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Executive summary

This paper examines how a Norwegian manager in Spain experiences the cultural differences, whether adapting to the Spanish culture or facing cultural collisions. Further the paper seeks to establish whether the findings of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner can be used in developing successful expatriation programs to avoid the problems caused by cultural differences.

A tentative research model is introduced based on theoretical findings and their representation to the specific setting of Norway and Spain, which draws on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s dimensions and on issues of patterns of corporate culture and gender differentiation.

The above mentioned model was the basis for an interview guide, designed to answer the two research questions. 6 Norwegian managers with primarily Spanish subordinates were interviewed.

The interviews revealed much convergence between the expatriates’ experiences and the findings of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, yet only some of the differences proved problematic in their professional lives.

The conclusion of the study is that with careful consideration and looking for specific issues, one could use Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s dimensions as tools, along with many other instruments to predict and understand future behavior of Norwegian sojourners in Spain.
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This chapter constitutes the point of departure for the whole thesis. Two research questions will be formulated and the ways this thesis will try to answer them will also be presented in brief.

One of the main assertions that Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2002) make in their widely appreciated book\textsuperscript{1} is that, while the “classic” writers (Taylor, Fayol, Drucker) of the organizational theory gave the impression of the existence of a “one best way to organize”, there is actually no best way of organizing and no always right formulas that can be used in overseas areas. Looking to find the most effective method of management and organization, the organizational theories developed (mostly) in United States, largely overlooked the national culture issue\textsuperscript{2}.

We are all belonging to a certain national culture and we all have developed a certain cultural framework. Browsing through the various definitions of it, one will find that culture is the way in which a group of people solves problems and reconciles dilemmas (Schein, 1985\textsuperscript{3}) and it is acquired by each of us through social interaction with others.

It is, as well, the context in which things happen and it is certain that we are a part of one. While we interact with persons from other cultures we notice that there are differences in the way we solve problems, and it is obvious that they do not stem only from the physical distance between countries. These cultural differences are the basis for many issues regarding coherent management across countries and, due to their importance and possible consequences they have to be carefully deemed by any manager contemplating a cross cultural situation.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2002) have based their research on culture on theoretically derived bipolar dimensions. They have found and interpreted patterns of answers to existential questions at the national level.

While the other major theoretical development in the field (Hofstede 1980, 2001) has looked at the national cultures on a series of bipolar dimensions as well, recent concerns (Gooderham and Nordhaug 2003, Hodgetts and Luthans 2000) regarding the changes in
national cultures registered in the last thirty years since Hofstede’s research was published, have led to the employment of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner dimensions in this paper. Another reason was that Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner have also extended their search by examining corporate cultures by nationality, a move which is very close to the object of this study.

The dimensions provided are based on the specific answers each culture finds to various problems: attitudes toward time and environment and relationships with other people.

The encounter in a business setting of people representing two interesting cultures, mostly having an opposing, or at least different answer to the set of cultural dimensions provided by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, will provide valuable insights on how to deal with large cultural differences in solving problems. Will a Norwegian manager in Spain adapt to the local culture? Will it be possible for he / she to disseminate own beliefs and way of working? Will the two cultures collide? And if so, could Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s cultural dimensions be used to reconcile and solve crises?

These dimensions are, to a large extent, theoretically derived from Talcott Parsons’ work and refer mainly to national cultures. Another interesting issue to look upon throughout this paper is whether specific (organizational or professional) business settings provide other solutions or make the dimensions ineffective. The scope here is not to generalize, but to find specific issues and solutions that might enrich the field and might help create programs for successful expatriations.

Hence, the following research questions constitute the object of this study:

a. Could Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings and other related theoretical developments be used to develop a successful expatriation program for Norwegian managers relocating to Spain?

b. Were there any other factors that affected the working experience of Norwegian managers in Spain which were not encompassed by the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner research?

In assessing whether Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings could be used to develop a successful expatriation program, one would have to start by investigating the evidence of
existing Norwegian managers working in Spain and examine if their behavior is somehow on the same direction as indicated by the theoretical findings or it deviates from them.

Building on the existing literature regarding organizational and professional culture (Hofstede\textsuperscript{4} 1980, 2001, Johns\textsuperscript{5} 2004, Trompenaars and Woolliams\textsuperscript{6} 2003) this paper looks as well to identify, if appropriate, new elements on top of the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings that might prove useful to the development of expatriation programs. Gooderham and Nordhaug’s (2001) discussion over the change in the political system in Europe and the increased exposure to the influence of globalization also provides an interesting perspective of the matter. All this is applied to a specific setting, Norwegian managers’ work experience in Spain.

This thesis is structured on a case study approach (consistent with Yin\textsuperscript{7}, 1993 propositions) and ensues through the following sections:

- Starts with the review of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner dimensions and findings and continues with the introduction of organizational and professional culture elements. A discussion of the national patterns of corporate culture and those of professional culture is also realized, and the differences and resemblances between Spain and Norway are noted.

- Drawing on the general theoretical considerations presented, a model is built in Chapter 3. This tentative research model is the foundation of all future discussion and analysis.

- The research design and the context of the research are reviewed in Chapter 4. Consequently, the interview guide is created. The tools used in the data collection process and the explanation of how data collected will be analyzed forms the second part of this chapter.

- Chapter 5 introduces the data that were collected during the interview process and discusses the findings.

- Based on the original model, Chapter 6 analyses the findings and shows how, actually, Norwegians have had to adjust their management style towards Spanish
subordinates. It examines the changes of the original model and introduces an adjusted (to the Spanish reality) model.

- The 7th Chapter discusses the implications of the adjusted model, limitations of this case study, and makes few propositions for future research.
Chapter 2 Theoretical review

This chapter starts by reviewing the most important theoretical considerations regarding cross-cultural differences, and continues by introducing, based on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings, the key dimensions found to provide different answers across cultures. After a brief presentation of them and their meaning, the discussion of national patterns of corporate cultures will provide more depth to the culture issue, while the matter of culture change will be discussed in the end of this chapter.

2.1 Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings

In their chase to find the best and the most effective ways of managing and organizing, the organizational theories developed in the 1970s looked at the environment, but overlooked the effects of national culture. Starting with Taylor’s scientific management and Webber’s bureaucracy, and continuing with organizational (such as TQM, MBO, BPR, flat hierarchy) and motivational theories (Maslow’s, Alderfer’s, etc.) thought of as generally applicable to any organization, they all seek to offer one best way of organizing. Even when including the environment in their spectrum these theories failed to consider the national cultures as an important element in the success of an organization. It was Talcott Parsons⁸ who stated that organizations have to adapt not only to the environment, but also to employees’ perceptions.

Culture refers to the system of shared meaning (artifacts, norms, values and assumptions) by the members of a group, shared meaning which distinguishes these members from the ones of other groups. In order to receive the correct message people must be able to process the information they receive in common ways. Hence, finding common ways of processing information among the people interacting is the purpose of all social interactions or meaningful communications. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2002) state that one culture can be distinguished from another by the arrangements of the specific solutions it selects for each set of problem situations.

Trompenaars’ argues that the symbols that we observe trigger some expectations, and it is when the expectations of whom we are communicating with, meet our own, that there is a
mutuality of meaning: “What I expect depends on where I am coming from and the meanings I give to what I experience”.

It is important to note how the general set of beliefs and values forms. As individuals, although we are belonging to a culture, we still do not have identical sets of values, beliefs, expectations and goals, but rather within a nation there is a wide spread of them. However, Trompenaars recons, as the answers cultures give to general human questions are always deeply rooted into their environments and their specificity; this spread has a pattern around an average and what we perceive as characteristics of a nation, it is actually “the most predictable behavior”.

Cultural dilemmas need to be reconciled in a process of understanding the advantages of each cultural preference.

In the same way that people have variations in meanings for different cultures, so organizations have different meanings for the people working in them. Different meanings lead to different, specific solutions to certain problems.

All these differences discussed between cultures are based on assumptions, on observations and on perceived patterns. These patterns, founded in general on notions such as attitudes to time, to environment, relationships with other people, human nature and activity, are interrelated. Although the theoretical developments of the last decades introduced many directions and divagations, the following scheme (Figure 2.1) presents the most widely agreed upon proceedings in this field. It can be observed that, although these dimensions have been derived either through direct observation (such as Hofstede’s) or using other theoretical developments (Trompenaars’ case), nature, people and time, as well as relationships with each of them are present, in a more or less similar form, in all researches.
All the dimensions stem from culture’s definition as shared solutions to existential problems. Managing relationships with the environment include assumptions regarding control and uncertainty, or the nature of human activity. Managing relationships with other people include assumptions about task orientation or relationships, about hierarchy and authority. Nordic and Anglo-Saxons are more task-oriented and realistic in their approach. Their activity is linear, following a logical thinking. Latin and Arabic cultures are relationship-oriented, intuitive in decision making, and emotionally expressive. The Asians tend to be affective and highly sensitive, while valuing harmony and avoiding confrontations. These patterns have made Lewis propose three dimensions of culture: linear active (Nordic and Anglo-Saxons), multi-active (Latin and Arabic cultures) and reactive (Asians are characterized, at large, by the reactive dimension).
These patterns are not mutually exclusive and actually represent extremes along which different cultures can be placed\textsuperscript{10}. They can be used to discuss the strength and weaknesses, competencies of the cultural prototypes without getting distracted by the “most predictable behavior” of persons belonging to a nation in the eyes of a foreign national, expectations also known as stereotypes. Stereotypes are widespread beliefs, notions about persons in a certain category, with no distinction made among individuals\textsuperscript{11}. They actually reflect the mindset of the ones judging and not of the ones being judged. They are usually based on bits of truth about the ones being judged, but these bits vary very much, and, they are, at best, half truths (Hofstede, 2001). What is for sure not correct is the application of stereotypes from a nation level to an individual level.

