

# The Impact of Employees' National/Regional Culture on the Adaptation to Organizational Culture

Ahsen Yalin

Yeni Yüzyıl University, İstanbul, Turkey

In respect of all forms of enterprises, whether it is a private or public institution, labor cohesion and productivity is one of the most emphasized issues. Culture, on the other hand, can be characterized as one of the inextricable and hardly ever alterable features of human kind. Whether the profession cohesion and accordingly productivity of those employed within a culture discrepant from their culture of origin both due to the effect of globalization and domestic conditions are culturally affected is a question of importance, which must be answered with regard to state, institution, and employee. The occupational obligation to work in various regions, encountered in public employees at a national scale, particularly in the fields of education and health, and identified with legislative regulations, has become a reason of preference due to economic justifications for private sector employees. Hofstede (1990), who divides culture, in general, into two, national and organizational, has presented five parameters for the elucidation of cultures. These are "power distance", "individualism vs. collectivism", "masculinity vs. femininity", "uncertainty avoidance", and "long and short term orientation". By means of power distance, the conception by an organization or social structure of power distribution of its members is queried. In other words, the difficulty or simplicity in people establishing communication with more influential individuals of the society is evaluated. Individualism vs. collectivism is with regard to whether individuals consider themselves as a distinct individual or a member of a group. Masculinity vs. femininity is the parameter, explanatory of the mentality, rather than a form of gender discrimination. Masculine cultures attach more importance to competition, force, and achievement whereas feminine societies place emphasis on emotions and life quality. Uncertainty avoidance is associated with the attitude of societies towards uncertainties. While some may not pay attention to uncertainties, for others, situations without clear boundaries may be registered as a threat. Long and short term orientation is related to long or short term planned by people and accordingly bearing expectations and in other respects, displays the past, present, and future oriented thinking tendency. Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to identify the positive or negative impact of the culture of origin of university staff, to be designated in İstanbul/Turkey, on the organizational culture. By means of the results of the aforementioned study, the comparison of cohesion is in terms of ability to communicate and accordingly productivity, within the frame of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, between those employed within their culture (of origin) and those employed in different cultures. In pursuant of the results obtained from this study, an opinion can be formed for the regulations to be issued on the matter on national scale. At institutional scale, contributions can be made in the assessment of employee productivity from the aforesaid perspective and in terms of the employee, awareness can be raised on the impact of working within the body of different cultures.

---

Ahsen Yalin, Dr., assist. prof., Yeni Yüzyıl University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ahsen Yalin, Maltepe Mahallesi, Yılanlı Ayazma Caddesi, No. 26 P.K. 34010 Cevizlibağ/Zeytinburnu/İstanbul, Turkey.

*Keywords:* culture, labor, organizational culture, Hofstede's cultural dimensions, regional culture

## **Introduction**

Culture, which contains the function of acting in unison with affiliation, belonging, common values, and in other words, the function of creating synergy, also uses these functions to be separated, or even move further away from other cultures. Especially the developments in the communication technologies after 1980's relatively transformed cultures, and also relatively pulled them into each other. However, despite that, many cultures managed to keep their own motives and localness. Hofstede, who was working on cultural differences, analyzed culture in its national and organizational dimensions; and generalized it under the titles of "power distance", "individualism and collectivism", "masculinity-femininity", "uncertainty avoidance", and "long-term orientation". While national and organizational cultures differ from each other, it's possible to mention different local cultures as in Turkey when it comes to national scale, and different national cultures when it comes to international scale. Voluntary/forced migrations/emigrations made a living or worked with necessary multiculturalism, and therefore studies with a focus on culture have gained more and more importance.

## **Culture and Globalization**

Culture, which is a common means of communication used to maintain the need of humanity for cohabiting and to form a social order presents a unifying characteristic on one side; on the other side, it might be quite separating with its written or unwritten strict rules. Culture is the activity of making distinctions: of classifying, segregating, drawing boundaries, and so dividing people into categories internally united by similarity and externally separated by difference; and of differentiating the ranges of conduct assigned to the humans allocated to different categories (Bauman, 2015). The word "culture" consists of of a tension between doing and being done, rationality and spontaneity. This tension not only satirizes the abstracted mind of Enlightenment, but also challenges the cultural reductivism of many contemporary ideas (Eagleton, 2011).

Increasing global population and decrease of world's scarce necessitate cohabitation of different cultures, in other words living not where one is "born", but where one can "survive" (generally due to economic reasons such as better income, better job, and living conditions). This mostly forced expansionism that led to migrations throughout the history of humanity indicates the process of globalization that includes concepts such as connection, interaction, change, and transformation. With the point of view, globalization can be defined as (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 2008):

a process or collection of processes that creates flows and networks through activity, interaction, and use of power between continents and regions, evaluated in terms of its volume, intensity, pace, and impacts, where the transformation in local organization of social relations and processes materialize. (p. 89)

Humanity who takes along the culture acquired from the living environment mediates the change/transformation of culture by not forgetting the culture of origin, but trying to adapt himself into the new culture as well. On the other hand, globalization also brings about connection, interaction, and change also for the societies that don't change place and prefer to remain local.

