

**Measuring organizational culture: An empirical assessment of the Hofstede questionnaire in an Austrian setting**  
Submission to IACCM 2011, at Ruse, Bulgaria

*Authors:*

Bös, Bernhard,  
Dauber, Daniel ([daniel.dauber@wu.ac.at](mailto:daniel.dauber@wu.ac.at))  
Springnagel, Mario ([mario.springnagel@wu.ac.at](mailto:mario.springnagel@wu.ac.at))

*Abstract*

**Purpose:**

While it has become common practice to measure organizational culture quantitatively, its applicability is seldom questioned nor investigated. This empirical study shows, how one of the most frequently used questionnaires (Hofstede et al. 1990), can only be partly replicated in an Austrian setting using a translated version of the Hofstede et al. (1990) questionnaire. Thus, scholars need to be aware of the fact that findings resulting from such questionnaires are difficult to interpret in a German-speaking research context.

**Design:**

Quantitative data was collected and analyzed accordingly, using common statistical procedures, such as factor analysis and Cronbach alpha measures. The sample consists of 275 Austrian employees.

**Findings:**

This study shows that Hofstede et al.'s (1990) questionnaire can only partly be replicated in an Austrian setting. We outline that mainly two reasons account for these findings: (1) practices and values belong to two different, but related constructs. It could be possible that similar practices might be found in different organizations that have complementary organizational values, and (2) national cultural differences.

**Research limitations/implications:**

Data was only collected and interpreted in an Austrian context. However, it can be assumed that such results can also derive from other German speaking regions. We propose that future research should focus on matching dimensions approaches to organizational culture with other existing models, e.g. Schein (1985), Hatch & Cunliffe (2006), Dauber et al. (2010).

**What is original/what is the value of the paper:**

To the knowledge of the authors, this study is the first to empirically evaluate the questionnaire in an Austrian setting using two different versions. With respect to the six cultural dimensions of Hofstede et al. (1990), only three of them could be replicated by our data set.

**Keywords:** organizational culture, performance, Hofstede questionnaire

## INTRODUCTION

Tsui et al. (2007) showed with their comprehensive review of 43 cross-cultural studies that Hofstede's (1980, 1991, 2001) cultural dimensions have become one of the most frequently applied questionnaires in the field. In the sample of Tsui et al. (2007) about 28% of all studies (i.e. 12 papers) used at least one of Hofstede's (1980, 1991, 2001) national culture dimensions as a dependent, independent or moderating variable. Only Schwartz's (1992, 1994) questionnaire can keep pace with the popularity of Hofstede's (1980, 1991, 2001) approach, accounting for about 23% of all studies (i.e. 10 papers) reviewed by Tsui et al. (2007). While 43 studies might seem to be inappropriate for a representative comparison of research approaches, the selected papers have considerably shaped our understanding of cultural effects in the last decades.

Although not analyzed by Tsui et al. (2007) in-depth, organizational culture has become an increasing field of research. Hofstede et al.'s (1990) seminal work, which got already cited more than 1,500 times (retrieved from Google.scholar, May, 31, 2011) has become an important empirical tool to measure culture in organizations. Their questionnaire was developed and tested with data collected in Denmark and the Netherlands.

This paper aims at validating the questionnaire in an Austrian context, in order to test its applicability in other national contexts. Based on 275 received questionnaires, it was found that only two of six dimensions can be replicated. We provide explanations for these findings and give recommendations for scholars wishing to measure organizational culture, using the Hofstede et al. (1990) scales.

## **THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE BY HOFSTEDE ET AL. (1990)**

Hofstede et al. (1990, p. 286) defined organizational/corporate culture as '(1) holistic, (2) historically determined, (3) related to anthropological concepts, (4) socially constructed, (5) soft, and (6) difficult to change.' Further, Hofstede (1991, pp. 179-180) argues that organizational culture is 'the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one organization from another' and distinguishes between the 'software' for national cultures, mainly expressed in values, and the 'software' for organizational cultures, which is revealed through practices. In his research on cross-national culture differences Geert Hofstede (1980; 2001) had identified national cultures to distinguish people, institutions and organizations in different countries. Ten years later, Hofstede et al. (1990) looked at corporate cultures from the perspective of practices, i.e. patterns of behavior.