However, it is almost impossible not to perform a value judgment via our own set of norms when interacting with other cultures. In this case, the cultural relativism notion should be reinforced, and one culture has to suspend judgment when dealing with other cultures different from one’s own. Information about the nature of cultural differences between societies, their roots and consequences should precede any form of judgment and action.

According to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2002), there are three levels of culture: national, corporate and professional. Focusing more on the national level, the basis of cultural differences is considered to be the way each culture finds specific solutions to certain problems and dilemmas.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner argue that the problems between various cultures may appear from the answers they give to three categories of existential dilemmas:

1. Problems generated by our relationships with other people. These constructs are theoretically based, derived from Talcott Parsons’ five orientations covering the ways in which human beings deal with each other. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s dimensions on the relationships with other people category are:
   a) universalism vs. particularism
   b) individualism vs. communitarianism
   c) neutral vs. emotional
   d) specific vs. diffuse
   e) achievement vs. ascription

2. Attitudes to time
3. Attitudes to environment

In essence, as understanding and explaining a culture is a very difficult process, studying each country would require too many resources and would be potentially flawed, as each individual is unique. Hence, comparing the countries in relation to one another, and using the average national values on few dimensions looked more appealing to researchers (Hofstede 2001, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner 2002). Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner administered 30000 questionnaires to managers and administrative staff in two stages, during 1980s and 1990s. There were twenty-eight countries covered.

Based on these bipolar dimensions mentioned above, each country is regarded as exhibiting a more or less adherence to a dimension than another country. Being familiar with and understanding these differences before an intercultural encounter, guides a sojourner with regard to what to expect and how behave to succeed in the new environment.

**Universalism versus particularism** dimension can be practically translated into a rules versus relationships construct. For a universalistic person it is important to always follow the rules and respect the contracts. Individual circumstances do not matter, at least in a first stage, and can not represent a reason to bend the rules. However, universalism is rarely used to the exclusion of particularism, and actually forms the first principle in the process of moral reasoning. On the other hand, persons belonging to the particularistic countries facing the same dilemma, tend to help their friend, even if this means that they will break the rules. As relationships are very important, particularists are more likely to help their friend as the seriousness of the situation increases, contrary to the universalistic approach, where people feel stronger that rules should be obeyed as the seriousness of the crime increases.

Having 75% of the Spanish that were interviewed opting for a universalistic system, Spain differs considerably compared with the Nordic Countries and the UK. These ones have an almost total universalistic approach and tend to regard a particularistic attitude as corrupt.

There are profound managerial implications of these cultural differences and one of most emphasized is the pay-for-performance system, which works very well in a universalistic culture, but do not function and may actually lead to more problems in a particularistic culture. Another implication is the prevalence of contracts and their tight conditions, which is seen as de facto by the universalists, while the mass of particularists consider that the contracts are implying that one the of the parts might be cheating. The latter also see that
contracts may bound a relationship, by not allowing it to evolve beyond the written conditions.

The head office in a universalistic country tend to run by its own all the global tasks, including marketing, human resources and do not allow strategic decisions to be taken by subsidiaries. However, when the subsidiaries are in particularistic countries, the head office finds is difficult to control and run the operations without accepting the involvement of the local office.

**Communitarianism versus individualism** (or the group versus the individual) refers to the conflict between what each of us wants as an individual and how this corroborate with the interests of the group we belong to. In communitarianism cultures, people regard themselves as belonging to a group and do not look to distinguish themselves from the other members. In individualistic cultures people like to be singled out and recognized for their achievements, while promotions and pay-for-performance systems are based upon these achievements. Generally, individualism is regarded as the characteristic of the modern society, while the communitarianism is seen as representative of a more traditional societies and former communist states (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner). As well, these dimensions are seen as complementary, not opposing, preferences. The most appropriate example of this is the one of France, where people are communitarian when it comes to other French people, but individualists with regard to social encounters with the rest of the world.

The Spanish (63% of them) tend to place the responsibility more on individual shoulders, while only 54% of the Norwegians opt for individual freedom. Collaborative attitude is a characteristic of the Norwegian work environment and managers are expecting their employees to discuss and actively influence the decision making process.

Individualistic cultures rely on individuals’ decision when it comes to representation issues, while organizations of the communitarianism cultures use plural representation and often prefer to confide to their headquarters to make a decision. The communitarians opt to take time in the decision making process and reach a consensus, which usually leads to smooth implementation phases, while the individualists opt for saving time in the decision making process and may run into problems during implementation.
Organizations are seen by the individualistic cultures as instruments to serve individual owners, employees and customers, while the authority stems from individual’s skills at performing a certain task. In communitarianism, growth and prosperity are valuable ends by themselves and not the prize of the individuals.

**Neutral versus emotional** dimension, or the range of feelings expressed, is represented by how much emotion is considered to be appropriate to show in various social settings. Neutral cultures are not necessarily cold or do not have emotions, but actually, due to a large extent to social conventions, they choose not express them openly. The acceptable level of expressed emotions, vehemence, intensity, anger, delight varies greatly from country to country. While the Americans are on the expressive side, exhibiting emotions but separating them from work, the Norwegians are not at all very open and eager to display them, and the Spanish tend to exhibit, and not to separate emotions.

Even in verbal and nonverbal communications there are very large differences. The Anglo-Saxons express their understanding and agreement with the speaker by letting him finish the sentence, while the Latins will frequently interrupt to show their interest. While interrupting is impolite in Anglo-Saxon cultures, not doing so actually signals lack of interest in the subject matter to a Latin. Eye-contact and personal space are also different from culture to culture. The Northern Europeans confirm interest by establishing eye-contact, but the Southern Europeans stare much longer to confirm interest.

Only 19% of the Spanish are not in favor of expressing their feelings at work. On the other hand, 39% of the Norwegians would not show emotions at work.

**Diffuse versus specific** (the range of involvement) relates to how much distinction is made between work and private life. The diffuse cultures are characterized by the mélange of work and private life. A boss is boss even outside work and consequently his authority extends into many other areas. In the specific cultures’ case the authority does not translate outside work setting. Private life is completely separated from work and does not even have to be related with the work setting. Specific cultures have considerable freedom for free speech and interactions with the diffuse counterparts could be potentially creating tensions, especially when losing face principle is broken. This principle refers to situations in which something that is considered as private it is made public, producing to the inferred person a
great loss. Although public criticism and similar situations of losing face should only concern work issues (as considered by specific cultures) they are taken very personal.

Specific and diffuse cultures are also called low and high context cultures. Context relates to how much you have to know before effective communication can occur, how much knowledge it is implied and shared. High context cultures are rich in meanings and subtle and much of the intended information to be disseminated it is transmitted by tacit mutual understanding. The low context cultures tend to be easily adaptable and flexible and function much on the principle “what you see is what you get”.

One of the diffuseness indicators used by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner refers to how much the company should involve in the life of its employees, and it found that 77% of the Norwegians do not find it appropriate that the company should provide housing for its employees, while only 19% of the Spanish are thinking the same.

**Achievement versus ascription** refers to how status is accorded, which principles are used to this end. In some cultures status is awarded based on characteristics such as age, social connections, family background, gender, education, profession. This type of status is known as ascribed status. When based on principles such as education and profession, ascribed status makes more sense from the business point of view, while status awarded due to social connections, gender and family background does not. Overall, it appears that the nations which ascribe status to persons and sectors are doing it so that they will receive special attention and encouragement to drive them to better performance. Achievement oriented cultures accord status based solely on person’s achievements, on experience, and are directly connected to business success. While achievement cultures assign the status after the success has taken place, the ascription cultures assign it before any success has taken place.

When thinking of the international business context, specifically, in negotiations between achievement and ascription cultures, the translator plays a very different role. For the achievement countries, the translator’s main duty is to offer an accurate and unbiased translation. For the countries where status is ascribed, the translator is effectively a member of the negotiation team, not only he is an interpreter, but also his job is to evaluate behavior, gestures, meanings, and to even make recommendations.
In Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner survey, the Norwegians believe to a great extent (77%) that things should be done even at the expense of personal freedom to live as you feel you should. Norway is, without a doubt a culture where status is achieved (shown also by the answers to a second question where 94% disagree that respect should depend on family background). On the other extreme, the Spanish (only 14%) favor “getting things done”, but 82% of them disagree that status should depend on family background.

**Attitudes to time** category concerns some kind of shared expectations about time and its importance for the business setting stems from the need to coordinate the business activities. When a culture views time as a series of passing events without having too much connection to each other, it is said to have a sequential attitude towards time. On the other hand, when past, present and future are interconnected and the present is shaped by ideas about the future and memories, the culture has a synchronic time orientation. How we think of time is interrelated with how we plan, create strategies, and co-ordinate activities. The time horizon criterion splits the people in the ones who have a short time horizon and the others who have a long time horizon.

The cultures characterized by a sequential time horizon see relationships as more instrumental, and the authority of the individual will depend upon his/her latest achievement, but can be easily challenged, especially as time passes. Promotions are awarded based on latest results, and the relationships one has with the management are unimportant.

Cultures with a synchronic time horizon are more communitarian and more particularist at valuing people. The authority stems more from ascription based on passed qualifications, age, class, gender and it is more durable. Promotions are based on evaluations over long periods of time, and can be awarded based on relationships developed with the management (seeing the relationship as developing over time) and even if the respective person did not have great achievements over the last period.

An interesting discussion is that of the efficiency (which characterize the sequential cultures) over the effectiveness (which characterize the synchronic cultures). The first looks at how to do better as soon as possible, while the latter values developing more lasting relationships.
Norwegians have a longer time horizon (4.56 years) than the Spanish (4.42 years). However, they are both in the area of 4.5 years and the differences on this perspective are not very significant.

