: implications for multinational management: implications for multinational enterprises." Unpublished dissertation, Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok.
31. Stoner, J.; Ereemen, R.; Gilbert, D. (1999). *Vadyba*. Kaunas: Poligrafija ir informatika.
32. Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture & Leadership*. 2nd Ed, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
33. Schneider, B.; Reichers, A. (1983). "On the etiology of climates." *Personnel Psychology*, 36, pp. 19–39.
34. Vaitkūnaitė, V., (2006). "Susijungusių organizacijų kultūrų poveikis verslo sėkmei." *Verslas: teorija ir praktika*. Nr. 1. Vilnius: Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas, pp. 45–53.
35. Xenikou, A.; Furnham, A. (1996). "A correlation and factor analytic study of four questionnaire measures of organizational culture." *Human Relations*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 349–371.
36. Zammuto, R.F.; Krakower, J.Y. (1991). "Quantitative and qualitative studies of organizational culture." *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 5, pp. 83–114.
37. Wallach, E. (1983). "Individuals and organization: the cultural match." *Training and Development Journal*. Vol.12, pp.28–36.

NACIONALINĖS KULTŪROS DIMENSIJŲ ĮTAKOS ORGANIZACINEI KULTŪRAI LYGINAMASIS VERTINIMAS

Dalia ŠTREIMIKIENĖ, Asta MIKALAUŠKIENĖ

Santrauka. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami nacionalinės kultūros ir organizacinės kultūros vertinimo metodai. Siekiant įvertinti organizacinę kultūrą Lietuvos SVV Kauno regione, taikytas Denisono organizacijos kultūros klausimynas. Straipsnyje siekiama apibrėžti nacionalinės kultūros dimensijų įtaką organizacinei kultūrai taikant lyginamąją Taivano, Meksikos ir Lietuvos analizę. Lyginamoji analizė parodė, kad jėgos pozicija yra teigiamai susijusi su dalyvavimo dimensija, tačiau neigiamai susijusi su nuoseklumo, prisitaikymo ir misijos dimensija. Individualizmo dimensija yra neigiamai susijusi su visomis organizacinės kultūros dimensijomis išskyrus dalyvavimo. Vyrishkumo dimensija turi teigiamos įtakos dalyvavimo dimensijai, bet neigiamai veikia kitus organizacinės kultūros bruožus. Neapibrėžtumo vengimo dimensija yra teigiamai susijusi su visomis organizacinės kultūros dimensijomis išskyrus nuoseklumo dimensiją. Ilgalaikė orientacija yra teigiamai susijusi su dalyvavimo ir nuoseklumo dimensijomis, tačiau neigiamai su prisitaikymo ir misijos dimensijomis.

Dalia Štreimikienė – Doctor in Economics, professor of Department of International Trade and Customs, Faculty of Economics and Finance Management, Mykolas Romeris University. Scientific research area - sustainable energy, energy policy, climate change mitigation policies, international trade and economics.

Dalia Štreimikienė – Mykolo Romerio universiteto Ekonomikos ir finansų valdymo fakulteto Tarptautinės prekybos ir muitų katedros profesorė, ekonomikos mokslų daktarė. Mokslo tyrimų sritys – darni energetika, energetikos politika, klimato kaitos švelninimo politika, tarptautinė prekyba ir ekonomika.

Asta Mikalauskienė – Doctor in Economics, associate professor, Vilnius University, Kaunas Faculty of Humanities. Scientific research area - international trade and economics.

Asta Mikalauskienė – Ekonomikos mokslų daktarė, Vilniaus universitetas, Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas. Mokslo tyrimų sritys tarptautinė prekyba ir ekonomika.