While the first study had surveyed employees of one company across many countries, the 1985-1987 project was designed to explore similarities between various organizations in two cultural regions, in that case in Denmark and in the Netherlands. This study, known as the IRIC project (Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation in Maastricht, Netherlands), took place between 1985 and 1987 and covered 20 units of 10 companies with the goal of ensuring an in-depth analysis. The task was to identify differences between organizational and national cultures. They found that organizational culture refers to shared practices much more than to shared values. The identified differences in values mainly resulted from nationality, whereas differentiations in practices mainly resulted from organizational membership. These practices consist of symbols, heroes, and rituals.

Since Hofstede and his co-researchers could show that organizational cultures differ mainly at level of 'practices' and not at the level of values, it became clear that the value-based 'five dimensions of national cultures' (power distance, individualism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term versus short-term orientation) are not suitable

for comparing organizations within the same country. Hofstede and his team (Hofstede, 2008; Hofstede et al., 1990) identified „six dimensions of practices’ for organizational cultures (‘P’ stands for ‘practices’), which will be described shortly in the following sections:

- P1: Process-oriented versus results-oriented
- P2: Employee-oriented versus job-oriented
- P3: Parochial versus professional
- P4: Open system versus closed system
- P5: Loose versus tight control
- P6: Normative versus pragmatic

*P1: Process-oriented versus results-oriented (Hofstede et al. 1990)*

This dimension opposes a concern with means (process-oriented) to a concern with goals (results-oriented). In process-oriented organizational cultures people perceive themselves as avoiding risks and making only a limited effort in their jobs, while each day is pretty much the same. In the results-oriented cultures people perceive themselves as comfortable in unfamiliar situations, and put in a maximal effort, while each day is felt to bring new challenges. This dimension of ‘process vs. results’ relates to organization sociology, with Burns and Stalker’s distinction between mechanistic and organic management systems. According to Burns & Stalker (1961, p. 120), mechanistic systems are characterized by ‘the abstract nature of each individual task, which is pursued with techniques and purposes more or less distinct from those of the concern as a whole; i.e., the functionaries tend to pursue the technical improvement of means, rather than the accomplishment of the ends of the concern’. Organic systems are characterized by ‘the realistic nature of the individual task, which is seen as set by the total situation of the concern’ (Burns & Stalker, 1961, p. 121). Results orientation also corresponds with Peter and Waterman’s (1982) maxim number one ‘a bias for action’. In order to generate bi-polar dimensions (e.g., ‘process-oriented vs. results-oriented’), Hofstede et al. (1990) also took care of bi-polarity for the items (e.g., ‘our style of dealing with each other is quite formal’ vs. ‘we are easy with each other’).

*P2: Employee-oriented versus job-oriented (Hofstede et al. 1990)*

This dimension contrasts a concern for people (employee-oriented) with a concern for 'getting the job done' (job-oriented). In employee-oriented cultures people feel their personal problems are taken into account, that the organization takes a responsibility for employee welfare, and that important decisions tend to be made by groups or committees. In the job-oriented units people experience a strong pressure to complete the job. They perceive the organization as only interested in the work employees do, not in their personal and family welfare, and important decisions tend to be made by individuals. This dimension corresponds to the two axes of Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid (1964). The view that these two researchers claimed employee and job orientation to be two independent dimensions contrasts with the view of two opposites of a single dimension.

*P3: Parochial vs. professional (Hofstede et al. 1990)*

This dimension opposes units whose members derive their identity largely from the group itself (parochial) to organizations in which people primarily identify with their job (professional). Members of parochial cultures feel the organization's norms cover their behavior at home as well as on the job. They feel that in hiring employees, the company takes their social and family background into account as much as their job competence. In assuming that the company will take care of them, they also do not look far into the future. On the other side, members of professional cultures consider their private lives their own business, they feel the organization hires on the basis of job competence only, and they do think far ahead. This distinction is also known in sociology as 'local' versus 'cosmopolitan', reflecting an organization's internal to an external frame of reference (Merton, 1968).