**Attitudes to environment** relates to the role people assign to their natural environment. As mentioned before, nations’ basic answers to primordial dilemmas concerning survival has constituted the basis for different answers and consequently cultural differences between people. The two major directions considered by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner have been related to how people react towards nature: on one hand, control it and impose your will upon it, or, on the other hand, act with the environment, be a part of it and go along with its laws, direction and forces. We inner-direct when we control our fate and we accept outer-direct logic when we consider that others can influence our fate. Half of the interviewed Spanish believe that it is worth trying to control the nature, while 43% of the Norwegians agree with the statement. The controlling dimension took a different perspective when it became more personal, with control over own fate being completely internalized: this time 86% of the Norwegians believe that what is happening to them is their own doing, and 76% of the Spanish agree with the same proposition.

There is an important difference, in a business setting where inner and outer-directed cultures collide, which appears when outer-directed persons are required to behave in an inner-directed way. This difference stems from the fact that, although it looks like the outer-directed people accept guidance from outside, when this guidance threatens their equilibrium, they do not really internalize it or even use it successfully.

Another issue concerning the inner-directed cultures is the extension of the view of controlling nature to relationships with others. As Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner put it: “everyone else may come to stand for nature”, and modern management may become a battle between private agendas.

Even the feedback they get to various problems generates different directions for the two types of cultures. The inner-directed one sees the feedback as a mean to maintain the original direction, while the outer-directed culture perceives it as an expression of an eventual necessity to change the direction.
The pattern of Spanish national culture leads to a strong orientation toward rules and deference to leadership\textsuperscript{12}. Group harmony as validation of the individual is a strong value inhibiting open disagreement and generative conflict. Leaders play a central role in structuring norms that support both the collective identity of the group and task accomplishment, create task designs that value interdependence, and look to balance the need for saving face with open discussions and productive disagreements. Initially, these issues can be constructively resolved through informal networks.

2.2 Hofstede’s work

The other major theoretical development in studying national cultures and their differences is Hofstede’s work developed on IBM employers between 1967 and 1973. In his research, he has also proposed bipolar dimensions, but they were derived empirically. He proposed four value dimensions that were not intended to describe individuals, but national norms: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism – Collectivism and Masculinity – Femininity. Hofstede later (1986) identified another dimension, to the satisfaction of criticism that was arguing that four dimensions are just inadequate to convey cultural differences\textsuperscript{13}: Long term versus Short term orientation.

When discussing Hofstede’s dimensions, the question that surface in this paper is why choosing Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s study over the former.

First of all, the two researches supplement each other, and for the most part explore very different cultural dimensions; hence, the choice can not be reduced to choosing one over another. However, Trompenaars’ dimensions are, as well, complemented by an inclusion of the national patterns of corporate culture, which concords with this paper’s goal.

Unlike Hofstede’s categories, which were mutually exclusive, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s do not perceive culture as being static on a dual axis map. This way, one cultural category does not mutually exclude its opposite.

Another reason is that, whilst Hofstede’s study has been drawn from a single company, Trompenaars’ provide a more representative sample.
As well, few researchers (Hill 2000, Hodgetts and Luthans 2000, Gooderham and Nordhaug 2003) have compared the dimensions proposed by Hofstede, on one hand and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, on the other hand. While, as mentioned, the general accord is that the researches supplement each other, there is one dimension on which the research is similar: Communitarianism versus Individualism (in Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s research) and Individualism versus Collectivism (in Hofstede’s research). Although there is a large consistency in the classification of countries on both researches, some of these countries are particularly interesting as they are more individualistic on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner study than on Hofstede’s. One of these cases regards Spain, which appears more individualistic in Trompenaars’ case. This is the result, according to Hodgetts and Luthans (2000), of a change that took place as a result of the different time frames of the studies. This evolutionary note of Spain might have been generated by the political and economic changes these countries have been facing in the last thirty years or so, i.e. the integration to the European Union standards and adherence to varied, if not different, values.

2.3 National patterns of corporate cultures

Organizational and professional theories discuss the socialization process (Van Maanen and Schein 1979, Johns 1996), which describes the stages that people go through to learn the norms and roles that are necessary to fulfill their duties in a group or organization. They follow many phases: anticipative socialization, accommodation, and role management. Extrapolating to an international setting, the same stages must be accomplished by an expatriate manager too. In the anticipative stage, a future expatriate manager looks to gain insights on the new job, to figure out his/her main impressions and expectations of the new place. As, in normal circumstances, he/she has been with the company prior to the current assignment, this experience ensures to a certain extent that the anticipative socialization has started before the expatriation process, and he/she has been enriched by eventual pre-assignment cultural training. Right about this stage, the expatriate perceives and understands that there are differences he/she needs to overcome.

In the accommodation stage, the expatriate dives deep into the new reality. His/her values and expectations meet the ones of the locals. The sojourner must assume differences until similarity is proven, empathise, and recognise his or her own cultural biases. Formal and
informal aspects of this stage could include company orientation and job rotation, interaction with subordinates and with managers.

If the accommodation process has been successful, the sojourner has adjusted to the extent that he/she can begin a so called role management process. Although the accommodation process might have succeeded just partially, the expatriate feels confident to adjust and improve his/her task. However, cross-cultural issues will still be a concern, if the two cultures colliding differ in the way they answer specific questions.

**Figure 2.2  The socialization process in a cross-cultural setting**

While passing through all the stages, a sojourner inevitably compares different ways and meanings with his/her own, and the cultural filter to a great extent influence his/her reactions and behavior (Figure 2.2). This cultural filter refers to the different meanings communication items have for each of the participant to the interaction process. The implicit and explicit transmitted message is received through a process of screening by the recipient, and the received and inferred message, consequently may differ greatly with the original message. It can be argued that the problems sparked by the interactions and the cultural filter may dilute in their extent from one stage to another, influenced by a culture learning process. It does not really matter whether this process has been accomplished through pre-assignment training or direct contact, as long as it led to the understanding that there may be various answers to dimensions such us relationships with other people, attitudes to time and to environment.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner also discussed the national patterns of corporate culture and tried to show how differences between national cultures helped determine the type of corporate culture chosen\(^\text{15}\). Corporations’ structure is influenced by various cultural dimensions, as the impact of culture on management is multidimensional. Managers need to
recognize that the relationships between cultural dimensions and structure are not simple cause-effect links, but instead, are multi-determined (Schneider and Barsoux\textsuperscript{16}, 2003: 101). Similar approaches may exist for different cultural reasons, and different approaches may exist for the same reason.

The question to ask when examining organizations (in different countries) that are remarkably uniform by major criteria (number of functions, levels of hierarchy, etc.) is not “how many levels two organizations have” but “what those levels and that hierarchy mean to the two nationalities”.

They argue that the corporate culture is influenced by three aspects of organizational structures:

⇒ the general relationship between employees and organization
⇒ the hierarchical system of authority
⇒ the general views of employees about organization’s role and goals

If each of the dimensions employed in the previous national culture categories were bipolar, in establishing the patterns of corporate cultures two dimensions have been used (each being bipolar). Hence, there are four quadrants to distinguish different corporate cultures, generated by the following dimensions:

- equality – hierarchy
- orientation to the persons – orientation to the task

A similar discussion was proposed by Laurent\textsuperscript{17} (1983), who argued that managers have different conceptions of organizations: one which focuses on task: instrumental, and the other which focuses on relationships: social.

For Latin European managers, organizations are considered as systems of relationships, with personal networks and social positioning playing an important role (Laurent 1983). Relationships and the way they are managed lead the organization to goals achievement, while roles are defined formally by the hierarchy and as well informally, by authority, power and status which are pretty much ascribed and refer to a person and not to a task. Personal loyalty and deference to the manager is expected. Getting things done means sometimes working around the system, that is, to use personal networks to avoid hierarchies and rules.
For the Northern–European managers, hierarchies are not so important, rather, the importance is placed on knowing what has to be done and doing it. This is an instrumental view of the organization, where structure is defined by activities, and authority is specific to the job, not the person.

Returning to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings on the corporate culture dimensions, they consider that slating countries in each of quadrants makes is it easier and more comprehensive to explore the basis of each type of corporate culture in terms of how their employees learn, change, resolve conflicts, motivate, etc.

Consequently, the four types of corporate cultures are:

1. the family
2. the Eiffel Tower
3. the guided missile
4. the incubator

**The Family culture.** In this category are included countries that are hierarchical and in the same time have an orientation to the person. A family culture is one which is personal, with emphasis on close relationships, but also one in which the parent, “the father”, has far more authority than the other members. Status is ascribed to this father figure, which makes the family culture a power–orientated one, where the relationships follow, in many respects, a family atmosphere. The members of the organization are seen as members of the family. Relationships tend to be diffuse, while they are also characterized by high context (people do not need to verbally state their feelings of ideas, there is a lot of them implied, implicit).

Spain is a very good representative of this category, as it scores, on average high on both of dimensions. The Catholic religion has had a great role in disseminating “father’s role” and in not questioning the authority within the organization. Pressure in this type of corporate culture is moral and social. While only 71% of the Spanish believe that a good manager should be left alone to get the job done, Norway is situated among the highest ranking countries, with 87%. The “leader as a father” countries have steeper hierarchies, and Spain ranks in the second tier from the top, while Norway is in the first at the bottom. No doubt, leaders are seen differently in Spain and Norway.
The Eiffel Tower culture. This type of culture refers to countries which consider that structure is more important than function. The boss here is not the “father figure”, but rather a role. Anyone with the proper qualifications may replace him/her, as the authority stems from the occupancy of the role. Although a hierarchical culture, the authority is much more legal and formal than in the family culture, and subordination is clearly rational and coordinative. Status is ascribed to superior roles, and their occupants are distant, but powerful. People are seen as human resources and relationships are specific. Representatives for this culture are Germany, Austria and Hungary, which rank high on both dimensions, Germany being the highest scoring for Eiffel Tower culture.

