Review paper

THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURE ON CERTAIN TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

UDC 316.722: 005.32

Gordana Nikčević

Faculty of Economics, University of Montenegro

Abstract. *National culture, among other factors, largely determines organizational behavior. The paper relates to influence of national culture on certain types of organizational behavior such as: motivation, organizational changes and communication process. Introductory section emphasizes the importance of proper understanding of the relationship between national and organizational culture, especially emphasizing the role of cultural factors that largely determine organizational behavior in modern conditions. The author first provides an overview of different perspectives in defining national culture. To explain the influence of national culture on certain forms of organizational behavior, the author uses Hofstede dimensions of national cultures. In that context, the author analyzes the influence of national culture on motivation and organizational changes. Various forms of communication that represent the consequence of different cultural influences are anylyzed further in the article. Final section of the paper provides conclusions about influence of national culture on motivation, organizational changes and communication process.*

Key Words: *national culture, organization, management, organizational behavior.*

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, a trend of more intensive research of national culture and its influence on certain forms of organizational behavior is emphasized. Emphasizing the importance of national culture in the functioning of organizations implies a standpoint according to which it is necessary, for design of management systems and techniques, to take into account the cultural context in which they will apply. In theory of organization and management, the opinion that there are universal principles of management, regardless of the above mentioned cultural differences prevailed for a long time. Contrary

to earlier prevailing belief in theories and researches that there are universal principles of management and organization applicable regardless of cultural differences, in recent decades there has been more awareness of the great importance of cultural factors that largely determine design and functioning of modern organizations.

Each organization has its own culture, which is predominantly influenced by the national culture of the society in which it was created. National culture determines values of organizational culture of companies that operate within its framework, and has significant influence on organizational culture and organizational behavior (Hofstede 1980, 2001; Trompenaars, Hampden-Turner, 1998). Some authors argue that national culture influences the style of thinking of managers of different nationalities and cultures, which is particularly evident when they work together. Thus, for example, certain cultures foster the right to freedom of speech, while other cultures consider that such right should be subordinated to interests of sthe ociety as a whole, etc. (Brooks, 2006: 271-295).

Nowadays, companies are faced with multiple challenges. Companies need to provide heterogenous workforce, that belongs to different cultural and ethnic groups, to work together to achieve common goals, thereby treating each individual regardless of its culture and identity. In order to achieve that, the organization must be aware of the importance that culture and approach the issue of cultural differences in a proactive manner. Only those organizations that employ people from different cultures can respond quickly and creatively to global society challenges. In addition, cultural differences can be neither neglected nor ignored. If ignored or if there is no awareness of them, it may cost the organization dearly.

Regardless of different standpoints regarding national culture, there is a general agreement on its crucial influence on the success of the organization, except that some factors may be affected more and some less. Since we live in time of changes, these changes also include changes in manner of business operations. Today's companies, if want to be successful, must adapt to the environment through a process of organizational changes. Communication can contribute to the success of an organization in a way that ensures it to be proactive, not just reactive, to have relevant and consistent influence on the environment, to be adaptable and future-oriented and, as such, to be ready to accept diversity in opinion and behavior. In this process, motivation should play a very important role. Therefore, the main objective of this paper is to point out the importance that national culture has on certain (the above mentioned) types of organizational behavior through analyzes of influence of national culture on motivation, communication process and organizational changes in the company, i.e. to show that national culture is the factor that dominantly determines certain types of organizational behavior.

1. DEFINITION OF NATIONAL CULTURE

National culture has many definitions. One of the most influential and multidisciplinary definition of culture is the one of Kroeber, an anthropologist and sociologist, according to whom the culture represents „transmitted and created content and patterns of values, ideas, and other symbolic-meaningful systems as factors in the shaping of human behavior and the artifacts produced through behavior (Kroeber, Parsons, 1958: 583). Definition of Geertz, an anthropologist, also deserves attention „Culture is an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their

knowledge about and their attitudes toward life" (Gerc, 1998:122). Certainly, the most widely quoted definition in the literature is the definition of a Dutch researcher Geert Hofstede, who contributed the most to the development of the study of cultural influences on organizations. According to Hofstede „National culture represents mental programming: different patterns of thinking, feeling and potential acting, which were learned throughout (one's) lifetime" (Hofstede, 2001: 25).

