HOFSTEDE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND HSE CULTURE BEHAVIOR

Khadijeh Izadi Zamanabadi
Department of Environment management, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Esmail Kavousy (Ph.D.)
Department of Management, Tehran Shomali Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Mahnaz Mirza Ebrahim Tehrani (Ph.D.)
Department of Management, Tehran Shomali Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract
This study has done to surveying the relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and HSE culture behavior. Populations were 25 people of cultural management and planning elites. For a sampling it was used of simple sampling method. For gathering data in theoretic section we used library and also interview with scholars and specialists of the organization and in data gathering section we used questionnaire method. In this research, In order to determine the validity of data collection we used Cronbach's alpha to test the validity of the formal symbol or reliability. To analyze hypotheses, we have used descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Findings show that there is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Power distance, Individualism–collectivism, Masculinity–femininity, Uncertainty avoidance, Long-term orientation) and HSE culture behavior.
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INTERDICTION
Culture can be best understood as "the way we do things around here". Culture forms are the context within which people judge the appropriateness of their behavior. An organization's culture will influence human behavior and human performance at work. Poor safety culture has contributed too many major incidents and personal injuries. An organization's culture can have as big an influence on safety outcomes as the safety management system. 'Safety culture' is a subset of the overall organizational or company culture. Many companies talk about 'safety culture' when referring to the inclination of their employees to comply with rules or act safely or unsafely. However we find that the culture and style of management is
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even more significant, for example a natural, unconscious bias for production over safety, or a tendency to focus on the short-term and being highly reactive. Success normally comes from good leadership, good worker involvement and good communications (Yule, 2003).

Safety culture is the ways in which safety is managed in the workplace, and often reflects "the attitudes, beliefs, perceptions and values that employees share in relation to safety" (Cox & Cox, 1991). In other words, "the way we do safety around here" (ZCBI, 1991)

The Chernobyl disaster highlighted the importance of safety culture and the impact of managerial and human factors on the outcome of safety performance (Flin, Mearns, O’Conner, & Bryden, 2000). The term ‘safety culture’ was first used in INSAG’s (1988) ‘Summary Report on the Post-Accident Review Meeting on the Chernobyl Accident’ where safety culture was described as: "That assembly of characteristics and attitudes in organizations and individuals which establishes that, as an overriding priority, nuclear plant safety issues receive the attention warranted by their significance."

Since then, a number of definitions of safety culture have been published. The U.K. Health and Safety Commission developed one of the most commonly used definitions of safety culture: "The product of individual and group values, attitudes, perceptions, competencies, and patterns of behavior that determine the commitment to, and the style and proficiency of, an organization’s health and safety management" (HSC, 1993). "Organizations with a positive safety culture are characterized by communications founded on mutual trust, by shared perceptions of the importance of safety and by confidence in the efficacy of preventive measures."

Since the 1980s there has been a large amount of research into safety culture. However the concept remains largely will define (Guldenmund, 2000). Within the literature there are a number of varying definitions of safety culture with arguments for and against the concept. The above-mentioned definitions, from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and UK Health and Safety Commission (HSC), are two of the most prominent and most-commonly used definitions (Yule, 2003). However, there are some common characteristics shared by other definitions. Some characteristics associated with safety culture include the incorporation of beliefs, values and attitudes. A critical feature of safety culture is that it is shared by a group (Glendon, et al, 2006; Pidgeon. & O’Leary, 2000).

Culture is central to the way we view, experience, and engage with all aspects of our lives and the world around us. Thus, even our definitions of culture are shaped by the historical, political, social, and cultural contexts in which we live (Sorrells, 2013).