Norway is largely (97%) opting for function, rather than personality and Spain ranks in the first half of the chart with 83%.

The guided missile culture. Here, the characteristics are equalitarianism and impersonal and task oriented. This culture fits perfectly the description of Norwegian corporate culture. While task oriented, jobs that members do are not fixed in advance and the hierarchies are not very much respected. Any member working on a project could have essential inputs, and the goal is to get the job done. It is a neutral culture, where criticism is constructive and task related only.

The incubator culture. The most important principle in this type of culture is that organizations come second to individuals. In this case, organizations’ only purpose is to serve as incubators for self-expression and self-fulfillment. Being person oriented and equalitarian, organizations in the incubator culture have almost no structure, but the roles are central. Relationships are diffuse and people are regarded through their creative skills. These companies are also operating in an environment of emotional commitment. The Silicon Valley companies are considered as the prototype for this kind of culture.

To sum up the following figure maps Norway and Spain on the two dimensions and to their respective corporate image.
Summarizing Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s findings after reviewing the patterns of corporate culture, other dimensions were introduced: equality versus hierarchy and orientation to the person or to the task. Coping with these dimensions might prove a complex issue for a Norwegian manager relocating to Spain. The reason would be that Spain, along with France appears as hierarchical, while the Scandinavian countries have egalitarian cultures. Norway proves the most project-oriented culture, while Spain is a legitimate representative of the person-oriented culture.

However, the authors’ recommendation is to treat the conclusions with care. They argue that smaller companies are more likely to prefer family and incubator forms, wherever they are, while large would favor Eiffel Tower and guided missile forms.

2.4 Culture change

An interesting discussion, which relates to the usefulness of cultural dimensions over time, starts with the dilemma of whether cultures change and if so, in what respect, with what rhythm?

Hofstede argues that national cultures are extremely stable over time\(^1\), and he explains it by the reinforcement of culture patterns by the institutions that themselves are the products of the existent value system. However, change still comes, and most of the times it stems from the outside: technological breakthroughs, dramatic events. Gradually all countries are exposed to same discoveries, which leads to somewhat similar developments in different societies, but this does not wipe out variety. A country’s answer to these changing elements it is usually according to its cultural value system. Among Hofstede’s dimensions, the one that showed the most obvious changes is individualism (in concordance with Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner results that showed different answers in time to their respective similar dimension) and it is particularly important for this study, as it is the only dimension similar in both researches.

Trompenaars and Woolliams (2003) believe that changing an organization’s culture is a contradiction in terms\(^2\). They have noted that most previous researches are developing models of culture change at two levels: within organizations or across national cultures. The authors argue that cultures tend to reinforce themselves and are only changing certain aspects to avoid modifying other important aspects: the organization itself, its profitability or market share. Choosing between the existing set of values and others, desired ones, it is a dilemma that all cultures face. They differ on how they approach the dilemma, but they all have to find an answer. When extrapolated to the individual, this it is the same dilemma an expatriate face when relocated to another country: will he/she choose to change/adapt his/her set of values? How stable his/her value system will prove to be?

Gooderham and Nordhaug (2001) have a different perspective on Hofstede’s dimensions, after performing a “Eurobusiness student survey”. Though their research has been criticized by few scholars, including Hofstede himself, the importance of their perspective on cross-cultural management issues lies in challenging Hofstede’s contention that management systems are nationally idiosyncratic and that attempts to apply management systems across borders are courting failure\(^3\). They argue that the national culture might not be an exact
indicator after all, and that gender appears to be a more powerful tool for predicting work-related cultural differences than nationality.

According to them, there were a number of significant differences between men and women. Their replies to issues such as Opportunities for fast promotion, Opportunities for personal development or Good personnel policy differ to a great extent and lead the authors to the question whether Europe, at least at the business school students’ level, is more divided in terms of gender rather than in terms of country. Following this line of thinking, it appeared that Italian women have more in common with their Swedish counterparts than with their fellow national males (Gooderham and Nordhaug, 2001).

To summarize their findings, the authors propose that there might actually be increasing scope for pan-European management systems.

More research is needed, and these results should be taken carefully. But even considering that the greater gender differentiation as opposed to country differentiation result may be more important only within the European Union countries (ten of the eleven countries studied, with the exception of Norway, were members of EU) as a result to their convergence in economic and political systems, this finding may have great impact on management systems. It also shows, as mentioned before, that cultures do change and this process is influenced by the economic conditions, by the political conditions and by the institutional setting.

On the line of Gooderham and Nordhaug of cultural differentiation on different criteria than country, Schneider and Barsoux (2003) reviewed industry cultures and professional cultures.

Industry cultures can be easily identified when thinking about the large differences between, for example, high tech industries and mining or retailing from construction.

There are numerous examples of unsuccessful attempts to collaborate between banks and insurance companies, or various companies from different fields. Differences in industry cultures are, as well, rising from the different environments, the products or services they are producing or commercializing, or the nature of decision making (Schneider and Barsoux 2003). The need for resources, the choices of efficiency over customer satisfaction, the technology, the practices valid only within an industry, even the inside jokes are also factors in cultural differentiation. When industry culture interacts with national culture bigger
problems may occur. The examples of clashes as the result of mergers or acquisitions between media giants from different industries and different countries, like the ones between Columbia Pictures and Sony, or Vivendi, Seagram and Universal Studios have shown that success stories cross-industries and cross-nations are hard to be accomplished.

Professional cultures are very powerful sources of differentiation as well. The actual trend is to have specialists and professionals very well educated and expert in certain domains. Accountants, computer professionals, doctors, professors, all have their characteristics, codes of conduct and often different meanings of what is proper behavior, business conduct, methods. Values and beliefs are divergent from one profession to another, and do not necessarily regard country as an element of any importance. A certain profession brings a certain status and authority to a professional.

Without a doubt, both industry and professional cultures bring more sources of differentiation between people. This only reinforces the cultural relativism principle and the necessity to suspend judgment when dealing with other cultures different from one’s own, and assume differences between cultures until proven otherwise.

Since this case study builds upon national cultural differences as tools to better understanding the different answers to problems and dilemmas, of great interest would be to check how much different are the answers to the interview guide for the Norwegian managers in Spain. While keeping the national cultural differences as the main differentiation tools, this paper will also look upon how gender and profession affects the perceptions of a Norwegian national working in Spain.
Chapter 3  Tentative research model

Based on theoretical findings and their representation to the specific setting of Norway and Spain, a tentative research model is introduced. This model draws on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s dimensions and on the issues of patterns of corporate culture and gender differentiation.

After reviewing the theoretical developments in cultural differences area, and in more depth, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner dimensions, few propositions can be inferred about what a Norwegian manager should expect upon his/her encounter of the Spanish national and corporate culture.

These propositions are derived based on the expected behavior of a Norwegian sojourner in Spain:

1. Review of Trompenaars’ dimensions:
   ⇒ relationship with other people
   o universalism vs. particularism
   o individualism vs. communitarianism
   o neutral vs. emotional
   o specific vs. diffuse
   o achievement vs. ascription
   ⇒ attitudes to time
   ⇒ attitudes to environment

2. national patterns of corporate culture: the meaning of an organization – task orientation versus social system;

3. gender differentiation
Starting from Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2002) dimensions and considering them in the setting of a Norwegian manager working in Spain, the following propositions can be made as regard to relationships with other people:

- With regard to the rules versus relationships dimension, while the Spanish would expect their colleagues to disregard the rules to help him/her with a personal matter, the Norwegians would find it ludicrous to do so;

- On the group versus the individual issue, Spanish people manifest a strong deference to leadership, while Norwegians look more communitarian. Collaborative work environment might signal to a Spanish subordinate that his/her boss lacks confidence.

- Being more emotional than the Norwegians, the Spanish tend to exhibit and not to separate emotions from work. Their behavior may be interpreted as aggressive or even out of control by the Norwegians.

- While at the individual level, both the Spanish and the Norwegians would not look up at the boss outside work, the Spanish think that the company should provide help and get involved in areas of their private lives, being specific when compared with the Norwegians. As well, the loss of face and open direct criticism is a major offense for a Spaniard, but a normal situation for a Norwegian.

- Being part of a more achievement oriented culture than the Spanish one, the Norwegians managers in Spain should mind that their counterparts and subordinates do not favor “getting things done” to live as they feel they should.

Drawing from the other two major dimensions proposed by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, it can be proposed that:

- While Norway exhibits a sequential time orientation, Spain leans towards a more or less synchronic one. Norwegian managers in Spain might find their subordinates as hectic, dealing with many thinks in the same time and having no respects for deadlines.
- The Spanish are more likely to try to control the nature, while the Norwegians believe that what happens to them is the result of their own doing.

Another major issue in this tentative model is the meaning of organizations, consequently, the patterns of corporate culture. Task orientation and the hierarchical system differences make Spain and Norway to belong to two different corporate cultures: in Norway the guided missile culture is predominant, characterized by task orientation and equalitarianism, while in Spain the corporate culture is of a family type, with orientation towards person and steeper hierarchies. Following these developments it can be argued that a Norwegian manager working in Spain would feel that the Spanish subordinates do not focus on their tasks enough, would not collaborate and give proper feedback.