For ease of understanding of national culture while respecting definitions of previous authors, for the purpose of this paper we will use a definition according to which „national culture represents a system of assumptions, values, norms, and attitudes, manifested through symbols which the members of an organization have developed and adopted through mutual experience and which help them determine the meaning of the world around them and how to behave in it" (Janićijević, 2013: 547). As with the organizational culture, as a result of the above mentioned definition, the national culture's content are: assumptions, values, norms, attitudes and symbols. However, in contrast to organizational culture in which norms, attitudes and symbols play a crucial role since they were created in it and according to which an organization functions, national culture is a little different. Given that national culture lies deep into its members' subconsciousness, assumptions and values have greater importance while norms, attitudes and symbols are of less importance. Norms, attitudes and symbols result from proizilaze assumptions and values, but do not have such importance for national culture. Stories, anecdotes, and nonverbal behavior in both the family and society have a large role in transmission of values and assumptions. National culture assumptions and values develop at a young age and are very difficult to change. This definition implies that national culture assumptions and values are created through long-term experience and through interaction of society members, by solving problems the society is facing with and repeting successful solutions. In fact, as with the organizational culture, certain rules of understanding the world and behaving within it are created. These rules are transformed over time in values to be pursued, as well as assumptions about what is the nature of reality and relationships within it.

It follows from the definition that the content of culture, i.e. assumptions, values, norms and attitudes significantly determine the manner in which members of certain nation perceive and interpret the world around them and the way they behave in it. Since they share the same assumptions, values, norms and attitudes, the members of an ethnic community will interpret events that surround them in the same manner. As they move in the environment of their compatriots, who adopted the same assumptions and values in the same manner, they will be hard to believe that this is the only and right way of thinking and behaving in the world. However, as it is a larger social group, the power of typical national cultural pattern and homogeneity of thinking and behavior of members of a national culture is lower than in organizational culture. Certainly, the national cultural pattern exists, and it will sometimes stronger and sometimes weaker, direct the members of a nation to interpret the world around them and to behave in it in the same way.

2. Hofstede's Study of National Cultures and Particular Determinants of
Organizational Behavior

2.1. National culture dimensions

In the seventies of the last century Geert Hofstede started a study that aimed to identify and measure dimensions of cultures. In other words, Hofstede wanted to measure national culture by comparing the attitudes and values of the members of different national cultures. The data for his original empirical study came from 116.000 questionnaires filled in by IBM employees in 40 countries and three regions. Thus, the dimensions of national culture of a society are as follows (Hofstede, 2001: 98):

1. Hierarchical distance, i.e. Power Distance – describes the extent to which the society accepts unequality among people;

2. Individualism versus Collectivism – represents the degree to which individuals in the society rather act as individuals, not as group's members;

3. Masculinity versus Femininity – explains whether the society prefers value of "masculinity" or "femininity" value;

4. Uncertainty Avoidance – deals with a society's tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity.

5. Later, Hofstede added a fifth dimension 'Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Orientation' or Confucian Dynamism.

1. Power Distance represents „the extent" to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. Hierarchical levels correspond to certain hierarchical relationships that represent the epitome of power in terms of subordination of the subordinates. If there is complexity of activities within an organization, a multihierarchical structure with an appropriate division of labor and grouping of activities is required.

Power distance is a qualitative experience of management span. The span of management usually varies from level to level. In large organizations a limited span of management increases the number of levels in hierarchical structure, which as a result has the effect of increasing the number of intermediaries in the transmission of information and reducing the effectiveness.

Power distance also determines the appropriate leadership styles. In organizations with high power distance the superior does not share its power with its subordinates, nor consults them in decision-making process. Organizations with low power distance are characterized by involvement of employees in formal decision-making process. The authority of the manager applies only in those areas related to its scope and in which he is a competent one, while initiative, creativity, independence of thought are expected from the subordinates.

2. „Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after her/himself and her/his immediate family. Collectivism stands for a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty" (Hofstede, 2001:225).

Individualism and collectivism are significantly different. Individualism assumes that there is a free will of people, so that they can change things and influence their own destiny. Employees meet the pre-determined plan and do not tend to changes. Collectivism

implies the existence of a stronger social structure in which the collective is responsible for the destiny of an individual. The emphasis is given to involvement of an individual in an organization that is primarily moral, so the individual also feels emotional attachment to the organization.