*P4: Open system vs. closed system (Hofstede et al. 1990)*

This dimension describes the communication climate of an organization (e.g., Poole, 1985). In the open system unit members consider both the organization and its people open to newcomers and outsiders. This means that almost anyone would fit into the organization, and

new employees only need a few days to feel integrated. In the closed system units, the organization and its people fit into the organization, and new employees need a long time to feel at home.

*P5: Loose vs. tight control (Hofstede et al. 1990)*

This dimension refers to the degree of internal structures within an organization, which affect aspects like company behavior and business apparel. People in loose control units feel that no one thinks of costs, meeting times are only kept approximately, and jokes about the company and the job are frequent. People in tight control units describe their work environment as cost-conscious, meeting times are kept punctually, and jokes about the company and the job are rare. Hofstede did already refer to this distinction between loose control and tight control in his research on management control (Hofstede, 1967, p. 144).

*P6: Normative vs. pragmatic (Hofstede et al. 1990)*

Is dealing with the aspect of 'customer orientation'. This dimension opposes units, whose members accomplish their tasks in strictly following their inviolable rules (normative) to market-driven organizations (pragmatic). In normative units the major emphasis is on correctly following organizational procedures, which are more important than results. In matters of business ethics and honesty, the unit's standards are felt to be high. In the pragmatic units, there is a major emphasis on meeting the customer's needs. Results are more important than correct procedures, and in matters of business ethics, a pragmatic rather than a dogmatic attitude prevails. The 'pragmatism' pole thereby corresponds with Peter and Waterman's maxim number two 'staying close to the customer' (1982).

## **METHODS**

The sample is based on the study by Boes (2009) and another independent study conducted in 2010, using the same questionnaire. Together the sample consists of 275 returned

questionnaires collected from members of Austrian companies. A German translation of the Hofstede et al. (1990) questionnaire was used to collect the data online.

## **RESULTS**

The following section will present (1) the descriptive statistics of the sample and (2) the results of our test of the Hofstede et al. (1990) questionnaire.

### **Descriptive statistics**

This section is split in two parts showing characteristics of the sample: (1) Individual characteristics of respondents and (2) organizational characteristics.

#### *The individual level: Sex, age, nationality, educational background, type of job, job area*

As can be seen from Table 1, most of the respondents, were male Austrians, working as a clerk and finished a higher school, university or college. Apart from that, more than 60% of all respondents were between 26 and 45 years old. Finally, the majority of individuals who filled out the questionnaire currently worked in 'sales and marketing'. These findings clearly outline to which population findings of this study can be generalized.

**Table 1: Individual characteristics of respondents: Sex, age, nationality, educational background (n = 275)**

		# of respondents	in % of total
<b>Sex</b>	<i>Male</i>	177	64,36%
	<i>Female</i>	98	35,64%
<b>Age</b>	<i>20-25</i>	22	8,00%
	<i>26-35</i>	98	35,64%
	<i>36-45</i>	84	30,55%
	<i>46-55</i>	45	16,36%
	<i>Over 55</i>	26	9,45%
<b>Nationality</b>	<i>Austrian</i>	261	94,91%
	<i>EU 27 nationality (except Austria)</i>	14	5,09%
<b>Highest completed formal education</b>	<i>Compulsory school</i>	5	1,82%
	<i>Company apprenticeship</i>	19	6,91%
	<i>School without higher school certificate</i>	16	5,82%
	<i>Higher school</i>	66	24,00%
	<i>University or college</i>	160	58,18%
	<i>Other formation after higher school certificate without university</i>	7	2,55%
	<i>Missing values</i>	2	0,73%
<b>Type of job</b>	<i>Clerk</i>	242	88,00%
	<i>Laborer</i>	6	2,18%
	<i>Civil servant</i>	4	1,45%
	<i>Contract worker</i>	1	0,36%
	<i>Freelancer</i>	3	1,09%
	<i>Entrepreneur</i>	18	6,55%
	<i>Other</i>	1	0,36%
<b>Job area</b>	<i>Management</i>	40	14,55%
	<i>Finance and controlling</i>	38	13,82%
	<i>Human resources</i>	11	4,00%
	<i>Research and development</i>	18	6,55%
	<i>Purchasing</i>	7	2,55%
	<i>Production</i>	16	5,82%
	<i>Sales and marketing</i>	88	32,00%
	<i>Logistics</i>	7	2,55%
	<i>Quality and customer services</i>	9	3,27%
	<i>Other internal services</i>	41	14,91%