Another direction, introduced by Gooderham and Nordhaug’s (2003) discussions, is that in today’s Europe, gender plays a sometimes more important differential role than country. As the importance of gender relative to the country can be determined through empirical studies far more complex and large than the scope of this paper, what can sought upon is that, indeed, gender is important in managing overseas. Therefore, it can be proposed that work relations are better (due, in part, to gender convergence of values and beliefs) with same gender foreign colleagues than with opposite gender colleagues (foreign or co-nationals).
Chapter 4 Methodology

The objective of this chapter is to introduce the methods used to investigate the research questions. The sources and methods of data collections are presented, and the context of the case study and the reasons for choosing this context are also provided. Data analysis and how the data were written up constitute the last part of this chapter.

4.1 Research Design

The strategy for answering the questions or testing the hypotheses that stimulated the research in the first place constitutes the research design.

The object of this study is to determine the extent to which:

a. May Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings be used to develop a successful expatriation program for Norwegian managers relocating to Spain?
b. Were there any other factors that affected the working experience of Norwegian managers in Spain which were not encompassed by the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner research?

The research objective addresses “how” and “why” type questions and does not look to establish frequencies or be predictive about certain outcomes. It actually looks to observe behaviors and implicitly not to manipulate them. The aim of this project is to build upon the expectations drawn from the theoretical framework combined with practitioners’ experience, hence the research tool used will be an exploratory case study. Important in this case is the way in which participants (and not the researcher) interpret their experiences and construct reality, and to accomplish this purpose, this case study uses techniques such as open questions and one-to-one technique.

This study aims to describe whether a Norwegian manager in Spain behaves similar to the theoretical prediction and collects data at one point in time. The unit of analysis is the individual and his/her behaviour within a foreign community, and fulfils Pinsonneault and
Kraemer’s criterion\textsuperscript{21} that the unit chosen relates to the questions and hypotheses in the research.

6 individuals have been selected for this case study, so that they would offer a rich basis for evaluating the propositions. The interview is set up on the collection of qualitative data, which is useful in this type of exploratory research because it may lead to valuable considerations. Personal interviews with the selected Norwegian managers working in Spain have been conducted during the autumn of 2004, between September and November.

The interview questions were drawn upon the theoretical developments identified within the Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner findings, and adjusted to the specific setting of a Norwegian manager working in Spain. Based to Yin\textsuperscript{22} principles, various tactics have been used in this paper to account for the quality of the research.

Interview transcripts have been returned to participants by email so that they could agree/disagree to what has been noted about themselves. This procedure has been employed to improve the construct validity. Also, an external observer (a colleague in the MiB program) has been asked to read the case study and check whether there is a concordance between the findings presented in the case report are surely the same findings that were collected during the data collection process. In the case study methodology, the emphasis is on analytical generalization to account for external validity.

As regard to the issue of the internal validity, which is a concern only for causal or explanatory studies (Yin 1993), in the exploratory studies case problems stem only from making inferences. One way of addressing the issue of making the correct inferences is the analytical tactic of pattern matching. This has been addressed in this paper by comparing predicted patterns with the empirical created ones.

Another principle that according to Yin (1993) contributes to the quality and the reliability of the research is to maintain the chain of evidence. This chain of evidence refers to the possibility that a later investigator, who will follow exactly the same procedures and conducts on the same case study all over again, would arrive at the same findings and conclusions (Yin 1993). To achieve this, the steps in building up the interview guide have been detailed in the Theory Review Chapter, while the data collection and analysis stages
are described to a greater extent in the reminder of this chapter. Following the same exact procedures and line of thinking will largely contribute to obtaining similar results.

4.2 Data collection

The context for this case study is the one of Norwegian managers working in Spain. They have at least one year of experience in this setting and can be considered that they successfully completed the accommodation stage. Part of the reasons for exploring the situation of Norwegian managers in Spain is the presupposed differences between a representative of a Latin culture and one of the Nordic cultures. Being the representatives of such diverse cultures makes their solutions to most of the dimensions reviewed to be to a large extent different. It is expected that the cultural biases and issues would be very easily recognizable in this setting. Identifying the correct issues in this setting, whether they are according to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner dimensions or not, would contribute greatly to creating better and more successful expatriate programs. All these make the mentioned setting a good context to answer the two research questions.

A personal schedule-structured interview (Frankort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992) has been elaborate to acquire information about the matters identified by the specialized literature as important when exploring cross cultural issues. This case study emphasizes the importance of the information obtained from the Norwegian managers working in Spain. The personal schedule-structured interview has some advantages in this context, as it uses basically the same interview question schedule (which is important as it ensures that variations in responses are due to the interviewee and not to variations in the interview), and involves a one-to-one situation, which is very useful when qualitative answers and insights are sought.

When different suggestions or proposals have been made by any of the interviewees, they have been incorporated in the interview guide to validate them in the following individual interviews. This step helps to ensure that the interview process will allow identifying any new factors that might affect the sojourner condition. Since the main structure was still followed, adding questions at a later time does not constitute a departure from the schedule-structured interview, but a development to match the exploratory characteristic of the case study.
Evaluating directly the managerial perceptions through personal interviews depends very much on the way interviews are conducted. According to Easterby-Smith et al. (2002), the interest and commitment shown by the interviewer often produce far better results than detachment. Hence, the interviewer has been committed and careful with the proceedings of the interviews and with evaluating interviewees’ perceptions.

Data collection activities were based on a three sections interview guide. Each section has been focusing on one major direction. The first explores general issues about the sojourner; the second section reviews the perspective on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, while the third goes in depth in the corporate and professional culture area, also touching upon the gender differentiation. To allow the interviewer more interaction and discussions on the specific issues with the interviewee, the questions in all sections are open type.

The interviews were accomplished within a 10 weeks period during autumn 2004. The meetings took, on average, 50 minutes (35 to 120 minutes range) and were conducted in a relaxed, open atmosphere. The language used has been English, which, although is not the mother language of the interviewees, did not cause communicational problems, as it is used in day-to-day activities by all the respondents. 60% of the respondents have declared that they are uncomfortable being taped, while the others although did not object when asked for permission, requested not to store the recordings and use them just to help with the transcripts. Hence, detailed field notes were completed within three hours of each interview to minimize the effects of limited recall. Interviews were transcribed fully within five days of each site visit and transcripts have been returned to informants for verification. This procedure has been done by email.

Although the first interviews were based on the theoretical developed framework, after interviewee suggestions, other questions have been included to cover and explore their applicability. The interviewees were stimulated by open questions and by requests to clarify ambiguous responses or comment on the interviewer interpretation of the data. Straight “yes” or “no” answers have been avoided, while many of the questions have appealed to the respondents’ experience and thoughts regarding cultural issues. Interviewees have also been encouraged to ask any questions related to the interview guide.

For a closer look at the interview structure please see the Interview Guide in Appendix 1. Also, all the interview transcripts may be provided by request by the author of this thesis.
4.3 Data analysis

The strategy for data analysis in a case study research proposed by Yin (1993) is to rely on theoretical propositions. This is generated by the belief that the original objectives and the design of the case study presumably were based on such propositions. There were three analytic techniques introduced by Yin (1993): pattern matching, explanation building and time series. Pattern matching is the appropriate technique for this case study and it is based on the comparison of an empirical pattern with a predicted one (or with several alternative predictions).

According to Pinsonneault (1993), when exploration or description is the aim of survey research, analysis frequently does not generate design issues. However, to strengthen the external validity, the study’s research design features the use of multiple cases and data analysis based on comparing the findings of the individual cases. If there were interesting findings in one individual case, they were taken along with other information to the next case and looked upon to confirm/contradict them. This way, the findings are tested in conditions where the theory has specified that a specific result should occur. It also allows identifying any new factors and validating them in the subsequent individual interviews. This process has been referred to as replication (Yin 1993). A within case study analysis will be performed for each of the individual cases.

The written report in Chapter Five will contain the most interesting findings of the individual cases and a section covering the case analysis and results, while the individual cases are presented in the Appendix 2.
Chapter 5  Interviews findings

This chapter introduces the results of the interview process. Following the discussions with the Norwegian managers sojourning in Spain, the chapter looks first at the general findings, then reviews the common grounds among the interviewees and gathers the main differences.

5.1 General findings

As stated in the previous chapters, all the Norwegians interviewed for this paper were managers, with various positions within companies, ranking from middle to top management. Most of their subordinates were Spanish, making sojourners’ dive into the Spanish culture complete.

All respondents have had at least one year of experience in their current expatriate position, ranging from one to eight years. Most of them have been working / studying abroad before this current assignment.

They were all working in various fields of activity, such as:

- food import;
- property development;
- dairy industry;
- fertilizer business;
- life style management.

The Norwegians were performing their daily activities on positions such as: Project Manager, Director of Operations, Technical Manager, and Managing Director. One of the interviewee was a sole owner of the company.

Whether it was due to their technical competence, to their position within the company, or to their education, the first perception of these managers was that they were very good professionals, with high standards and very good perception of their role within the respective companies.
Most of them have talked of changes they had to bring to the daily activities of their companies and of their proactive role. They had at times to reorganize from scratch, fire people, drop long term suppliers, introduce new rules, buy watches so that the people will understand they are late and that is a bad thing. But the changes have not been only one way, as they all reckoned they had to adjust their perceptions and behavior as well.

They had to adapt to the local environment in terms of:

- Communication: how and what you say to your peers was different from their customs. Due to the language barrier and the cultural filter, the message must be very clear and precise, not to provoke any misunderstandings;
- Expectations: while certain practices, such as employee initiative, delegation, showing up in time for meetings, were accustom in Norway, expecting the same in Spain turned out to be not a good strategy.
- Way of doing business: bureaucracy is omnipresent, therefore you have to find a way to deal with it. One solution has been to hire someone “who knows the way” around things.