3. „Masculinity versus femininity: Masculinity stands for a society in which social gender roles are clearly distinct: men are supposed to be tough, assertive and focused on material success; women are supposed to be modest, tender and concerned with the quality of life. Femininity stands for a society in which social gender roles overlap: both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender and concerned with the quality of life" (Hofstede, 2001: 297).

4. Uncertainty avoidance represents „the extent a culture programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations" (Hofstede, 2001:161). The main problem in this case is the extent to which a society tries to control uncertainty. However, in the same way that human society uses technology, law, religion in order to tackle with uncertainty, so the organizations use technology, rules and rituals thus reducing internal uncertainty caused by unpredictable behavior of its members.

5. Long-term versus short-term orientation relates to the extent to which culture affects its members to accept delayed satisfaction of their material, social and emotional needs. Namely, „long-term orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift. Its opposite pole, short-term orientation stands for the fostering of virtues related to the past and present in particular, respect for tradition, preservation of "face", and fulfilling social obligations" (Hofstede, 2001: 359). In the long-term orientation cultures loyalty to the organization represents a special value. They give priority to values of learning, integrity, adaptability, responsibility and self-discipline, while leisure does not matter. Short-term orientation cultures put emphasis on freedom, rights, independence and leisure.

Regarding specified dimensions, Hofstede believes that our opinions about organizations are most affected by hierarchical power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Hierarchical power distance gives us the answer to the question "Who has the power to decide", and uncertainty avoidance, "which rules and procedures will be respected in order to achieve the desired goals within the organization." These two dimensions affect the process of planning and control in organizations. Namely, the higher a person is on the hierarchical scale, the less formal are processes of planning and control, i.e. higher level of uncertainty avoidance requires more detailed planning and control. According to Hofstede, there are no universal principles of management and operations that would be equally applicable to all organizations, but these principles are the result of different theories that have the characteristics of the culture in which they arose. „Each country or region has unique features that no model can include " (Hofstede et. al., 2001).

The above mentioned dimensions of national culture will be used for explanation of the impact of national culture on motivation and organizational changes.

2.2. Influence of culture on motivation and organizations

There are a number of theories that deal with the relationship between culture and motivation which differ in the manner of origin, level of emporia support, practical

usability and the like. However, what is common to all theories is that most of them originated in the United States (Robbins, 2001: 175).

We will mention only some of the motivation theories where some differences in employees' motives may be noticed, which are mainly the consequence of different national cultures. Alderfer's theory analyzes needs and motives that drive people in organizations in different cultures (Janicijevic, 1997: 227). Thus, for example. basic needs (physiological and safety) are important in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance. Cultures with strong individualism, i.e. "masculine" values and low power distance value independence and individual efficiency. Cultures with so-called „feminine" values, collectivism and high power distance satisfy their existential needs through belonging and loyalty to collective. Likewise, connection needs (belonging, respect of others) are crucial in cultures characterized by high uncertainty avoidance and high power distance, collectivism and "feminine values". Development needs (self-esteem and self-actualization) are the most important in cultures where "masculine" values, individualism, low power distance and uncertainty avoidance prevail (Janićijević, 1997: 227-230)

The theory of Frederick Herzberg also deserves atention. According to this theory, and confirmed by numerous studies, the desire for interesting work is important almost to all workers, regardless of their national culture. For instance, the desire for interesting work seems important to almost all workers, regardless of their national culture. In a study of seven countries, employees in Belgium, Britain, Israel and the United States ranked "interesting workk" number one among 11 work goals. And this factor was ranked either second or third in Japan, the Netherlands and Germany (Robbins, Coulter, 2005: 408).

Likewise, in some East Asia cultures motivation for the achievement is not individual but group-oriented. For Japan a group achievement motive is precisely the key "driving force" in organizations. Individual achievement is neither valued nor rewarded. On the contrary, in the U.S. individual achievements are much more valued and respected, and individuals who stand out from others are rewarded.