Local transformation is a part of multilateral increase of social connections of globalization within time and space. (...) For instance, increasing welfare of an urban area in Singapore may be causally connected to impoverishment of a

neighborhood in Pittsburg whose local products aren't able to compete in global markets through a complex network of economic connections. (Giddens, 2008, p. 81)

McLuhan symbolizes globalization with the metaphor of "global village" in a way to include change of culture as well. Tomlinson (2004), however, interprets the change in culture as "transformation of culture can be grasped not within the metaphor of vacation, but through becoming *homeless*" (p. 48). This interpretation emphasizes on the obligation of cohabiting with different cultures, in other words, addresses the concept of becoming a "global citizen". According to Tomlinson, "Globalization is significant for culture; this is because globalization puts the discussions on various cultural experiences in the center of strategies intervening other areas of connection (political, environmental, and economic)" (pp. 49-50).

Cultures changing or transforming with the interaction between other areas of connection generate the concept of "hybrid culture". However, when the literature is reviewed, "interculturality" or "multiculturality" concept is seen instead of hybrid culture. These two concepts can replace each other even though they differ from each other. "Multiculturality reveals different ways of thinking, problem solving, learning, and performance and activity, ways of communication, level or relations with the authority and of course, the understanding of governance" (Baltaş, 2011, p. 214). The individuals living in a multicultural society are open to preserve their own cultures and influence the culture they live in, and also to be influenced by that culture they live in. Thus, hybrid cultures are generated in multicultural societies. These expressions that in general evoke the interaction between cultures, also refer to separation of "I/we" and "other(s)". The concern of not being able to preserve one's culture against the negativeness of multicultural life as a result of globalization leads to preservation of "citizenship" due to different groups' sense of belonging. Individuals that are taken away from their traditional bonds and struggling for their existence in a foreign land prioritize the communication with their fellow citizens in order to preserve their cultural identity (Köse, 2008).

While the formation of multicultural societies was associated with migrations in the beginning, particularly the developments in the communication technologies make cultural change or transformation possible without the need for a change in place. However, it's not quite possible to suggest that the concept of "global village" may refer to a global culture in a foreseeable future. In other words, culture is generated by the inherited values, not by the plans that are going to shape the future. "Unlike national cultures, a global culture is essentially memoryless. Where the 'nation' can be constructed so as to draw upon and revive latent popular experiences and needs, a 'global culture' answers to no living needs, no identity-in-the-making" (Smith, 2008, p. 333). According to this statement, it would be possible to talk about two different ways for the culture generation: real culture and constructed culture. "If the culture defines humanity in certain conditions, and humanity then defines the culture with inventions, adaptations and responses" (Bourse, 2009, p. 75). While the generation of real culture is shaped through adaptation to nature in general, constructed culture prefers to fight with the nature and stand against it, and to define reconstructed rules. The culture generated by technology can be an example of constructed culture.

Nevertheless, both ways of culture generation apparently are influenced by each other and it would be difficult to prioritize one of them. Still, it would be possible to suggest that the real culture has a greater impact on traditional societies, while the constructed one has a greater impact on societies that are qualified as a modern one. The real culture has the authority to regulate the society, while it's not possible for the constructed

culture to regulate the society as a whole due to its global structure. According to Adorno (2013) who approaches to constructed culture under the name “Culture Industry” critically,

Culture suffers damage when it is planned and administrated; when it is left to itself, however, everything cultural threatens not only to lose its possibility of effect, but its very existence as well. It is neither possible to accept uncritically the concept of culture, long permeated by ideas of departmentalization, nor to continue to shake one’s head conservatively about what is being done to culture in the age of integral organization. (p. 122)

According to another approach, culture can be divided into modern era culture and postmodern era culture. While modern era culture emphasizes the worldwide domination of uniform consumption culture, postmodern era culture highlights the concepts of locality or micro-nationalism and micro-religiosity (Özkul, 2013). The first approach in this classification underlines acceptance of cultural impacts of similar ways of living and globalization unquestioningly and even voluntarily; and the second one refers to re-localization of culture as a reaction to this global culture.

Considering the period from the past or present, for instance, Republic of Turkey which inherited from the characteristics of the multicultural society that was living within the borders of Ottoman Empire preserves its cultural diversity. For many societies presenting such local/national/international samples, Peter Burke (2011), a historian in the field of culture makes four different assumptions in terms of the future of culture:

The first one is the homogeneity which is expected by and scares many people and is a result of globalization, or in other words, assimilation of different cultures within each other. The second one is the resistance or “anti-globalization”. The third one is the situation which is a combination of global and local cultures and is called “cultural bilingualism”. And the fourth one is the generation of a new synthesis. (p. 151)

It would be possible to say that each possibility exists in today’s world; however, the time will tell which one to become dominant in the following periods.