Among the various issues they had to deal with upon their arrival in Spain, the most important ones have been considered:

1. language
2. bureaucracy
3. time perception
4. “mañana” attitude

The language was the biggest barrier foreseen by the interviewees in their daily activities in Spain. While most of them were aware of it and started to learn the language while still in Norway, for all language has been a shock, amplified by the lack of English language knowledge of the locals. However, they found understanding and compassion from the Spanish counterparts as they strived to master the language and after a while the language stopped being a real barrier.

The bureaucracy was considered “really tough”, as all respondents had trouble working with the public administration. One solution has been to find ways around things or to find someone who has relationships and may easily find the ways as well. The interesting point here is that all seem to have found a way to manage this issue.
Time perception is another issue for a Norwegian manager in Spain. While some have fought it and imposed to their colleagues their perception of time, others have accepted that this is how the Spanish people are and adjusted to this reality. The industry here was not important, as delays in showing up for meetings or for work were a general habit in all sectors.

The “mañana” attitude defines the relaxed and untroubled by deadlines perspective of the Spanish people. Not acknowledging rules, deferring things and not finishing the task are not very accustomed habits and easy to understand by the Norwegians.

There have been many angles one could look at these issues. While learning the language has been the most recommended solution for the majority of sojourners, another helpful option is to look for advice from someone who knows and understands the local culture. This leads to the pre-assignment training most of the interviewees received before their departure to Spain. While all have considered it very helpful, they as well found it, to a certain extent, incomplete, beginning with the language barrier, which, in the interviewees’ opinion, has been deepened by the lack of English language knowledge of the locals and finishing with the contact of former or existent expatriates from the internal network before departure.

As well, the interviewees have touched upon the importance of knowing the particularities of the industry you are working in and country differences as regards to best practices or rules and regulations. “I was not mentally prepared for how different it was” declared one of the Norwegians interviewed, highlighting how incomplete the pre-assignment training has been in his case.

There are some striking recommendations that stem from all the interviews, regarding the things future sojourners need to consider before embarking on such an experience:

- One has to learn the language above the conversational level, be fluent in professional matters;
- One has to explore and learn from company’s internal network;
- One has to make sure his/her family is 100% willing to relocate as well.
5.2 Common grounds and particularities of the interviews

When looking at the answers to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s and the other theoretical proposals, one must consider the stereotypes that most of the interviewees already had in mind when answering the questions. They expect Spanish people to bend the rules for a friend, to feel more a part of a group, to ascribe status, and so on. However, not all the answers have been in the range predicted by the theoretical development, and they will all be reviewed in the next chapter.

5.2.1 Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner research

Each of the dimensions reviewed have exhibit interesting points of view. As such, on the universalism vs. particularism dimension, the most important point to make is that the more prone to follow the rules the interviewee was, the more his/her impression on Spanish subordinates was negative. As a matter of facts, three of them declared things like “rules are there to be followed” or “I am stickler for rules” and these were the ones that think that Spanish perspective, summarized by “they are more prone to bend rules” has a negative influence on their results, work and cooperation with others.

However, another interviewee, who would not help a friend only if it would hurt a third party, thought that bending rules was not influencing his work. The last one, would definitely bend rules to help friends, and perceived the Spanish attitude as positive. In his case, it looks like his entourage (he grew up in an orphanage, his wife is Ukrainian, he accomplished everything while in Spain) have altered his mindset.

On the Individualism vs. Communitarianism dimension, four of the respondents have found that the aspect negatively influences their work and results. One considers that the Spanish people “are more likely to do a job well, if they themselves benefit from it”, while other two that it would be better if they would feel and act as part of a group, but this is not happening. One thinks that the Spanish subordinates are very competitive and do not share, while the one who found no influence of this dimension on his work considered that in their office “there is a strong sense of WE”.

Summing up, both the individual and the group are important and it would be good not to stand out from the crowd, but it is difficult in Spain.
The **Neutral vs. emotional** aspect found all Norwegians in favor of openly express emotions and four cases in which the Spanish colleagues were positively influencing, by expressing their feelings, the work. There was actually a happy note about being able to express emotions more openly than in Norway. Only one considered that, maybe because the company was “male oriented” people were not expressing enough their feelings, and being an expatriate made him “stand out” from the crowd.

**Specific vs. diffuse** gets the most variation in answers. While for three of the Norwegians non-work interaction hardly ever occurs, and there is no influence of this dimension on results, for another two, the big boss gets extra attention. However, for one of the latter, there is some involvement in their private lives, whilst for the other being the big boss is a bad thing.

On the **Achievement vs. ascription** dimension, the negative influence on work and results have come from the respondents who asses the subordinates solely on their performance and achievements. When the background was important in the assessment process, the interviewees perceived the Spanish habits (to have kinship and relationships count towards your assessment) as neutral or even positive, but this was mainly in industries that apparently depend very much on this kind of networks.

The **attitude to time**, though mentioned in the discussion from above, showed another stereotype about Spanish people, that is, they do not respect time, especially the others’ time. It appears that this one it is true, as four were negatively or very negatively influenced by it, while only one seemed to have accepted their time perception. More so, not only the Spanish people are late, but they never bother to call and let you know they are late.

The interviewee who considered this dimension of a neutral influence on work and results, considered that “this is just something you get used to”, to the total opposite opinion of the others.

On the **attitude to environment** dimension, all agreed that mostly each one chooses his / her way and make own decision, so the responsibility comes strictly to the person. While the Spanish people are stronger believers in fate and destiny, it does not seem to influence in any way the results and the relationships with others. It is the only dimension where all respondents have seen no influence what so ever of a different perspective from their own on
the results of their activity, which makes this dimension rather of little influence from the business perspective.

Even by becoming a better boss, or a “bossy” leader, or understanding your colleagues and improving their daily activities, the general perspective has been that the expatriate experience has greatly improved own perspectives and definitely changed for life the sojourners. They all agree that they were having a positive experience, with all the ups and downs of the cultural differences.

Looking at all the answers it is clear that most positive experience has been the one regarding the range of feelings expressed, as it has been mentioned by all the respondent as such. In the same time, the group and the individual perspective has had the most negative impact. Other dimensions with negative impact are the time orientation and the Spanish people being more prone to bend rules to help friends.

In the same time, the group and the individual perspective has had the most negative impact. This finding might be due to the incomplete immersion of the sojourner in Spanish reality and could be generated by the longer accommodation period. Other dimensions with negative impact are the time orientation and the Spanish people being more prone to bend rules to help friends.

5.2.2 Corporate and professional culture

Most of the structures the sojourners were employed in Spain were exhibiting flat structures, with 2 to 4 layers and with obvious less formal and even informal authority dissemination. All the employees are entitled to visit anytime the boss and make proposals to improve the day to day activity, with a couple of the companies asking for those proposals to be properly documented and justified. This open door policy relates very much to the informal authority.

Three of the companies were focusing on the fulfillment of both, the task and the person, exemplifying this choice by the importance of the development of the sales people have for the accomplishment of tasks. In their view, this is an effect-cause relationship.

When it came to the performance appraisals systems, three of them had none, while the other two were very pleased with their systems, of which one was individual, and the other one
was group and individual based (they were employing the 360 degrees evaluation technique).

The reward systems were mostly individual, either based on commission or not at all performance related. One company used group and individual reward systems, while another one had dropped the individual system in favor of the team based one. They have been motivating this move by the failure of the individual system to stimulate collaboration and team cohesion.

Internal courses and seminars were part of the training the employees of one of the involved companies were receiving. However, the expatriate mentioned that they never had time to evaluate these programs, due to the daily workload. All the other companies mentioned on the job training or no training programs at all.

When reviewing the means of communication used, it came as no surprise, due to the size of the respective companies, that informal meetings and emails were preferred. Only the representatives of foreign companies have mentioned a strict report system, but still, in daily activities, informal meetings, emails or the blackboard were the most used. As well, when rigor and transparency were sought upon, formal meetings or official letters have been employed.

The way the profession contributed to work relations in Spain was positive, as most of the interviewees mentioned the ease of proving themselves and the need for them of their companies. In life style management case the profession made work more difficult, as the sojourner had to rely on relationships, which is different case when compared with an IT job, where you already know everything before you practice your job, but it also made it better, as the sojourner had to dive faster and more complete into the local culture.

On the ethics matter, the answers have been more diplomatic than anything, with few examples different ways of doing business, such as legal permits and building standards. However, the main point has been that once you understand the way things work, then you should not consider the ethical issues as an impediment to business relationships.

The opposite gender collaboration showed mostly better working relations (of men) with women, with only one exception, when the expatriate considered that women are less keen to learn and to behave professionally when compared to their men counterparts. The only
interviewed women stated no differences in collaboration with either men or women, which concords with the general Norwegian perspective of “women are different than men, but sure that is a good thing”.

All of the Norwegians interviewed sincerely did not regret the step they made when they have moved to Spain, considering actually a very good move for them, for their development as a person, as a professional, as a family person. However, as most of them declared they were not prepared for their experiences, they had numerous recommendations for future sojourners. The latter should see the relocation as a great opportunity, a chance to change for the better, to only focus on the good things of this experience and not gave in to difficulties, to concentrate on the family and how to overcome the changes an expatriation process entails.

Most of the factors considered to be important in a relocation process already have been mentioned, but few deserve a better review.

One’s expectations should be very careful built up, because their role in the appreciation of the overall process is decisive. The way one builds his / her expectation is crucial. High expectations may lead to disappointment, while very low prospects would generate a general awful mood for the sojourner.

Other factors mentioned were the very long working hours, the political conditions and the changes due to the Madrid bombings, the climate (the difference in climate from sunny Spain to rainy / frosty Norway).