Hofstede believes that the influence of cultural values on motivation can be best explained by crossing two dimensions of national culture which are uncertainty avoidance and "masculine values". In that sense, Anglo-American culture and cultures of the United States, Great Britain and their former colonies have low uncertainty avoidance and strong masculine values. In these countries, motivation is based on personal, i.e. individual success, expressed in the form of wealth and honor. Cultures with low risk avoidance and feminine values are present in northern European countries and the Netherlands. Motivation in these countries is based on success and interaction between people, while success here is partly measured by "quality" of human relations and living conditions. (Hofstede, 2001: 386) High uncertainty avoidance and emphasized "feminine" values are typical for France, Spain, Portugal and the former Yugoslavia. Motivation in those countries reflects in safety needs and needs for belonging. Individual wealth and success are less important than mutual solidarity and group cohesion. In countries with high uncertainty avoidance and emphasized "masculine values" (Japan, German-speaking countries, Greece) motivation essentially has personal, individual safety based on wealth and especially on the hard work. Furthermore, differences in motivation between people exist when people work for extrinsic money rewards and for the positive regard and support of their colleagues. In more communitarian cultures, this second source of motivation may be so strong that high performers prefer to share the fruits of their efforts

with colleagues than to take extra money for themselves as individuals. (Trompenaars, Hampden-Turner, 1998: 63)

Regardless of the fact that most contemporary motivation theories are considered culturally limited, the results of some studies (Gelfand, Erez, Aykan, 2007: 482) however show universality of certain motifves, such as the pursuit of personal efficacy, need for control, achievements and the like. However, specific factors that cause these motifves differ from culture to culture. Individualized feedback influences beliefs about personal effectiveness in individualistic cultures, whereas group feedback has the same effect in collectivistic cultures. Similarly, although the need for control is universal, personal culture is important in individualistic cultures, and collectivistic in collectivistic cultures. Although there are beliefs that the achievement motive is more strongly present in individualistic than in collectivistic cultures the more is present a standpoint that it is about existence of different meanings of this term in different cultures. Collectivists believe that positive results represent the outcome of collective effort, not just individual.

Erez and Earley believe that there are certain universal principles of motivation acceptable in different cultures. Content domain of human needs and motivations is universal. Needs for personal advancement, efficiency and consistency are universal human characteristics. What is different in cultures is the need to emphasize different needs, as well as means to meet them.

Certainly, when it comes to relationship between national culture and motivation the analysis of influence of certain cultural dimension to this process in organizations dominates.There is often aspiration to explain influence of culture to motivation through two-dimensional matrix. All explanations are interesting and stimulating, but ignore the fact that national cultures represent the wholes that cannot be reduced solely to individual dimensions. This requires application of a systemic or holistic approach that observes national cultures as wholes that cannot be reduced to its individual dimensions.

2.3. National culture and organizational change

Many authors indicate that understanding of certain activities in organizations varies between national cultures. National culture significantly influences the process of changes management in an organization. The nature of this influence can be seen through the following questions (Robbins, 2001):

Do people believe that change is possible?

If change is possible, what is the time period in which it can be implemented?

Is resistance to change greater in some cultures than in others?

Does culture affect implementation of the change planned?

Do successful change agents do different things in different cultures?

Do people believe that change is possible? Cultures differ in the extent to which its members believe that they have the ability to control their environment. In cultures where the prevailing belief is that the environment can be controlled, individuals will have a positive attitude towards changes (example for those cultures are the U.S. or Canada). In other cultures (for example, Iran or Saudi Arabia), people are considered subordinate to their environment and are likely to take a more passive attitude towards changes.

When it comes to time in which it is possible to perform the change, certain differences occur. Namely, in long-term oriented cultures (e.g. Japan) patience in awaiting positive results of planned changes has already been expressed. In short-term oriented cultures

(e.g. the U.S.), fast improvements will be expected and change programs accepted that promise quick results. The fifth dimension of Hofstede's model, long-term versus short-term orientation represents this aspect the best.

Is resistance to change greater in certain cultures than in others? Resistance to change will undoubtedly be influenced by the extent to which a certain culture relies on tradition. National culture of Italy is often cited as an example of the frequent reliance on the past, while the culture of the United States is believed to be focused on the present. Accordingly, resistance to change should be significantly higher in the first than in the second culture.

Regarding the influence of culture on the manner of implementation of planned changes, power distance is a dimension of culture that influences the above mentioned process. In cultures with high power distance (Philippines, Venezuela) changes will be autocratically imposed by top management layers in an organization. On the contrary, low power distance in certain culture presumes greater participation of all employees in implementation of organizational changes (e.g. cultures of Denmark and Israel).

Do successful change agents resort to various "techniques" of implementation of changes in different cultures? The answer to this question is affirmative. Members of cultures with emphasized power distance prefer that initiators of changes receive support from the top of the organization, in order to accept innovations themselves. Furthermore, the higher is uncertainty avoidance in the culture change agents are forced to, as far as possible, develop innovations within existing rules and procedures (Robbins, 2001: 562).