*The company level: Company area, company sector, company size*

With respect to company specific characteristics, it can be noted that mainly privately held companies are included in the sample. While more than 30% of individuals indicated that they are employed by a company that has less than 250 employees, almost 40% of the respondents work for a larger organization (i.e. more than 250 employees) (see Table 2).



**Table 2: Characteristics of the companies forming part of the analyzed sample (n = 275)**

		<b># of respondents</b>	<b>in % of total</b>
<b>Company area</b>	Private area	241	87,64%
	Public area	21	7,64%
	Other area	13	4,73%
<b>Company sector</b>	Mining and quarrying (stones, oil, gas) and services	1	0,36%
	Production of food and beverages	21	7,64%
	Production of paper, publishing, print and copy shops	3	1,09%
	Mineral oil processing, cokery	8	2,91%
	Production of chemicals and chemical products	5	1,82%
	Production of rubber and plastic products	2	0,73%
	Production of glass, stone and earth products	1	0,36%
	Production of metals and metal products	22	8,00%
	Mechanical engineering	8	2,91%
	Production of office machines, electrical & precision engines	4	1,45%
	Production of vehicles and vehicle components	16	5,82%
	Energy and water supply	4	1,45%
	Construction	4	1,45%
	Retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and/or gas station	2	0,73%
	Wholesale and trade negotiation	25	9,09%
	Retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and/or gas station	2	0,73%
	Hotels and restaurants	2	0,73%
	Transport (air flights, railroad,..), travel agencies	5	1,82%
	Communication (telephony services,..)	4	1,45%
	Credit and insurance business (banks,..)	20	7,27%
	Real estate	3	1,09%
	Rentals	5	1,82%
	Data processing and data bases	7	2,55%
	Research and development	1	0,36%
	Company-related services (Consulting,..)	34	12,36%
	Others	66	24,00%
<b>Company size</b>	Up to 10 employees	29	10,55%
	Up to 50 employees	48	17,45%
	Up to 250 employees	49	17,82%
	Up to 1000 employees	42	15,27%
	Over 1000 employees	103	37,45%
	Missing values	4	1,45%

Finally, the sample consists mostly of people working in the sector of ‘production of food and beverages’, ‘production of metals and metal products’, ‘wholesale and trade negotiation’, ‘credit and insurance business (banks,...)’, and ‘company related services’.

The findings in the following section have to be interpreted in light of the sample characteristics, thus constitute a limitation for generalization. Nevertheless, the validity of the

tested questionnaire should not change due to sample characteristics, in particular if the scales are expected to be useful across industries and sectors. This is the case for the Hofstede et al. (1990) questionnaire.

### **Validation of the original Hofstede et al. (1990) scales**

The next sections will (1) present the results of the internal validity analysis of item batteries based on the constructs of Hofstede et al. (1990), and (2) suggest an alternative dimensionality for the items based on a factor analysis. This seems necessary to allow a meaningful interpretation of cultural dimensions in a Viennese cultural context.

Table 3 provides the Cronbach's Alpha scores for each organizational culture dimension according to Hofstede et al. (1990). While 'results-oriented vs. process-oriented' and 'employee-oriented vs. job-oriented' can be replicated, all other dimensions score considerably below the commonly considered minimum level of '0.7' of Cronbach's Alpha (see also Kline, 1999).