All in all, these interviews have provided a very large discussion base for the analysis that will take place in the next chapter. The diverse situations and perspectives will definitely bring some interesting points to the table.
Chapter 6  Research analysis

The scope of this chapter is to analyze the results of the interview process. It reviews the actions and the reactions of the Norwegian managers when dealing with the Spanish reality and examines the changes they had to make, benchmarking them to the proposals of the developed model. Gradually, all the main directions of the proposed model are examined and an adjusted model is proposed.

As predicted by the various cross-cultural studies, the sojourners had to adapt their management style to the new realities, but also had to impose their standards to their working environment. What the theoretical developments have predicted, the two way adaptation, it appeared evident in all the interviews.

The expatriates mentioned as the most important directions they had to adapt the communication style, with a more concise and straightforward approach needed, in order to avoid too much loss in the cultural filter, and their expectations, which is again according to theoretical proposals.

6.1 Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s proposals

A structured approach to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s proposals when comparing them with the interviews findings is needed, to easily identify the variations in answers and the different perspectives.

On the universalism vs. particularism dimension the expectation was that, while the Spanish would expect their colleagues to disregard the rules to help him/her with a personal matter, the Norwegians would find it ridiculous to do as such. The answers ranged in this line, confirming the expectations, but the main finding was that the more prone to follow the rules the interviewee was, the more his/her impression on Spanish subordinates was negative and affected their work and results. The Norwegians behaved as expected, considering bending the rules as serious issue, while the Spanish performed as predicted as well.
On the **Individualism vs. Communitarianism** dimension Spanish people are the ones exhibiting a strong deference to leadership, such that the collaborative work environment welcomed by the Norwegians might signal to Spanish subordinates that his/her boss lacks confidence. This dimension as well was confirmed by the respondents, with the Norwegian sojourners feeling that the Spanish were individualists, very competitive and do not share, while for the Norwegian in the offices there should be a strong sense of **WE**. This has led to a general impression of negative influence on work and results.

On the **Neutral vs. emotional** dimension, it is argued the Spanish tend to exhibit and not to separate emotions from work. Their behavior may be interpreted as aggressive or even out of control by the Norwegians. The research showed that, indeed, the Spanish people were very emotional and open about their emotions, but this was not to the disagreement of the Norwegians. Even more, the Norwegians found it very good to behave this way and were very positive about it. Even work and the results were seen as positively influenced by the openness in showing emotions. This dimension anticipated the behavior of the Spanish people, but did not perceive correctly the Norwegian perspective. Could be due to the acceptance of some of the characteristics of the host culture or to the realization that, once experiencing it, the openness is better than a hold out.

The **Specific vs. diffuse** dimension stated that both the Spanish and the Norwegians would not look up at the boss outside work, but the Spanish people would expect the company to involve in their private lives. The answers showed that most Spanish and Norwegians would expect no involvement in the private lives, and when this happens, the Spanish treat differently only the big boss. These conclusions are in concordance with Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s findings.

The **Achievement vs. ascription** dimension should exemplify a more achievement oriented Norwegian culture than the Spanish one, with the Spanish not favoring “getting things done”. However, some of the Norwegian managers have come to appreciate the “relationships” when evaluating their subordinates and they considered the Spanish in this situation not having a bad influence on work and results, even sometimes having a positive influence. Anyway, most of the Norwegians considered the performance and achievements important in evaluations, therefore they perceived a negative influence of this dimension on work, which is according to the theory. The “manana attitude” comes
as a big issue for the Norwegian managers, who dislike, as mentioned in the previous chapter, very much that the Spanish subordinates are not achievements oriented and prefer to postpone things or deal with issues in their own ways or time.

On the **attitude to time** dimension, the Norwegian managers in Spain might find their subordinates as hectic, dealing with many things in the same time and having no respects for deadlines. This was really the case, with the Spanish not respecting anyone’s time, and this had a great deal of negative influence on work and results. **This was the dimension with the most convergence to Trompenaars’ directions.**

On the last dimension, **attitude to environment**, the Norwegians believe that what happens to them is the result of their own doing. As for the respondents, they all agreed that mostly each one chooses his / her way and make own decisions, so the responsibility comes strictly to the person. While the Spanish people are stronger believers in fate and destiny, this does not clash with the Norwegians perspective, and it does not seem to influence in any way the results and the relationships with others. **Behaving as predicted, this dimension however lacks the influence on Norwegian – Spanish business climate.**

All in all, most of the dimensions were describing predicted behaviors, with some spin-offs from the neutral vs. emotional aspect, where the Norwegians were definitely more in favor of Spanish behavior than the one perceived as characteristic to them. The universalism vs. particularism dimension reinforced even more Trompenaars findings, while the achievement vs. ascription dimension showed, surprisingly that some Norwegians have come to appreciate the relationships in evaluating people, and when this happen, they find it positive.
6.2 Corporate and professional culture

On the patterns of corporate culture, the findings mainly exhibited the predicted behavior. The Norwegians were characterized by task orientation and equalitarianism, while the Spanish were oriented towards person. However, the hierarchies are not steep, but rather flat, with two to four levels, with three levels being the average. It was not clear whether the open doors politics, clearly instated by the Norwegians was followed and to which extent. Did the Spanish people feel free to speak, or were they retained by the requirements to prove and exemplify their requests? These are some directions that were not covered in this paper.

It is expected, according to the proposed theory that a Norwegian manager working in Spain would feel that the Spanish subordinates do not focus on their tasks enough, would not collaborate and give proper feedback. The general feedback was exactly this. The collaboration between employees was almost inexistent; there was no focus on tasks as well, with people looking, for example to finish work faster to go home than to better serve the customers. Subordinates feedback was more related to their counterparts and the issues they have to complete their job, than being constructive.

In relation with the gender role, work relations were supposed to be better with same gender foreign colleagues than with opposite gender colleagues. The evidence was not in the favor of this statement. Most of the respondents declared that they work better with women, than with men. And all interviewees that declared this are men, which make the theoretical statement as inaccurate. Another dominant answer was that the gender did not matter, and the author’s opinion is that this answer is biased by the Norwegian beliefs on gender differentiation. The main point from here is that gender role was not as predicted, but pointing out that some results were just supposed to be politically correct.

When it comes to the culture change, there are some hints that culture evolved since Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’ field research. The most obvious is the Norwegians proneness to express freely and not dissociate emotions at work. It could be the environment, but it was the general feeling that expressing emotions at work it was a regular and normal state for the Norwegians.
Looking at the language, even foreign companies in Spain, whose working language was English had to deal with locals’ inability to speak in English language, therefore the communication was very difficult when not speaking the Spanish language. This has been a major issue for all the interviewees and it seems that the solution is for the sojourners to learn the local language.

### 6.3 The adjusted model

Following the results of the interview process and the analysis from above, the model presented in Chapter 3 had to suffer some changes. While the other statements remain the same, the following were added:

- **On the Neutral vs. emotional** dimension, the Norwegians not only will not hide emotions and not display them, but will approve and exhibit open feelings at work. They actually found it very good to behave this way and were very positive about it.

- The **universalism vs. particularism** dimension was reinforced even more than Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner predicted. The more prone to follow the rules the Norwegian was, the more his/her impression on Spanish subordinates was negative and affected their work and results.

- The **achievement vs. ascription** dimension was altered as well, showing that when the Norwegians have come to appreciate the local knowledge, relationships and networks as skills in evaluating people, they found it having a positive influence. However, this is not the regular behavior, but just a spin-off of Trompenaars dimension.

- On the **Gender role**, there was no evidence of the same gender better work relationships, and the proposal is that gender it is not important in managing overseas.

As well, one should consider the influence of the above model on day to day businesses, results and cooperation with others as an important focus of this paper. The most positive experience mentioned by the interviewees was the range of feelings involved. Are the
Norwegians repressing their feelings at home and a change in the cultural habit releases those feelings? It is the Spanish attitude that makes it easier to express? Did a cultural change has taken place?

The group and the individual perspective has had the most negative impact and this might be due to the incomplete immersion of the sojourner in Spanish reality and could be generated by the longer accommodation period.

The results of this paper would arise in its benefits, with the ones that were experiencing the expatriate life guiding the future sojourners. An expatriate should learn the language and the protocol of the country he is living in, should be committed to his / her choice, and should perfectly know his / her job. All these will prove to the locals the sojourner’s intentions and it will make it easier for them to accept him / her. And corroborating this with showing respect to the locals will only lead to better acceptance. On the preparation for relocation, one should consider to learn as much as possible about his / her future destination, be open and assume things were supposed to be that way until otherwise is proven. Use internal contacts from your company and gather as many stories as possible about your future home.

The conclusion of this study is that, with careful consideration and looking for specific issues, one could use Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s dimensions as tools, along with many other instruments to predict and understand future behavior of Norwegian sojourners in Spain. Training programs may be tailored, starting from predicted behavior and considering other changes, such the Norwegians being positive towards feelings expressed and being prone to reacting strong on rules and regulations.
Chapter 7  Conclusions and implications

This chapter discusses the implications of the adjusted model, limitations of this exploratory case study, and makes few propositions for future research.

7.1 Implications of the adjusted model

When looking at supported findings one should be able to consider much of the information needed to create a pre-assignment training program or to review the most necessary information needed before an expatriation process. Whether it considers the answers for cross-cultural Norwegian-Spanish specific issues or for a general setting, he / she should be able to reach better conclusions and focus on things that are really important.

One should carefully review all the dimensions, but focus on the ones that have been shown to have direct implications on work, results and cooperation with the locals.

The most positive experience has been the one regarding the feelings expressed openly at work. This one has been mentioned by all the respondents as such. A Norwegian should be warned or taught, as the general impression was that the actual sojourners have embraced the Spanish perspective on this dimension, that it is ok to express feelings, to get over with them and move on.