### **Organization Culture**

Business life which constitutes a significant part of human life occupies approximately 7-8 hours of working class’ daily life, or 30-40 years of a 75 years of life. Although the factors such as life expectancy, education period, retiring age variability differ from one country to another, it’s obvious that this rough amount of time spent by an employee in the business environment is worth analyzing in terms of many aspects. This framework that is generally referred to as “organization” or “institution” and defines the business structuring owes its generation and development to the culture internally defined by founder/managers and all the other employees and externally by the stakeholders. In other words, all the values of the organization are shaped by the culture reflected by the relevant persons.

The organization is defined as groups in which two or more individuals collaborate to achieve their goals (Ülgen & Mirze, 2004). In other words, the organization is a necessity for the bureaucratic structuring of organizations in modern societies. “According to Weber, the proliferation of bureaucracy is inevitable in modern societies; bureaucratic power is the only way to handle the administrative needs of large-scaled social systems” (Giddens, 2012, p. 686). Bureaucracy which is also a significant part of organization culture today incorporates bookkeeping operations, administration and hierarchy concepts.

In our day, many organizations such as Cocal Cola, IBM, GE are referred to as global-scaled, and the importance of organization culture gradually increases. Organization culture provides guidance to define

appropriate behaviors and relations, to motivate individuals, and to provide solutions for the employees in case of uncertainties (Vural & Akıncı, 2012). According to Baltaş (2011), organization culture is what employees do when they aren't assigned and supervised.

Organizations are living organisms and therefore their foundation, development, growing, and even merger are possible. Organization culture "takes effect in the regulation of knowledge, values and internal relations, administration of the firm and any visible and invisible levels ranging from organization's stories, ceremonies, symbols to language used, office decoration, building plan and dress code among the personnel" (Vural & Akıncı, 2012, p. 194). When successful corporations are considered, it would be seen that they have real or constructed stories and these stories have great impact on any stakeholders of the organization. "It's this kind of stories and myths that take firms beyond concrete buildings, annual budgets and balance sheet analyzes and make them living organisms and them" (Kozlu, 2014, p. 87). In other words, organizations may possibly achieve their goals through fundamental values, leader and heroes, ceremonies, symbols and stories which are all based on communication apart from numeric values.

While it's not possible to assess any cultures as "better" or "worse" than any others, it's also not possible to come to such a conclusion about the organizational culture. However, the fact that the individual doesn't experience nonconformity in his/her own culture doesn't apply to the organization culture. In other words, conformity of an individual with the culture he belongs to or conformity with an organization's culture may differ from each other. It's been observed that there are two situations determining the dominant culture in transnational corporations: the first one is culture that has the biggest amount of shares and therefore keeping management lines under control; and the second one is the culture imposed by the majority of the employees. From another point of view, the culture that is dominant in the organization might be the determinant of the organization culture.

"Organizations that are approached as human-made artificial social order or system can be seen as miniature societies that generate their own cultures" (Nişancı, 2012, pp. 150-151). As a constructed culture, organization culture has standards and all the employees are expected to abide by these standards defined by the organization's administrative bodies. In the organizations with employees from different cultures, it's possible to ensure this conformity or standardization with a well-structured organization culture. In other words, the need of employees to experience the culture they belong to can be minimized through a well-structured organization culture.

Employees that experience major nonconformities between their social culture and organizational culture have a cultural shock. When the employee faces unusual methods, this might lead to concern, fear, exhaustion, and tedium, considering one's capabilities, invaluable, and emacination of perception of identity and genuine cultural values (Barutçugil, 2011). In this case, the individual refuses the different culture and organization culture, tends towards other employees/fellow citizens if any and tries to exist this way. However, this outcome both challenges the employee and might lead to some damages in the organization due to decreased labor productivity.

### **Hofstede and Cultural Dimension**

Professor Geert Hofstede (1990) has investigated the interaction between societal culture and organization culture in his work where he started with IBM co-worker in 50 countries in three regions and expanded to more than 70 countries. As a result of this study, he evaluated the Power-Distance, Individualism-Nationalism,

Masculinity-Femininity, and Uncertainty-Avoidance dimensions. And the long-term orientation dimension which is also known as “long and short term orientation” or “Confucius Dynamism” has been added as the 5th dimension in the study conducted by Michael Harris Bond in 1991 and supported by Hofstede (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/research.html>). While Hofstede analyzed the culture in national and organizational terms, he has indicated that the layers of culture consisted of values, rituals, heroes, and symbols, and associated values with national culture and the others with organizational one. Fornaroli and Jacobs who explained the culture with the iceberg metaphor, stated that tip-of-the-iceberg consisted of organizational culture/rituals, heroes and symbols, while the bigger part under water consisted of national culture/values (Fornaroli & Jacobs, 2016).

Hofstede who defined culture as the common programming of the mind, characteristics separating the members of a group or a category of the society from others (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/cultural-dimensions.html>), also analyzed organizational culture and considered it as the differences occurring in terms of the applications among departments in the same organization. Characteristics of the organizational culture have been deemed to be related to comprehensive, historical, anthropological terms, social, sensitive/moderate, and unalterable (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990).