When it comes to specific process of managing changes in organizations, the management of an organization, consciously or unconsciously over time develop its own approach to change management. Of course, this process is largely influenced by implicit assumptions, beliefs and values of managers that they adopt from national culture to which they belong. "The main determinants of the approach to change management in organizations are character and changes leadership style. In other words, the approach to change management is determined by commitment to a particular type of change and a certain style of leadership change"(Janićijević, 2008: 361)

When it comes to this subject, the question about the type of changes that will be applied in a particular organization and changes leadership style deserves special attention. As for the type of changes, despite the fact that all organizations go through everyday, incremental and partial changes, a gap between the organization and its environment is created over time. In this regard, in order to overcome the aforementioned gap, the need to carry out a comprehensive, radical and intensive changes (the so-called discontinuous changes) arises. Managers are expected to opt for a particular type of change. This choice is largely determined also by cultural factors. When it comes to choosing between continuous and discontinuous changes, the importance of two dimensions of national culture is primarily emphasized. Uncertainty avoidance and power distance. "Continual changes require low degree of uncertainty avoidance in the national culture, as these are incremental and partial, but everyday changes. The organization can be continuously changed only if members of such organization accept the fact that changes are inevitable and permanently present. We can expect such assumptions only in cultures with low uncertainty avoidance. In cultures with high uncertainty avoidance members of organization are not willing to accept everyday and frequent changes. They prefer the stability which inevitably leads their organization more frequent and faster to disharmony with the environment, thus causing the need for radical, transformational

changes. Therefore, in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance, the management of an organization will be prone to discontinuous changes. It seems paradoxical that a high degree of uncertainty avoidance leads to radical changes, revolutionary and comprehensive changes that bring a far greater degree of uncertainty than continuous changes. This is because members of organization in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance tend to eliminate the immediate sources of uncertainties in front of them. They will postpone changes as long as possible, and when it is not possible any more they will inevitably resort to radical changes. For members of cultures with high uncertainty avoidance, it is acceptable to face with rare and shorter periods of high uncertainty, than with low but constant uncertainty of evolutionary change" (Janićijević, 2008:362).

In addition to uncertainty avoidance, power distance can affect the choice between continuous and discontinuous changes. Namely, continuous changes are implemented through numerous smaller "adjustments" at all levels of the organization and because of that their initiation and management is under the competence of the lower levels managers. This implies a relatively even distribution of power and authority and decentralization of organization for which one of the cultural prerequisites is low power distance. On the other hand, radical, revolutionary and comprehensive (discontinuous) changes mean concentration of power in the person of a strong leader at the top of the organization, which is most common in cultures with high power distance.

Accordingly, the conclusion is that discontinuous changes will be more accepted and have chances for success in organizations of culture with high power distance and stronger uncertainty avoidance, in contrast to cultures characterized by low risk avoidance and less emphasized power distance which favors implementation of continuous changes. Of course, it has been mentioned earlier that all organizations are faced with and with both types of changes irrespective of dimensions of national cultures in which they function. Both, the aforementioned dimensions, influence predominant selection of the type of change and certainty of the success of such a choice (Janićijević, 2008: 363).

Style of leadership in organizational changes is also substantially influenced by national culture. The main leadership styles are directive and participative. It is clear that dimension of power distance mostly affects the choice of organizational changes leadership style. In cultures with emphasized power distance unequal distribution of power in organizations is accepted and considered justified. So, the leaders are expected to reach all important decisions, including decisions about the type and manner of implementation of changes. Directive leadership style (top-down approach) is appropriate for such a cultural orientation. On the other hand, national cultures characterized by low power distance imply an active role of employees in decision-making. It also refers to the process of organizational changes in which participative leadership style (bottom-up approach) is more likely to be successful and accepted by employees. Dimension of uncertainty avoidance also has similar impact on the choice of leadership style in organizational changes. Mentioned orientation implies reluctance of subordinates to changes and risks which they inevitably bring. When an organization is faced with inevitability of change, the more likely are inertia and passivity of employees and giving up to a directive leadership style by managers. Members of cultures with low uncertainty avoidance do not feel jeopardized in unclear and uncertain situations that accompany the process of change and, therefore, they actively participate in designing and implementation of changes. Dimension of individualism / collectivism also affects organizational change leadership style. In individualistic cultures where interest of the individual is primary, the choice of participatory leadership is more likely to be

accepted. On the other hand, collective interests have the primacy in collectivist cultures, which is primarily provided for by relying on leaders' decisions, which also applies to decisions on manner of implementation of changes, including the choice of directive leadership style as the most appropriate (Janićijević, 2008: 363-364).