**Table 3: Cronbach Alpha scores for the organizational culture dimensions by Hofstede et al. (1990) (n = 275)**

<b>organizational culture dimensions Hofstede et al. (1990)</b>	<b>Cronbach Alpha</b>
<i>results-oriented vs. process-oriented</i>	0.858
<i>employee-oriented vs. job-oriented</i>	0.766
<i>professional vs. parochial</i>	<b>0.339</b>
<i>open vs. closed system</i>	<b>0.606</b>
<i>tight vs. loose control</i>	<b>0.404</b>
<i>normative vs. pragmatic</i>	<b>0.382</b>

Table 4 includes the Cronbach's alpha scores, for improved scales, achieved through the elimination of certain items. Nevertheless, all four low-scoring constructs remain unreliable (in bold).

**Table 4: Cronbach-Alpha scores if certain items were excluded to improve the internal validity of constructs as defined by Hofstede et al. (1990) (n = 275)**

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Conbach Alpha (without respective item)</b>
<i>results-oriented vs. process-oriented</i>	positive feedback	0.860
	fast	0.839
	easy with risks	0.847
	everyday new challenges	0.852
	proactive	0.830
	easy with others	0.856
	warm	0.842
	modern technology	0.854
	direct	0.833
	always to the maximum	0.848
	mistakes not punished	0.857
optimistic	0.837	
<i>employee-oriented vs. job-oriented</i>	group decisions	0.738
	not only work	0.713
	expert decisions	0.734
	support careers	0.732
	change decree together	0.743
	support newcomers	0.752
	tops support union	0.771
	integrated in society	0.765
	personal than job	0.752
<i>professional vs. parochial</i>	our private life is considered our own affair	<b>0.280</b>
	job competence is the only hiring criterion	<b>0.156</b>
	plan the future at least the next three years	<b>0.391</b>
	we are strongly aware of competition	<b>0.375</b>
	cooperation and trust between departments	<b>0.222</b>
<i>open vs. closed system</i>	not only special people	<b>0.570</b>
	our team the best	<b>0.618</b>
	tops generous	<b>0.564</b>
	attention is paid to work conditions	<b>0.585</b>
	we are open to newcomers	<b>0.514</b>
	newcomers fast feel well	<b>0.504</b>
<i>tight vs. loose control</i>	cost conscious	<b>0.065</b>
	respect meeting times	<b>0.344</b>
	Well-grounded	<b>0.330</b>
	always speak seriously	<b>0.515</b>
<i>normative vs. pragmatic</i>	high standards	<b>0.357</b>
	organization contributes to society	<b>0.156</b>
	following correct procedures is important	<b>0.408</b>
	strict rules	<b>0.359</b>
	history counts	<b>0.336</b>

Due to the fact that 4 dimensions could not be replicated an exploratory factor analysis was conducted in order to identify how these items might be related and formulate into a different set of items representing similar or even other dimensions identified throughout the analytical process. Table 5 and 6 show the results for the factor analysis including items used in Table 4, which are those who contributed most to the dimensions suggested by Hofstede et al. (1990). Only items, which showed factor loadings of 0.4 or higher, are shown, indicating a clear assignment to one of the factors. The factor '(1) performance orientation vs. weak performance orientation' almost coincides with the dimension 'results- vs. process-oriented' by Hofstede et al. (1990) and shows a remarkable internal consistency of Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.862$ . All other explored factors show rather low  $\alpha$ -scores and consist of items that belong to various dimensions of Hofstede et al. (1990). Still this factor analysis yields acceptable item-combinations, which reflect meaningful dimensions compared to the original dimensionality by Hofstede et al. (1990).