Power Distance Index—PDI: Power distance expresses the approach by the people towards the ones that are more powerful within the society. The less powerful members of the society believe that the power is not distributed evenly (Smith, 2016). Power-Distance dimension is about the behavior of inferiors while following the orders of their superiors in an organization. In the cases where the power distance is high, the orders given by the superior positions aren't questioned; and where it's low, members holding inferior positions consider themselves equal with their superiors (Öğüt & Kocabacak, 2007). In the organizations with low power distance, employees are observed to be individuals with high self-confidence who are irritated to be supervised constantly and have high socio-cultural level, while in the organizations with high power distance, the need to supervise and be supervised by superior positions is seen. For instance, when power distances in China and Luxembourg are compared, it's seen that China has a high power distance with the score of 80, while Luxembourg has a low one with the score 40. In more general terms, it would be possible to suggest that eastern cultures have a higher power distance and the western cultures have a lower one. Turkey is among the countries with high power distance with the score 66 (out of 100) and the control is in the hands of the powerful ones both in terms of organizational and national cultures (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/>).

Individualism-Collectivism—IDV: This dimension is about the reflection as “me” or “us”, and this is the dimension where the individuality exists in the societies with high living standards (education, income level...), and where the collectivism becomes prominent with the decisions taken collectively, and in other words, every member of the society feels the burden of life and therefore feels responsibility towards each other. On the other hand, in the societies displaying collectivist behavior, it could be seen that cultural dissolution is more common due to the desires of people to be involved in a group and to act collectively. As in Turkey, the importance of the concept fellow citizen is great in the collectivist societies. It's seen that the responsibility of individual and 1st degree relatives are undertaken in the societies where individualism gets ahead, while close and distant relatives sometimes get ahead of the individual in the societies where collectivism is prioritized. When China and Luxembourg are compared again. It's seen that China demonstrates a collectivist characteristic with the individualism score of 20, while Luxembourg has a more individualist society with the individualism score of 60. Turkey is a collectivist society with the individualism score of 37, and it wouldn't be

possible to state that the direct communication as in other collectivist cultures is not much existing. The possibility to observe nepotism (favoritism) is high and the feedback is always given indirectly in the organizations (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/>).

**Masculinity-Femininity—MAS:** This dimension is about the importance level of emotions such as competition, success, ambition, and being the best one in one area in a society. In masculine societies, these values start from the school years and continue in the organizational culture. A low score for this dimension indicates a feminine society, and it's observed that the quality of life is prioritized as the dominant value in feminine societies. What is implied by quality of life is the prioritization of pleasant situation in life rather than higher living standards. This dimension can also be associated with being strict or sensitive or rooting for the underdog. The scores of China and Luxembourg in terms of this dimension are 66 and 50, respectively. According to this, it would be possible to suggest that China is a masculine society, while Luxembourg is neither a masculine, nor a feminine one. In other words, Luxembourg society demonstrates both competitive and sometimes strict, and also sensitive behaviors. Turkey has a feminine culture with the score of 45. Reconciliation culture exists for the Turkish people in terms of business and private lives and Turkish people care about spending and sharing their time with their families and friends in their spare times. The situation regarding rooting for the underdog also has a great percentage in the Turkish society (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/>).

**Uncertainty Avoidance:** Uncertainty-Avoidance dimension is related with the will to estimate and control what the future is going to bring, planning and taking measures about these even though it's not known. Cultures react differently to uncertainty avoidance due to different reasons. For instance, China has the uncertainty avoidance score of 30. According to the data, it would be possible to suggest that uncertainty does not effect Chinese society dramatically. However, when other characteristics of China connected with economic condition (as of the years when Hofstede conducted this study), employment status, political status, and many other similar factors are considered, it would be possible to claim that the society has become more nonreactive to uncertainties. Similar situations can be seen in Vietnam's score of 30, and India's score of 40. On the other hand, many European countries desire to guarantee their future although they have quite high levels of welfare. Therefore, they try to keep the situation under control through laws and bureaucracy. For instance, uncertainty avoidance score is 99 in Portugal, 94 in Belgium, 86 in Spain and France, 75 in Italy, 70 in Luxembourg and Austria, and 65 in Germany. Turkey's uncertainty avoidance score is 85 and it could be concluded from this result that the society has worries for its future. It's observed that the Turkish society refer to faith, traditions, and rituals in order to tolerate their worries. According to obtained official and unofficial data, majority of university students in Turkey would like to become a government official, and this demonstrates their worries regarding employment (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/>). Since the tolerance of society towards uncertainty in Japan and Greece is low considering the scores of 92 and 100 respectively, lifelong employment is an indisputable right (Sargut, 2010).