Several scholars discuss the choice of dimensions most appropriate for conceptualizing and operationalizing culture. However, Hofstede’s framework is the most widely used national cultural framework in psychology, sociology, marketing, or management studies. Hofstede used 116,000 questionnaires from over 60,000 respondents in seventy countries in his empirical study (Hofstede, 2001). He created five dimensions, assigned indexes on each to all nations, and linked the dimensions with demographic, geographic, economic, and political aspects of a society, a feature unmatched by other frameworks. It is the most comprehensive and robust in terms of the number of national cultures samples (Smith et al., 1996). Moreover, the framework is useful in formulating hypotheses for comparative cross-cultural studies. Consequently, Hofstede’s operationalization of cultures (1984) is the norm used in international marketing studies, compares Hofstede’s dimensions to other approaches for unpacking the concept of culture. It shows a high level of convergence across approaches, supports the theoretical relevance of Hofstede’s framework, and justifies further use of his dimensions.
1-Individualism–collectivism: Individualism–collectivism describes the relationships individuals have in each culture. In individualistic societies, individuals look after themselves and their immediate family only whereas in collectivistic cultures, individuals belong to groups that look after them in exchange for loyalty.

2-Uncertainty avoidance: Uncertainty avoidance refers to “The extent to which people feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid these situations” (Hofstede, 1991: 113). This dimension deals with the need for well-defined rules for prescribed behavior.

3-Power distance: This dimension reflects the consequences of power inequality and authority relations in society. It influences hierarchy and dependence relationships in the family and organizational contexts.

4-Masculinity–femininity: Dominant values in masculine countries are achievement and success and in feminine countries are caring for others and quality of life.

4-Long-term orientation: Long-term orientation “stands for the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift” (Hofstede, 2001: 359). A late addition to the initial four (Bond, 1987), this dimension represents a range of Confucian like values and was termed Confucian Dynamism. Hofstede (1991) later proposed the long-versus short-term designation as more appropriate for this dimension.

METHODOLOGY

This study has done to surveying the relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture behavior according to HSE model. Populations were 25 people of cultural management and planning elites. For a sampling it was used of simple sampling method.

For gathering data in theoretic section we used library and also interview with scholars and specialists of the organization and in data gathering section we used questionnaire method.

In this research, In order to determine the validity of data collection we used Cronbach's alpha to test the validity of the formal symbol or reliability. The method is based on a pilot study of 30 employees, the reliability of Hofstede's cultural dimensions 0.74 and 0.88 for culture behavior.

To analyze the data and test hypotheses by using SPSS software version 20 using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and etc.) and inferential statistics (the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, Pearson correlation and regression multiple) were used.

RESULTS

In this paper we have one main hypothesis. The statistical way of analysis of hypotheses is two ways, H₁ is acceptance of hypothesis and H₀ is rejecting of hypothesis. In other words, it means that H₁ has positive meaning and H₀ has negative meaning.

Hypothesis 1: There is relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture behavior according to HSE model.

- Null: There is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture behavior according to HSE model.
- Alternate: There is relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture behavior according to HSE model.
In multivariable regression equation to determine the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and the weight of each variable (Beta), a collection of independent variables enter in the equation. Moreover, in order to determine the contribution of each variable in the dependent variable multivariate regression model was used to explain it.

Table 1: regression analysis to predict Hofstede's cultural dimensions on the culture behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism–collectivism</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity–femininity</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term orientation</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>1.427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table (1) shown there is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture behavior according to HSE model.

CONCLUSION

This study has done to surveying the relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and culture behavior according to HSE model. Populations were 25 peoples of cultural management and planning elites. So, we developed one main hypothesis and analyze regression multiple.

According to table (1) Standardized Coefficients for Power distance is .302 and the t-value is 0.555 and Sig. is .585 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H₀ and reject alternate hypothesis; the Standardized Coefficients for Individualism–collectivism dimension is .006 and the t-value is 0.013 and Sig. 0.99 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H₀ and reject alternate hypothesis; Standardized Coefficients for Masculinity–femininity dimension is .327 and the t-value is -0.1 and Sig. 0.99 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H₀ and reject alternate hypothesis; Standardized Coefficients for Uncertainty avoidance dimension is .286 and the t-value is 1.313 and Sig. 0.205 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H₀ and reject alternate hypothesis; and Also, Standardized Coefficients for Long-term orientation dimension is .513 and the t-value is 1.427 and Sig. 0.17 that is bigger than 95 percent confidence level. So, we can confirm H₀ and reject alternate hypothesis

Findings show that there is not relationship between Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Power distance, Individualism–collectivism, Masculinity–femininity, Uncertainty avoidance, Long-term orientation) and culture behavior according to HSE model.
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