**Table 5: Results of the factor analysis – Factors 1-3**

<b>factor</b>	<b>factor loading</b>	<b>items</b>	<b>dimension by Hofstede et al. (1990)</b>	<b># of items</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>
<i>(1) strong vs. weak performance orientation</i>	.857 .855 .772 .753 .750 .591 .567 .534	Fast Proactive Direct Optimistic Well groomed Employees feel comfortable in unfamiliar situations and in taking risks Employees always push themselves to their maximum Every day brings new challenges	Results-oriented Results-oriented Results-oriented Results-oriented Tight control Results-oriented Results-oriented Results-oriented	8	0.862
<i>(2) participative leadership vs. top-down leadership</i>	.701 .661 .593 .576 .576 .492 .459 .415	Decisions are taken by experts, regardless of their position Cooperation and trust between our departments are normal Changes are implemented in coordination with the people concerned Our managers try to support good people to advance within the organization We are ahead of others with our technology and working methods All important decisions are taken by the groups or committees We also get feedback from our superiors for good performance In some cases mistakes are accepted as consequence of initiative	Employee-oriented Professional Employee-oriented Employee-oriented Results-oriented Employee-oriented Results-oriented Results-oriented	8	0.695
<i>(3) job orientation vs. employee orientation</i>	.744 .692 .646 .631 .619	Organization only interested in work people do Little concern for personal problems of employees Our top managers do not support our membership in unions Little attention is paid to our working environment Management stingy with small things	Job-oriented Job-oriented Job-oriented Closed system Closed system	5	0.687

**Table 6: Results of the factor analysis – Factors 4-6**

<b>factor</b>	<b>factor loading</b>	<b>items</b>	<b>dimension by Hofstede et al. (1990)</b>	<b># of items</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>
<i>(4) open system vs. closed system</i>	.838	Warm	Results-oriented	4	0.796
	.821	We are open to newcomers and outsiders	Open system		
	.787	Newcomers are supported to adapt quickly to the job and to the team	Employee-oriented		
	.702	New employees usually need only a few days to feel at home	Open system		
<i>(5) loose control vs. tight control</i>	.806	We do not think more than a day ahead	Parochial	3	0.528
	.803	We never respect the meeting times	Loose control		
	.521	We are all not conscious of the costs (time, material,..)	Loose control		
<i>(6) strong vs. weak rule obedience</i>	.865	Organization contributes little to society	Pragmatic	3	0.487
	.765	No special ties with local community	Job-oriented		
	.441	In matters of business ethics, we are pragmatic, not dogmatic	Pragmatic		

## **TWO POSSIBLE REASONS WHY HOFSTEDE ET AL. (1990) DOES NOT REPLICATE IN AN AUSTRIAN SETTING**

Hofstede et al. (1990) argue that organizational culture should be measured through 'practices'. This argument stands slightly in contrast to earlier and more recent studies. For example, in light of Schein's (1985) model on organizational culture, 'values' (defined as underlying assumptions and espoused values) and 'practices' (defined as 'artifacts') are different elements of the same model. Although related to each other, practices only represent the manifestation of values. More recently, the generic model of organizational culture (Dauber et al., 2010) extended the model of Schein (1985) by including research conducted on strategy and structure (e.g. Andrews, 1971; Ansoff, 1965; Donaldson, 1987, 1996; Hamilton and Shergill, 1992, 1993; Williamson, 1975), as well as the impact of the external environment on organizations (e.g. Daft, 2009; Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976; Gartner, 1985; Donnelly-Cox & O'Regan, 1999; DiMaggio & Powell, 1994; Scott, 2008). They conclude that values become manifest through strategy, structure and, finally, observable patterns of behavior, i.e. organizational practices. Thus, the question arises whether similar practices can be found in different organizations, although their underlying values of behavior might be different. Neither this paper nor the analysis of Hofstede et al. (1990) can provide an answer to that question. Thus, more research would be necessary to demonstrate whether the described practices of Hofstede et al. (1990) truly reflect organizational culture values. A possible alternative approach is provided by Sagiv & Schwartz (2007) who used pure 'values' as items (e.g. equality, social justice, creativity, etc.). Consequently a combination of both questionnaires would make it possible to correlate values and practices. This might shed light on whether practices remain consistent across different organizations with different cultural values.

Furthermore, the data suggests that nationality or national/societal culture has an impact on the validity of the questionnaire. While Hofstede et al. (1990) report high scores for the construct validity of their items, only two of six were replicable in an Austrian setting. Therefore, this study might also show effects of societal culture differences between Austria, Netherlands and Denmark (see also Table 7). Thus, a future study might introduce societal cultural values as a moderating variable between the relationship of values and practices.