**Long Term Orientation—LTO:** Every society needs to keep connections with their pasts in order to solve their problems regarding their present and future. The societies which in general tend to preserve their traditions have a short-term orientation, while the highly modern societies tend to have a long-term orientation. In terms of organizational culture, it would be plausible to suggest that the normative societies have short, while pragmatic ones have long-term orientation. According to this, Egypt with 7, Iran with 14, Argentina with 20, Australia with 21, Denmark and Norway with 35, Israel, Finland, and Poland with 38, and Malaysia with 41

indicate the instances of a normative society. In other words, these societies respond to change in a more controlled way due to their concerns regarding the deterioration of their traditional structures. On the other hand, Italy with 61, France with 63, Luxembourg with 64, Switzerland with 74, Russia with 81, Belgium with 82, Germany with 83, China with 87, and Japan with 87 display the characteristics of a pragmatic society, and they tend to be more open to change and development. Turkey is in between two behaviors with the score of 46. In other words, while Turkey respects its traditions, it is also open for change on the other hand (<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/>).

## Method and Application

### Method

Generally, the researchers working in the field of Social Sciences, but especially in the sub-branch of cultural studies have issues regarding the method. For instance, scientists are researching on culture and people are looking for the answer whether to analyze culture and community from the outside or inside constantly (Sargut, 2010). Internal investigation method is called *emic*, while the external one is called *etic*. Emic approach is defined as “The ability to understand and interpret physical and societal world with the individual values of the community and their relation with transcendental” (<http://sosyolojisi.com/antropolojinin-yontemi-ve-arastirma-teknikleri/3048.html>). The etic approach implies the short-term and narrow evaluation in multiple environments (Sargut, 2010). Although most of the findings obtained through qualitative research method can't be represented, it's considered significant in terms of an opinion regarding the researched subject. Therefore, qualitative research method was used in this study in order to form opinion both on cultural studies and the subject itself. Interview technique was used in the study, and it would be beneficial to start the interviews as a research technique with a questionnaire prepared beforehand (Seyidođlu, 2003).

### Sampling Characteristics and Findings

Although only the employees of a foundation university in Istanbul will form the research group in the study, the employees of a private construction company were also involved in the sampling due to developments. According to this, short interviews (approximately 15 minutes) were conducted with 70 persons in total from both organizations, and 27 of these are university personnel, and the remaining 43 persons are the employees of the other organization. The terms “culture one belongs” and “different culture” were defined briefly for the participants verbally and in writing as follows:

**Culture One Belongs:** The culture where you were born and raised and lived within and where you spent a certain amount of time learning and applying traditions, customs, and similar cultural characteristics. Or it's implied that even though you were born and raised in a different place, the culture persons who raised you have impact on your belongings.

**Different Culture:** It can be considered as the culture that is different from the one taught and imposed up to a certain age and that one tries to adapt.

Numerical values regarding research participants were summarized in Table 1 below:

Since the sampling was determined as a university and a big construction firm, it could be suggested that the educational level of participants is higher than Turkey's average.

It's observed that the majority of the sampling is 35 years old or younger. In other words, majority of the sampling consists of Y Generation.



Table 1

*Educational Background*

Education/position	University personnel	Other organization (construction firm)
PhD	8 (7 Faculty Member, 1 Teaching Ass.)	-
Master's	10 (9 Res. Ass., 1 Faculty Sec.)	8 (4 Architectures, 2 Engineers, 2 Experts)
Bachelor's	5 (2 Faculty/Institution Sec., 1 Res.Ass., 2 Officers)	31 (18 Architectures, 8 Engineers, 2 Lawyers, 4 Officers)
Upper secondary education	3 (1 nurse, 2 Officers)	2 (Acc./Law Off.)
High school	1 (Secretary)	1 (Accountant)
Total	27	43

Table 2

*Age Level*

Age range	University personnel	Other organization (construction firm)
1955-1960	-	1
1961-1965	-	3
1966-1970	2	3
1971-1975	2	1
1976-1980	3	8
1981-1985	7	7
1986-1990	7	16
1991-1995	6	4
Total	27	43

Table 3

*The Ones Working Within Culture They Belong to/Different Culture*

Working within the culture they belong to		Working within different culture	
University	Other organization	University	Other organization
12	20	15	23

In the research group, the numbers of university personnel working within the culture they belong to/different culture is distributed as 12/15; and the numbers in the other organization are found as 20/23. Additionally, the total number of the ones working within the culture they belong to is 32, and is 38 for the ones working within a different culture. In the group of the ones working within the culture they belong to, the culture employees belong to and work within is of Istanbul. In the group of the ones working within a different culture, the culture employees work within is of Istanbul. However the ones they belong to are abroad 2—1 France and 1 Romania; Black Sea Region 6—1 Tokat, 2 Giresun, 1 Trabzon, 1 Ordu, and 1 Kastamonu; Central Anatolian Region 4—1 Kayseri, 1 Sivas, 1 Kırıkkale, and 1 Ankara; Aegean Region 9—2 Manisa, 1 Kütahya, 1 Afyon, 1 Uşak, and 4 İzmir; Marmara Region 5—1 Kocaeli, 1 Bursa, 1 Çanakkale, 1 Balıkesir, and 1 Sakarya; Mediterranean Region 7—1 Antalya, 3 Hatay, 1 Kahramanmaraş, and 2 Adana; Southeastern Anatolia Region 2—1 Mardin and 1 Şanlıurfa; and Eastern Anatolia Region 3—1 Erzincan, 1 Kars, and 1 Van. In both organizations, balanced distribution of the data obtained with coincidental and voluntary participation is significant in terms of the evaluation of results. Asking only eight questions for five dimensions to participants led to restricted data in terms of generalizable research results or providing clear results regarding the dimensions. However, it should be noted that the employees wouldn't be able to invest more time. Therefore, instead of conduction longer interviews with less participants, short interviews with more participants were carried out.