The group and the individual dimension have had the most negative impact. Again, the large differences in Spanish perspective compared to the Norwegian ones, not belonging to a group, but rather merely functioning in the advantage of the individual, with no respect for the common goals may be very disturbing for a Norwegian national.

The Spanish are more inclined to break rules to help friends, and this contravene to a great extent with the Norwegian perspective. Methods on how to deal with this may be developed, when the depth of this dimension has been asserted and understood.

Other important issues in a Norwegian-Spanish setting are the language, the bureaucracy, the time perception, as well as the “mañana” attitude. Being aware of all these would make the sojourner better prepared, more confident and prone to succeed.
7.2 imitations and proposals for future research

There are many things to be said and reviewed when trying to analyze such a problem and theoretical issue rich theme, as is the case for cross-cultural behavior. The following is just a selection of a couple of the most interesting challenges that have not been addressed in this paper. As well, some of the setbacks of the interview process are touched upon.

There were some questions that could not have answers, as they were beyond the scope and the possibilities of this paper. For example, the Norwegians behavior regarding openly expressing and separating emotions at work. The reasons the generated this behavior were not clear.

Another example is the open doors politic. Did the Spanish feel obstructed by the requirements to prove and exemplify their demands? Although wanted, was this behavior obtained? These are all directions for future research.

As with regard to the research design and the interview process, one of the recommendations when performing an exploratory case study is to realize a process called triangulation. This involves performing the interviews with respondents from both sides (companies) involved in the interview. Triangulation could not be performed as it would have meant to interview someone, a Spanish national from one of the respective companies. This either would not have been physically possible, or, according to the reply of one manager, would have been seen as a sign of distrust on the interviewer's behalf.

Another difficulty that occurred when performing the interviews was to keep the respondents from going back and forth from their accepted behavior as Norwegians to the one of an expatriate that has spent some time in Spain. Some answers were politically correct, while others were purely what the managers perceived as correct behavior.

The last concept to tackle is the possibility to generalize these findings to an international setting or even to a Norwegian – Spanish perspective. As mentioned, the predicted theoretical behavior has largely been confirmed by the interviewees, but few changes appeared. One should consider these changes as informal and should review other developments as well.
When assessing such a complex and controversial area of cultural differences, one should always reflect on the difficulty in understanding the directions and meanings of cross-cultural setting. As seen throughout this paper, there is no straight right or wrong issues, there are no common answers. One can not tell to a manager that this is the accepted behavior, or the other one is worse, but one may be able assert, given certain conditions, how some dimension will affect the participants, and how should be dealt with.

When looking at the adjustments to the model, one may easily identify more research directions:

- Are the Norwegians actually founding it very good to express emotions at work? If so, has the culture changed in this respect?

- On the universalism vs. particularism dimension, the Norwegians seemed much focused on following the rules, while his/her impression on Spanish subordinates became more negative and affected the work and results. Has Norway taken a stiffer stance on this dimension?

- It is possible for the Norwegians to appreciate in evaluating people skills such as local knowledge, relationships and networks? Is this depending on the industry this happen?
Chapter 8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1 Interview Guide

Respondent’s name _________________________________________________________

Company’s name: ___________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________________

Telephone: |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Part 1. General questions:

1.1 Could you please tell me some information about the company you are working for?

1.2 For how long have you previously worked abroad? For which company? Where?

1.3 What is your position with the company, how long do you plan to stay here, and how would you characterize your activity here?

1.4 What are the biggest accomplishments you have had here?
1.5 What are the problems you encountered upon arrival, with regard to working with locals?

1.6 How were these problems handled from your point of view?

1.7 Do you feel that you had to adapt your management style? In what ways?

1.8 What kind of pre-assignment training you went through before coming to Spain?

1.9 What do you think about the training you received at home? Did the expatriation experience reveal something missing from your training? Were there things which can not be trained/taught before the expatriation process has begun? Which?

1.10 What are the most important things an expatriation training process should be focusing on?

Part 2 Trompenaars & Hampden - Turner research review questions:

2.1 Rules vs. relationships. What do you think about bending rules to help a friend? What differences do you perceive between you and your Spanish colleagues in this matter?

2.1.1 How has this rules vs. relationships dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?
2.2 The group vs. the individual. What is more important to you: to feel that you are belonging to a group, to a community or to serve your own interest? Why?

2.2.1 How has this group vs. individual dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?

2.3 The range of feeling expressed. How do you feel about a person who readily expresses emotions in an interpersonal communication (in a business situation)? Have you encountered such a situation while working in Spain?

2.3.1 How has this range of feelings expressed dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?
2.4 The range of involvement. What do you feel about mixing your work with your private life? How much is the authority in working situations transmitted into non-work circumstances? How are the Spanish subordinates handling this?

2.4.1. How this range of involvement dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?

- Very Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very

2.5 How status is accorded. How important in your assessment of a subordinate are characteristics like age, kinship, status or how well they performed their tasks and their work attitude? What kind of principles are the Spanish managers using in similar situations?

2.5.1 How this accordance of status dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?

- Very Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very

2.6 Time orientation. What kind of time orientation you have (you are doing one activity at a time, keep appointments strict and do not let relationships interfere with their schedule and like to follow initial plans)?

2.6.1 How this dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?
2.7 Relationship with nature. Do you believe that what happens to you is your own doing and that you have enough control over the directions in your life?

2.7.1 How this dimension has affected your results, work, cooperation with the co-workers?

2.8 How the differences in culture collectively have affected you and your employees work?

2.8.1 Which differences have had the most impact? What type of impact (positive / negative)?

Rules versus relationships

The group versus the individual

The range of feelings expressed

The range of involvement

How status is accorded

Time orientation

Relationship with nature

Part 3 Corporate and professional culture:
3.1 How flat is the structure of your company? How authority is disseminated and on what grounds it is established (formal, informal)?

3.2 What are the steps to take for a subordinate to propose changes to a certain strategy or company practice?

3.3 Would you say that your company has a culture oriented towards fulfillment of tasks or towards person?

3.4 How do you find the performance appraisal systems your company use (whether they are individual or group based)?

3.5 What do you think of the reward systems your company employ (individual or possibly, group)?

3.6 How is the effectiveness of employee training and development evaluated?

3.7 What kind of strategy for communicating with the personnel does your company utilize? (written statements or missions, informal meetings, etc.)

3.8 What do you feel that your profession adds to the way you perceive working in Spain?

3.9 Which are the ethical issues you encountered while working in Spain?
3.10 How would you characterize your cooperation with same gender colleagues as opposed to your collaboration with opposite gender colleagues? Do you feel that sometimes you work better with same gender colleagues than with opposite-gender colleagues (foreign and co-nationals)? Please exemplify.

3.11 What are the suggestions you have for a Norwegian relocating to Spain?

3.12 Could you think of other factors that might have influenced your work experience in Spain?

Interview finish date: [___]:[___]

THANK YOU!
### Universalism vs. particularism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Svanberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individualism vs. communitarianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>strong sense of WE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>stand out from the crowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>better in groups, but not happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>are more likely to do a job well, if they themselves benefit from it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>they are competitive, and do not share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>some group feeling, but very divided between layers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neutral vs. emotional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Svanberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specific vs. diffuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>Non-work interaction hardly ever occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>There is no transmitting of authority, we are friends, colleagues. The big boss gets extra attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>To them I am Señor Johansen, even for our annual Christmas party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>We keep it very separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>I chat and talk to them, but there is definitely a distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>They chose to keep me at arm's length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Achievement vs. ascription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>I asses someone depending on the job</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>you get nowhere without connections</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>attitude and motivation is number 1</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>earning respect through performance</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>achievement and background</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>performance is everything</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes to time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu bought a stock of cheap watches</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann they steal time</td>
<td>very negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johansen accept their time perception</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anfinsen they are never on time</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tharaldsen people here are late for work, for meetings, for everything</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Svanberg Always late. Always</td>
<td>very negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes to environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>I don’t always go with the flow</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>I mostly believe we chose our ways</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>is my own doing, Spanish perspective not an issue</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>it is our actions that impact our lives the most</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>You make choices</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>my choices have consequences</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collective cultural # influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>positively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Differences with impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>rules vs relationships</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>range of feelings</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>range of feelings</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>rules vs relationships</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>time orientation</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>range of feelings</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>group vs individual</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>range of involvement</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>group vs individual</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>time orientation</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>range of feelings</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>group vs individual</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>range of feelings</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>rules vs relationships</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>time orientation</td>
<td>very negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Structure, Authority

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Svanberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employee proposals

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Svanberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fulfilment of tasks or persons

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>towards person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>task oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>Sales - person, rest - task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance appraisals

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Myklestu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aamann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward systems</th>
<th>Effectiveness of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>Both (individual and group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>individual, not performance related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>one individual bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td>individual commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>initially individual, now team bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Profession adds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Myklestu</td>
<td>Email and informal meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aamann</td>
<td>email and reporting system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Johansen</td>
<td>informal meetings, email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Anfinsen</td>
<td>informal meetings, blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tharaldsen</td>
<td>meetings, memos, email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Svanberg</td>
<td>written statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical issues</th>
<th>Opposite gender collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myklestu</td>
<td>permits issuing / working around things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamann</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen</td>
<td>building standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfinsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaldsen</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svanberg</td>
<td>colleagues give preferential treatment to friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>Other factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Myklestu</td>
<td>see it as a great opportunity; focus on the good things; family focus; listen and learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aamann</td>
<td>learn the language, use internal contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Johansen</td>
<td>family focus, language skills, be commited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Anfinsen</td>
<td>know your job; the language; respect the locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tharaldsen</td>
<td>Spanish protocol and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Svanberg</td>
<td>language, integrate, respect local customs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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