So, there is no doubt that national cultures differ when it comes to accepting changes. Some cultures are changing slowly and actively oppose to changes, primarily because of their preference for traditional behavior. Other cultures accept the changes, but sometimes a considerable number of their members tries to re-establish traditional values and behavior and sees change as a threat. Finally, some cultures are ambivalent with respect to the changes and at the same time accept them, resist them and fear them. It is important for managers to understand sources of resistance to changes so they can anticipate and reduce them. Tradition, customs, limited resources, fear of losing power and influence and fear of the unknown, are forms of resistance to change that can be found in all societies (Francesco, Gold, 1998: 207).

3. INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURE ON COMMUNICATION PROCESS

„We must never assume that we are fully aware of what we communicate to someone else .... Culture hides more than it reveals. Years of study have convinced me that the real job is not to understand foreign culture but to understand our own. I am also convinced that all that one ever gets from studying foreign culture is a token understanding" (Hall, 1976: 36-38).

From the above we may conclude that the American anthropologist Edward Hall sees the whole culture as one of communication forms. The relationship between communication and culture is reciprocal, complex and bidirectional. In 1959 Hall still considered that culture is communication and communication is culture (1990: 10).

He believes that communication acts as a transmitter of culture and thus influences its structure. Likewise, culture is manifested through communication, because people communicate according to the dictates of their culture. However, communication affects culture and vice versa. rephrase that, it is difficult to say what is the voice, and what is echo. This dualism exists because people "learn" about their culture through communication, which represents reflection of their own culture. Power of the link that connects communication and culture can be seen from the following questions:

For some castes in India rats are sacred animals, whereas in Europe and the U.S. people are destroying these rodents. Why?

Some people shake hands when introduced to a stranger, while others greet each other by bowing. Why?

The general answer to all these questions is the same: culture. Therefore, Hall explains all these differences as high and low-context culture (Samovar, Porter 2007: 22).

Depending on the manner of communication in cultures, Hall differs high and low-context cultures. The context is information that surrounds certain event which is also associated with that event. Cultures of the world can be divided into cultures with high and low-context. a high-context (HC) communication or message is one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or is internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message. A low-context (LC) communication is just the opposite; i.e., the mass of information is vested in the explicit

code. „Japanese, Arabs and Mediterranean peoples, who have extensive information networks among family, friends, colleagues and clients and who are involved in close personal relations are high-context. As a result, for most normal transactions in family life they do not require, nor do they expect, much in- depth background information. This is because they keep themselves informed about everything having to do with the people who are important in their lives. Low-context people include Americans, Germans, Swiss, Scandinavians and other northern Europeans. They compartmentalize their personal relationships, their work, and many aspects of day-to-day life. Consequently, each time they interact with others they need detailed background information. The French are much higher on the context scale than either the Germans or the Americans. This difference can affect virtually every situation and every relationship in which the members of these two opposite traditions find themselves" (Hall, 1990:6).

Edward Hall clearly emphasized differences in the manner of communication in certain cultures explaining high and low-context cultures. In this regard, Hall defined concepts of both high-context and low-context culture. Low-context cultures rely on what is explicitly said or written in order to understand the message, while high-context cultures rely more on interpretation of elements that are external to the text.

Characteristics of high-context cultures are as follows:
- relationships between people are long-lasting and individuals feel strong interest for others;
- because of a strong communication with the help of a "common code" (the context) in routine situations - such a communication is cost-effective, fast and successful. High-context cultures include that context in communication. For example, the Japanese often bypass the main topic in communication, assuming that an intelligent man will be able to discover the topic of conversation from the context that communicate;
- people in top positions are personally liable for actions of their subordinates, which further evaluates mutual loyalty between superiors and subordinates;
- agreements are often rather verbal than written. This may mean that the written agreement is only "the best assumption", because after signing the contract in Japan people may seek for further changes. Even many contracts contain a provision that it can be renegotiated if circumstances change;
- "insiders" and "outsiders" are clearly separated. The outsiders are, in the first place, people who are not members of the family, clan, organization and finally strangers (i.e.other cultures' members);
- cultural patterns are deeply rooted and slowly changed.