The 1st question asked in the study was *“How do you communicate with family elders, statesmen, officers, and executives in the culture you belong to/different culture?”*, and accordingly, 15 participants stated they communicate easily; 11 participants stated that they don't communicate unless it's necessary; six participants stated that they communicate hardly. In other words, 15 participants out of 32 stated that they communicate with the persons representing power easily, and the remaining 17 stated that they communicate only when they need to or hardly. According to the answers given by the ones working within a different culture, 15 participants stated they have an easy communication; 10 of them stated they have communication only when they needed to; two of them stated they have communication hardly and part of 11 participants stated that they communicate with their families hardly, and other stated that they communicate with the holders of the power hardly.

The 2nd question asked was *“How is the hierarchy between employees in terms of inferior-superior positions in your organization?”*, and according to this question, two of the participants stated that the hierarchy was high (For example, everybody calls each other with the titles such as miss, mister, and esteemed); 25 of them stated that the hierarchy is as much as it should be (they call their superiors as miss, mister, and the ones with equal positions call them with their names); two of them stated that it's almost none (almost everyone calls each other with their names); and the remaining three participants stated that it's either high or as much as it should be in accordance with the superiority of the position they deal with. According to the answers given by the employees working within different culture, one participant stated that it's very high; 31 participants stated that it's as much as it should be; and six participants stated that it's almost non-existent.

In these two questions where it were tried to evaluate participants' opinions regarding power distance, first one questions the remarks about the power holders, while the second one questions the situation in their organization. It would be possible to suggest that the power distance is still great in national culture, while it's slightly less in the organizational one. In other words, the results of the research conducted in 1990 (by Hofstede) and the study didn't have conflicting results. However, the fact that almost all the employees are university graduates may be a reason why power distance is considered less especially in terms of organizational culture. From another point of view, it could be claimed that the previous research was conducted with the participants from X generation while the recent one was conducted with participants from Y generation, but the culture hasn't changed much despite many factors observed.

The 3rd and 4th questions in the study aim to collect information about the individualism culture. The 3rd question asked was *“How often do you see your family, neighbors, relatives in the culture you belong to/different culture?”*. According to this question, only 20 of the employees working within the culture they belong to answered as “I only see the closest people”; nine participants stated that they see them often and share everything, which is important and they like it; two participants stated that they don't see them unless it's really necessary (due to certain reasons such as wedding, holidays, and funerals). When the ones working within a different culture are considered, 21 participants stated that they only see the closes people; 11 participants stated that they see them often and they are happy about it; and six participants stated that they don't see them unless it's really necessary.

According to the data, there isn't a significant difference between the participants working within the culture they belong to and within a different culture. Twenty participants demonstrated a collectivist characteristic by stating that they often see their close or distant relatives/friends and that this is a necessity; the remaining participants (50 persons) demonstrated individualist characteristic by stating that they only see the

closest people in their lives or they don't see them unless they have to. The 4th question asked to participants was "*What's the way of communication and frequency between you and your co-workers?*", and according to the answers from the employees working within the culture they belong to, eight people only communicate within working hours, as much as they need to and that other employees have the same pattern; 20 participants stated that they and the other employees enjoy spending time together both at the work place and outside; and four participants stated that they don't see their co-workers except working hours but the others see each other more often. When the ones working within a different culture are considered, 23 participants like to see their co-workers any time; 12 participants see them when they need to and prefer seeing them at work; and three participants see them as much as needed but the other co-workers see each other often. According to these results, 43 participants see their co-workers often at work and outside; 20 participants only see their co-workers at work as much as needed; and seven participants stated that don't see their co-workers but others prefer to see each other at work and outside. In terms of this specific study, it could be possible to suggest that the employees are more individualistic within national culture and more collectivist within the organizational culture. When both questions are averaged, it could be indicated that the participants demonstrate a collectivist characteristic with a slight difference.

According to the score obtained by Hofstede regarding Individualism-Collectivism dimension, while Turkey demonstrates a collectivist society, it was seen in this study that there is an increase in individualistic behavior. As a reason to this difference, the fact that it's possible to state the culture changed in years in terms of the dimension, or the fact that the sampling was selected from a metropolis, Istanbul can be shown.