**Table 7: National culture dimensions scores for Austria, Denmark and the Netherlands based on Hofstede (1980, 1991, 2001) (Source: [http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede\\_dimensions.php](http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_dimensions.php))**

	<b>Austria</b>	<b>Denmark</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>
<i>Power distance</i>	11	18	38
<i>Individualism</i>	55	74	80
<i>Masculinity</i>	79	16	14
<i>Uncertainty avoidance</i>	70	23	53

### **SUMMARY**

This paper has shown that some scales of Hofstede et al. (1990) are worth reconsideration in order to achieve an interpretable and reliable result in an Austrian context. Based on the collected data, a somewhat different dimensionality for the analysis of organizational cultures in Austria seems to better serve scholars who wish to understand Austrian corporate values. These dimensions includes: (1) strong vs. weak performance orientation, (2) participative leadership vs. top-down leadership, (3) job orientation vs. employee orientation, (4) open system vs. closed system, (5) loose control vs. tight control and (6) strong vs. weak rule obedience.

Reasons for not having been able to replicate the questionnaire could be that (1) similar practices might be found in several organizations with different underlying values, and (2) that national cultural differences have an impact on the validity of the scales.

More research is necessary to fully explore whether the questionnaire can be replicated in other contexts. Until then, hastily applying the organizational culture dimensions of Hofstede et al. (1990) might yield distorted or simply wrong empirical results.





## REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H.E., & Pfeffer, J. (1976). Environments of Organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2: 79-105.
- Andrews, K. (1971). *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*, Dow Jones-Irwin, Homewood, Ill., 1971.
- Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate strategy: An analytic approach to business policy for growth and expansion*. McGraw-Hoill, New York.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid: key orientations for achieving production through people*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Boes, B. (2009). *Managers' perceptions of organizational cultures in Austria*. Doctoral thesis, WU Vienna University of Economics and Business.
- Burns, T., & M, S. G. (1961). *The management of innovation* (1 ed.). London: Tavis- tock Publications.
- Daft, R. L. (2009). *Organization Theory and Design*. South-Western Pub.
- Dauber, Daniel, Fink, Gerhard and Yolles, Maurice, (2010). A Generic Theory of Organizational Culture. Southern Management Association Meeting. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1744040>
- DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W. W. (1994). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Donaldson, L . (1987). Strategy and structural adjustment to regain fit and performance: in defense of contingency theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24: 1-24.
- Donaldson, L . (1996). *For Positive Organization Theory: Proving the Hard Core*. London: Sage.
- Donnelly-Cox, G. & O'Regan, A. (1999). *Resourcing Organisational Growth and Development: A Typology of Third Sector Service Delivery Organisations, presented to IRSPMIII*, Aston.
- Gartner, W. B. (1985). A Conceptual Framework for Describing the Phenomenon of New Venture Creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4): 696-706.
- Hamilton, R. T. and Shergill, G . S. (1993). *The Logic of New Zealand Business: Strategy, Structure, and Performance, Auckland*, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilton, R. T. and Shergill, G. S. (1992). 'The relationship between strategy-structure fit and financial performance in New Zealand: Evidence of generality and validity with enhanced controls'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29: 95-113.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring Organizational Cultures: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study across Twenty Cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(2), 286-316.
- Kline, P. (1999). *The handbook of psychological testing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Poole, M. S. (1985). Communication and organizational climates. Review, critique as an new perspective. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational Communication: Traditional Themes and New Directions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sagiv, L. & Schwartz, S. H., 2007. Cultural values in organisations: insights for Europe. *European Journal of International Management*, 1 (3): 176-190.
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Cultural values in organisations: insights for Europe. *European J. of International Management*, 1(3 ), 176 - 190.
- Saxton & R. Serpa (Eds.), *Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Scott, WR (1992). *Organizations - Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Tsui AS, Nifadkar SS, and Ou AY (2007) Cross-National, Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior Research: Advances, Gaps, and Recommendations. *Journal of Management* 33 (3): 426-78.
- Wilkinson, A. L. & Ouchi, W. G. (1983). Efficient cultures: Exploring the relationship between culture and organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28 (3): 468-481.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies*. New York: Free Press.