On the contrary, low-context cultures are characterized by the following:
- relationships between individuals are relatively short and excessively expresed relatedness with others is not esteemed;
- communication messages must be clear and one can less rely on context and non-verbal communication in the process of communication;
- the authority is distributed through the whole bureaucratic mechanism and relations of personal responsibility are rarely established;
- agreements are often written rather than oral. Low-context cultures consider contracts as final and legally binding;

- ▪ "insiders" and "outsiders" are less clearly distinguished, which means that strangers easilyadapt to such a culture;
- ▪ cultural patterns are rapidly changing (Mead, 1998:27).

Therefore, people in different cultures communicate in different ways. Today there are more than 200 different languages and over 3000 different language versions. Not even one-half of the world is considered linguistically homogeneous. In some countries, there are several hundred different language versions (eg. Indonesia). Some languages, almost identical, are differently used in different countries, some words will be pronounced or written differently and even have different meaning (examples are British English and American English or German and Austrian German). When it comes to verbal communication two people can speak the same language (for example, people from the U.S. and England), and in fact do not understand each other. Language therefore is understood as a way of thinking, the system of values of a society. Learning language means learning culture (Rakita, 2003).

In addition to verbal, non-verbal communication is very significant particularly in certain cultures. Various studies show that impression we leave on others when communicating depends on what we say which is only 7%, how we pronounce it 38% and the most of our body language -55%. According to some estimates, 70-80% of communication is of non-verbal character. It implies that gestures, i.e. movements of head, arms, shoulders, look, how we use our eyes, voice, and even clothing. Every country has its code of conduct and interpretation of certain gestures, which represent reflection of itsculture. In this sense, the East uses non-verbal communication more than West. Also in this regard, experts distinguish between two types of culture: the culture of close and culture of distanced contact in communication. Cultures of close contact are characteristic for the Middle East, Indonesia, Latin America, Southern and Eastern Europe and are characterized by a high degree of intimacy (closeness), while cultures of distanced contact are typical for North America, Northern Europe and some Asian countries. It is also interesting that with the Russians, Arabs, French and Latino Americans kiss on the cheek or holding hands in the street is a common occurrence. For some other people, for example, the Anglo-Saxons and Asians it would be very inappropriate. In Japan and Korea other gestures are used when greeting and showing respect - they bow to each other and the depth of the bow depends on respect for the person you are bowing to. Arabs often watch their interlocutors in the eyes, because they believe that the eyes are the mirror of the soul, and that is very important to know the soul of the one you do business with. However, in contrast, Japanese children are taught in school not to look their teachers in the eyes but to direct their gaze at the region of their teacher's Adam's apple or tie knot (Rakita, 2003).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Therefore, the general conclusion is that the national culture determines the rules of company's business operations in a social context.

When it comes to analyzing the influence on the motivation process it would be the best to apply those motivational techniques and procedures that are the most appropriate for a given national culture. It is important that manager techniques and procedures coincide with the values of national cultures of organization's members. In addition, it is

very important to know and understand your own cultural values. It is interesting that different authors distinguish different dimensions of national cultures that affect the most motivation process in organizations. In this regard, Hofstede distinguishes uncertainty avoidance and "masculine/feminine values". All dimensions act as a whole that cannot be reduced to influence of one or two, or all four of them individually observed. This confirms the need of applied systemic, i.e. holistic analysis of cultural influence on motivation in organizations. Thus, in analyzing national culture influence on motivational process it cannot be simply reduced to its two dimensions.

In analyzing the influence of national culture on organizational changes, the position on cultural limitation of most of the theories and techniques of organization and management is particularly evident. For example, the theory that explains this influence may not always be fully in line with cultural orientation of countries of its origin. In this sense, is necessary to introduce professional and humanistic values of researchers' professional culture that could explain the above mentioned discrepancy. Furthermore, in addition to influence of national culture on the process of organizational change, other factors that influence those processes may not be neglected. Namely, organizations pass through continuous and discontinuous changes. Therefore, the standpoint that the organizations are forced, due to some cultural dimensions, to apply specified type of change is not correct. What can be declared with certainty is that there is a high likelihood that, because of different dimensions of culture, some changes will have a greater chance of being accepted and more successful than others. It is important to note the disharmony between the culture and planned changes and to find ways to overcome such disharmony.