The 5th and 6th questions were regarding Femininity-Masculinity dimension, and the question was "*What are your ideas on ambition, career, power, and winning regarding you, your family, and other employees around you within the culture you belong/different culture*". According to the answers given, four of the participants working in the culture they belong to and the people around them with rare ambitious, have career goals, and prioritize power and winning; 17 participants mostly act with their emotions and work as much as they need to and would like to enjoy their lives to the fullest. Apart from these, three participants stated that they have the emotions such as ambition, career, power, and winning while most of the people around them act with their emotions; eight participants stated the opposite implying that they act with their emotions while the others around them have the emotions such as ambitions, career, power, and winning. On the other hand, 21 of the ones working in different culture and the people around them act with their emotions; 11 of them are ambition, career, power, and wiggling focused; one of them is ambitious and wants to win but the people around that employee act with their emotions; and five of them are the opposite and act with their emotions while the people around them are ambitious.

The 6th question asked was "*The tendency of you, your family, and other employees in the culture you belong to/different culture to live the life, enjoy it, or economize*", and according to answers, 14 of the participants working within the culture they belong to stated that they prefer saving and buying real estate; six of the participants stated that both they and the people around them like to travel and go on vacation frequently and to spend their incomes; eight of the participants stated that they prefer saving while the people around them use their income for entertainment and resting; and four of the participants stated that they prefer spending their incomes while the people around them are economizers. On the other hand, 17 of the participants working within different cultures stated that both they and the people around them like to save money; 12 of them stated that they and the people around them tend to spend their incomes on entertainments and resting. Four of the

remaining nine participants stated that they prefer saving while the people around them prefer spending; the other four participants stated that they prefer spending while the people around them prefer saving; and the last one participant stated that neither of the options match with his/her preferences and that he/she doesn't want to answer the question. When analyzed in total, 31 participants are economizers; 18 participants would like to have fun and spending; 12 of them prefer saving while the people around them prefer spending; and eight participants prefer spending while the people around them save.

When the average of both questions towards determining feminine-masculine cultures is analyzed, it's seen that the majority demonstrates the characteristics of a feminine culture. Regarding this dimension in which Hofstede also had similar results in his study, it would be possible to say that there were no different results and that similarly majority of the participant employees were showing feminine characteristics within the organizational culture as well.

The 7th question asked was "*How important are the economic, political, and social uncertainties within the culture you belong to/different culture for you and your co-workers?*", and according to answers, four participants stated that they and the people around them care about those aspects extremely and they perceive them as a threat; 22 participants stated that they and the people around them care; one participant stated that he/she doesn't care; one participant stated that he/she cares but the people around him/her perceive them as a threat; two participants stated that they perceive them as a threat and the other people around them care; one participant stated that he/she perceives it as a threat while the others don't care; and one participant stated that he/she doesn't care but the others perceive it as a threat. When the participants working within a different culture are considered, five participants perceive them as a threat together with the other people around them; 25 participants and the people around them care about them; two participants don't care about them; four participants care about them while the people around them perceive them as a threat; and one participant doesn't care while the people around the participant care. This question was asked to form an opinion about the uncertainty avoidance level of the employees, and the majority care about the uncertainties regarding economic, political, and social aspects while they don't perceive them as threats. For this dimension, the remarks of the ones working within the culture they belong to/different culture are very close to each other. According to Hofstede's study, uncertainty avoiding score was quite high, and however, in the explanations regarding the scores, it was indicated that Turkish society compensate their worries through faith and rituals instead of taking measures despite the fear of uncertainty. In this study, even though the level of caring about uncertainties, in other words, uncertainty avoidance was quite high, uncertainties don't make the participants perceive those aspects as threats. They don't think about taking action or taking measures by weathering the situation with expression such as destiny and fate or stating that it was the same in the past.

The 8th as the last question was "*Do you and the people around you prefer living with long-term plans or the moment within the culture you belong to/different culture?*", and according to answers, 22 of the participants working in the culture they belong to stated that they make long-term and detailed plans with alternatives; four of them stated that they and the others prefer living the moment; four of them stated that they make plans while the other live the moment; and one of them stated that he/she is indecisive about the answer. Twenty-seven of the participants working within different cultures stated that they make plans; three of them stated that they prefer living without plans; three of them stated that they make plans while the others live the moment; four of them stated that they live the moment while the others make plan; and one participant was again indecisive. According to these answers, in terms of long- or short-term orientation, majority of the

participant tend to have a long-term orientation, and in Hofstede's study, both tendencies are close by the scores. In other words, they tend to both adhere to traditions and want the change. It would be possible to interpret the results differing from Hofstede's study as the increasing desire for change.

Within the framework of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, it could be suggested that in terms of this study's focus (for sampling of Turkey), the employees have problems in communicating with organization's administrative levels when Power-Distance dimension is considered; that they tend to show collective behaviors although there are small changes in terms of Individualism-Collectivism dimension; that they show the characteristics of femininity due to the focus on emotions in terms of Femininity-Masculinity dimension; that they don't take any measures even though they are afraid of uncertainties in terms of Uncertainty-Avoidance dimension and tend to yield the changes in the world in terms of long- or short-term orientation.

### Conclusion

Culture which is necessary in order for the people to cohabit also has the power of sanction to force the ones objecting its rules to draw apart. The culture that is impossible to avoid due to this peremptory structure deserves to be analyzed both in terms of social life and business life. In this work conducted with this point of view, the impact of nationalist culture on organizational culture was discussed within the framework of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, and the findings obtained were interpreted as follows:

(1) Culture doesn't indicate a process that shows great changes in the short-term (despite all the developments in any field). This is a significant indicator of its impact on societies.

(2) Culture which is much dominant on communities has different values/beliefs in different societies. While global common characteristics and uniformity can be observed in terms of economy, trade, science, technology etc., it becomes harder to talk about a common or one culture (globally) when it comes to culture.

(3) Culture which has a low flexibility (although it differs from one society to another) has positive/negative impacts on organizational culture. This impact is mostly considered as cultural nonconformity.

In case of a cultural nonconformity, this might also reflect on productivity of work. However, further research will be needed to make more precise statements on this issue.

According to this study, although it's acceptable to move towards a belief that people can communicate easier and more successfully, neither reaching a certain assumption such as "when the employees work within the culture they belong to, the productivity of work would increase" would be possible after only this study, nor this would be realistic since globalizing economy necessitates globalized work force.

Therefore, instead of the struggle to make the process of working within the culture one belongs to possible, reflecting on collective productivity of different cultures and supporting cultural differences and communication would generate more solutions.

### References

- Adorno, T. W. (2013). *Kültür Endüstrisi Kültür Yönetimi*. J. M. Bernstein, (Ed.). N. Ülner, M. Tüzel, and E. Gen (Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Baltaş, A. (2011). *Türk Kültüründe Yönetmek Yerel Değerlerle Küresel Başarılar Kazanmak* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Barutçugil, İ. (2011). *Kültürler Arası Farklılıkların Yönetimi*. İstanbul: Kariyer Yayıncılık.
- Bauman, Z. (2015). *Bireyselleşmiş Toplum*. Y. Alagon (Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

- Bourse, M. (2009). *Melezliĝe Övgü*. I. Ergüden (Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Burke, P. (2011). *Kültürel Melezlik*. M. Topal (Trans.). İstanbul: Asur Yayınları.
- Eagleton, T. (2011). *Kültür Yorumları*. Özge Çelik (Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Fornaroli, C., & Jacobs, M. (2016). Building on the strengths of a multicultural workforce. *Echo Des Entreprises*.
- Giddens, A. (2008). *Modernliĝin Küreselleşmesi*. Küresel Dönüşümler Büyük Küreselleşme Tartışması, (Ed.). D. Held, A. McGrew, and M. C. Çelebi (Trans.). Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi.
- Giddens, A. (2012). *Sosyoloji* (1st ed.). İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (2008). *Küreselleşmeyi Yeniden Düşünmek*. Küresel Dönüşümler Büyük Küreselleşme Tartışması. D. Held & A. McGrew, (Ed.). M. C. Çelebi (Trans.). Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi.
- 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.  
<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/research.html> 22.08.2016  
<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/cultural-dimensions.html> 22.08.2016  
<https://www.geert-hofstede.com/national-culture.html> 24.08.2016  
<https://geert-hofstede.com/turkey.html> 23.08.2016  
<http://sosyolojisi.com/antropolojinin-yontemi-ve-arastirma-teknikleri/3048.html> 24.08.2016
- Kozlu, C. (2014). *Kurumsal Kültür ABD, Japonya ve Türkiye’de Başarılı Şirket Yönetimleri* (4th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Köse, A. (2008). Küreselleşme Çağında Bir Aidiyet Zemini ve Örgütlenme Şekli Olarak Hemşehrilik. *Akademik İncelemeler*, 3(1), 225.
- Nişancı, Z. N. (2012). Toplumsal Kültür-Örgüt Kültürü İlişkisi ve Yönetim Üzerine Yansımaları. *Journal of Sciences*, 1(1), 1279.
- Öğüt, A., & Kocabacak, A. (2007). Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türk İş Kültüründe Yaşanan Dönüşümün Boyutları. *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 150-151.
- Özkuş, O. (2013). *Kültür ve Küreselleşme*. İstanbul: Açılım Kitap Pınar Yayınları.
- Sargut, A. S. (2010). *Kültürlerarası Farklılaşma ve Yönetim* (3rd ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Seyidođlu, H. (2003). *Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yazma El Kitabı* (9th ed.). İstanbul: Güzem Can Yayınları.
- Smith, A. D. (2008). *Küresel Bir Kültüre Doğru mu?* Küresel Dönüşümler Büyük Küreselleşme Tartışması, (Ed.). D. Held, A. McGrew, and M. C. Çelebi (Trans.). Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi.
- Smith, J. (2016). Country of interest: China, Home country: United States, Your role: Student studying abroad. The Hofstede Center. <https://www.geert-hofstede.com/> 23.08.2016
- Tomlinson, J. (2004). *Küreselleşme ve Kültür*. A. Eker (Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Ülgen, H., & Mirze, S. K. (2004). *İşletmelerde Stratejik Yönetim*. İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları.
- Vural, Z. B. A. (2012). *Kurum Kültürü ve Örgütsel İletişim* (4th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.