When it comes to the process of communication, organizations are nowday increasingly faced with new contacts, people and organizations from other countries. To be successful in working with people from other cultures, managers must be aware of cultural differences and similarities between a country of origin and a country in which they will do their business. The way of negotiation in some countries is largely determined by characteristics of national cultures of certain countries. Temperament, attitudes and way of thinking, moral and spiritual principles and other values shape behavior, and also the manner of communication among members of different countries. They also need to understand implications of diversity and to possess necessary communication skills to be able to decide in accordance with cultural specificities of the environment. The knowledge of corporate culture characteristics and the way of negotiating is an essential prerequisite for achieving successful business. Only in this way is it always and everywhere possible to achieve a successful business relationship, without occurence of any misunderstandings and bad emotions.

References

1. Brooks, I. (2006), Organizational Behavior: Individuals, Groups and Organization, (3rd ed.), New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
2. Erez, M, Earley, P.C. (1993), Culture, Self-Identity and Work, New York, Oxford University Press.
3. Francesco, A M, Gold, B.A.(1998), International Organizational Behavior: Text, Reading, Cases, and Skills, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
4. Gelfand, M., Erez, M., Aycan, Z. (2007), Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 58, pp. 47-514.
5. Gerc, K. (1998), Tumačenje kultura, Beograd, Čigoja štampa.
6. Hall, E.T. (1976), Nemi jezik, Beograd, Bigz.

7. Hall, E.T., Hall, M.R. (1990), Understanding Cultural Differences, Yarmouth, MA, Intercultural Press, Inc.
8. Hofstede, G. (1980), Culture's Consequences – International Differences in Work-Related Values, *Newbury Park*, California, *Sage* Publications.
9. Hofstede, G.(2001), Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations. Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publications.
10. Janićijević, N. (1997), Organizaciona kultura, Novi Sad, Ulixes.
11. Janićijević, N. (2008), Organizaciono ponasanje, Beograd, Data status.
12. Janićijević, N. (2013), Organizaciona kultura i menadžment, Beograd, Ekonomski fakultet.
13. Kroeber, A L., Parsons, T. (1958), The Concepts of Culture and of Social *System. American Sociological Review*, Vol.23, No.5, pp. 582-583
14. Mead, R.(1998), International Management: Cross-Cultural Dimensions, (2nd ed), London, Blackwell Business.
15. Rakita, B. (2003), Medjunarodni marketing, Beograd, Ekonomski fakultet.
16. Robbins, S. P., Coulter, M. (2005), Menadžment, Beograd, Data Satus.
17. Robbins, S.P.(2001), Organizational Behavior, (9th ed), London, Prentice-Hall International.
18. Samovar, L., Porter, R. (2007), Communication between cultures, *Belmont*, CA, *Thomson Wadsworth*.
19. Trompenaars, F., Hampden Turner, C. (1998), Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Global Business, New York, Mc Graw-Hill.

UTICAJ NACIONALNE KULTURE NA POJEDINE OBLIKE ORGANIZACIONOG PONAŠANJA

Nacionalna kultura, pored ostalih faktora, velikim delom određuje organizaciono ponašanje. Rad se odnosi na uticaj nacionalne kulture na pojedine oblike organizacionog ponašanja i to: motivaciju, organizacione promene i proces komunikacije. U uvodnom dijelu autor naglasava značaj pravilnog razumijevanja odnosa nacionalne i organizacione kulture, ističući ulogu kulturnih cinilaca koji u velikoj meri određuju ponašanje organizacija u savremenim uslovima. Autor u radu najpre daje prikaz različitih perspektiva u definisanju nacionalne kulture. Za objašnjenje uticaja nacionalne kulture na pojedine oblike organizacionog ponasanja, autor koristi Hofstedeove dimenzije nacionalnih kultura. U kontekstu toga analizira uticaj nacionalne kulture na motivaciju i organizacione promene. U daljem delu teksta analizirani su različiti oblici komunikacije koji su posledica različitih kulturnih uticaja. U završnom delu rada dati su zaključci o oticaju nacionalne kulture na motivaciju, organizacione promene i proces komunikacije.

Ključne reči: *nacionalna kultura, organizacija, menadžment, organizaciono ponašanje*.