

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF LITHUANIA

Audra I. Mockaitis*

Doctoral degree, social sciences
Vilnius University Department of Marketing
Saulėtekio al. 9, I-506, LT 2040 Vilnius
Tel. (370 2) 366 146, Fax. (370 2) 366 150
E-mail: Audra.I-Mockaitis@ef.vu.lt

This paper introduces the results of national cultural dimensions of potential Lithuanian managers, according to Hofstede's indices. It will be seen that Lithuanians scored high on Masculinity, and average on Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism and Power Distance, relative to all other countries in the database. These results are discussed in terms of their likely influence on management and marketing in Lithuania.

Introduction

The influence of culture on management has been a much-debated topic for the last three decades, its importance increasing with the growing rates of internationalization and globalization. Companies and researchers alike have become increasingly concerned with the application of standardized or tailored management techniques across cultures. On the one hand are those scholars advocating a "culture free" approach to organizational solutions and, on the other, are those who maintain and provide empirical evidence that culture by large, through the values and attitudes of individuals, determines the preferences for certain organizational forms and management methods over others. The latter view will be explored in this paper.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union opened the doors for foreign investors to reap the advantages of new markets, lower labor and production costs and the like. However, the doors were also opened to an array of cultures, to people differing in their tastes and preferences, languages, religion, educational levels, business and social customs and traditions, attitudes toward foreigners, work ethic, negotiation styles, perceptions of time and space, levels of and views toward corruption and bribery, attitudes toward power, risk-taking etc. And despite this, little to no research has thus far been conducted on the cultural similarities or differences on the countries of the former Soviet Union (FSU). Except for case studies or general descriptions of country environments, there are still few multi-country studies

* The author would like to thank the Foundation for International Information and Communication (IIC), the Hague for providing a grant to visit the IRIC and Aalborg University, Denmark, for providing a research grant and permission to conduct the study.

enabling comparison of countries in this diverse region. Some cross-cultural studies have been conducted in the larger Eastern European countries such as Poland (e. g., Nasierowski and Mikula 1998). However, publications on management and organization in the smaller FSU countries, except for general accounts of contextual factors, are still few and far between. Lithuania has been included in one cross-cultural study, measuring the differences in personality characteristics of managers in Lithuania, Georgia, the Ukraine and Great Britain (Cook et al 1998). However, this study says little about the cultural characteristics of Lithuania, for although personality traits can sometimes provide indications as to the cultural characteristics of a country, making generalizations on cultures based on the personality dynamics of individuals is the same as treating cultures as though they were individuals. Hofstede (1984) terms this inadequate treatment of data "reverse ecological fallacy."

The objective of this paper is to introduce the results of an empirical study on the cultural dimensions of Lithuania, based on the methodology of G. Hofstede. The Values Survey Module 1994 was administered to matched student samples in Lithuania and Denmark in the fall of 1999, and scores for four dimensions – Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance and Masculinity, were obtained. The paper begins by outlining the methodological framework of the research. The results of the study are presented and compared to Hofstede's sample of countries. Suggestions for their application and for further research are discussed in the final section of the paper.

The comparison of Lithuanian dimensions to those of numerous other countries in his study will pave the path for more extensive studies on employee attitudes or the applicability of various Western management practices in

Lithuania. The results will serve local and foreign business practitioners alike, enabling them to select the best organizational forms and practices and to identify areas of mutual advantage and potential problems based on similarities and differences.

Methodology

Any cross-cultural study must begin with a definition of culture. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) identified 164 different definitions of culture. Because this study is a replication study, instead of developing a unique definition of culture, Hofstede's description of culture as "the collective programming of the mind, which distinguishes the members of one human group from another (1984:21)," will be applied. In this case, nationality is used to delineate groups and values are seen as the fundamental determinant of culture.

Hofstede (1984) conducted a study of IBM managers and employees in 53 countries. He distinguished four dimensions according to which countries more or less differed in their results and labeled these dimensions Individualism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity. He hypothesized the implications of each of these dimensions on management and organization.

Individualism (IDV) (and collectivism on the opposite pole) refers to the relationship between an individual and the society, to which the individual belongs. Where individualism predominates, there is a clear distinction, or boundary, between the individual as a separate entity and society. Where collectivism dominates, the distinction between the individual and the group is more blurred – the individual's personal interests tend to be determined or predetermined by the interests of the collective. The level of individualism / collectivism in a society strongly influences the rela-

tionship between the individual and the organization. Collectivist societies are more emotionally involved in the organization, and thus the organization, in turn, must assume a certain responsibility for its members. The nature of this psychological contract in such societies also determines the relationship among members – there will be less acceptance of outsiders and more willingness to conform, less conflict, less initiative and more emphasis on security and group decisions. The opposite is true of individualist societies, where people join organizations often to satisfy their own personal interests and needs. Employment, promotion and dismissal will be based on merit, individual initiative is encouraged and individual decision-making, goals and rewards are preferred.

Power Distance (PDI) refers to the degree of inequality existing in society (the way that power is distributed among the more and less powerful) and accepted by members or the extent that effort is made to minimize these differences in society. In organizations, this would be represented by the superior-subordinate relationship. In countries where power distance is higher, individuals may behave more submissively toward people of higher status and will be more afraid to disagree with their superior. Symbols of status and prestige are accepted, decision-making will be concentrated in the hands of those in power, meaning there will be more autocratic or paternalistic management styles, as the role of the manager in such countries is to initiate structure. Employees in higher power distance countries will be more likely to accept close supervision and behave more formally toward their superiors. The opposite is true in low power distance countries.

The Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) dimension indicates the way in which a society copes

with or accepts uncertainty. Higher uncertainty avoiding societies tend to try to minimize uncertainty through the use of more rules, control systems and rituals and adhering to traditions, they are more dogmatic, have more or rigid laws. In organizations this is apparent in specified rules and regulations, bureaucracy, rigid planning, more use of reports and memos, less risk-taking, more specialized tasks, functions and careers, less initiative, fewer innovations, loyalty toward the organization and intolerance of conflict and competition among employees. Lower uncertainty avoiding societies have overall lower anxiety, are not as resistant to change and more willing to take risks, have a preference for the general versus the specific, such as broad guidelines, conflict and competition are viewed as natural and sources of ideas, innovations and change.

The final dimension (MAS) distinguishes between those societies, in which there is a clear distinction between gender roles and dominance of certain “masculine” attitudes and values (high Masculinity) and those societies, in which the line between sex roles is more fluid and there is a preference for more “feminine” values (low Masculinity). Individuals from masculine societies will generally have a preference for earnings, recognition and a challenge in their job versus cooperation, working atmosphere or job security. Individual decision-making will be more valued, as will achievement / ambition and large organizations. There will also be more gender differentiation in such societies; that is, men will generally assume “masculine” roles and jobs and women “feminine” jobs. Feminine societies value just the opposite – group decision-making, more personal time versus larger salary, smaller organizations etc. More men may assume more “nurturing” positions, for example, male nurses or teachers.

Hofstede is not the only researcher, who has conducted a multinational study of this type, to identify value differences across cultures. Trompenaars (1993) draws upon data from over 50 countries and proposes seven dimensions of culture. Schwartz (1994) has also developed an instrument, including 56 values, which, after analysis of data from 38 countries, resulted in 7 dimensions. Laurent (1983) argued that managers have different perceptions about concepts of management and that these beliefs influence the way they manage across cultures. From a sample of 817 managers from 10 Western countries, he obtained four dimensions, which capture the ways in which managers view organizations and their role within them. However, of all the studies on national culture, Hofstede is the most widely cited author¹. His study has been replicated numerous times with similar results, and his dimensions have been found to correlate with those of other researchers, among which are the above-mentioned scholars. Triandis (1982) has stated that Hofstede's study "will stand as one of the major landmarks of cross-cultural research for many years to come." Yet his work has been criticized as well – critics often deem the use of the multinational IBM a limitation, as the effects of its corporate culture on employee values are debatable. Because the number of countries in Hofstede's database is so large, inclusion of Lithuania in the databank provides prolific opportunities for comparison to other countries. The use of quantitative data collection methods also facilitates ease in replication and comparison of data over time. All of these factors influenced the selection of Hofstede's methodology for this study.

¹ In fact, Hofstede's work has been cited 834 times from 1980–1994 in the Social Science Citation Index (Usunier 1998).

Permission was granted by the IRIC² to use the Values Survey Module (VSM 94) in this study. This is the newest version of the VSM and contains 26 questions, 20 measuring the cultural dimensions and 6 demographic questions. The scoring of results followed the format outlined in the Values Survey Module 1994 Manual. The questionnaire was translated and back translated before administering the final version.

Sample Description

The sample consisted of 60 Danish and 136 Lithuanian respondents with similar levels of education and age. Samples were matched according to proportions of male and female respondents within countries, education, ratio of employed to unemployed respondents and age. All respondents had a similar level of education (students ranging from their third year of undergraduate to second year graduate studies). Danish respondents were students of Aalborg University and majored in international relations / studies, economics and business administration. Lithuanian respondents were students of Vilnius University and were majors in the fields of management, personnel management, accounting and audit, production management and marketing. Thus, all respondents shared similar backgrounds and have been exposed, to some degree, to business and management. The sample characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

The employment experience of the respondents in both countries was also fairly similar, although, the Lithuanian students had a somewhat higher level of employment in terms of job

² The Institute for Research in Intercultural Cooperation, Maastrich and Tilburg, the Netherlands.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

	<i>N</i>	Males		Females		Age	
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>m</i>	<i>std</i>
Danes	60	20	33.33	40	66.67	22.92	2.54
Lithuanians	136	46	33.82	90	66.18	22.57	0.89

Table 2. Respondent Employment Characteristics

	Lithuanians				Danes			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Unemployed	18	39.13	45	50.00	8	40.00	17	42.50
Unskilled or semi-skilled worker	2	4.00	2	2.22	8	40.00	18	45.00
Office worker or secretary	4	8.70	4	4.44	1	5.00	2	5.00
Vocationally trained worker	1	2.00	1	1.11	1	5.00	1	2.50
Academically trained professional	21	45.65	38	42.22	2	10.00	2	5.00

position³. The question on the survey regarding employment asked the respondent to choose the category, which describes his/her employment best. The categories ranged from unemployed, unskilled laborer, university trained professional, to different managerial positions. None of the respondents held managerial positions. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Hofstede (1984) has emphasized the importance of matched samples. It does not matter that the sample is narrow, and thus atypical for society as a whole. What is important is that the samples are atypical in the same way across countries, and that as many factors as possible are ruled out, so that the only difference

that remains is national culture (Hofstede 1984). The sample in this study thus satisfies these criteria. Hofstede (1984) also warns that in comparing the results, it is useless to calculate the results for a sample from one country and compare them to existing results. This is because we must consider the relative distances between countries and not absolute values. For this reason Denmark, a country previously studied by Hofstede, was chosen as a point of reference. It should be borne in mind the Denmark serves the purpose of comparison only, therefore, only the results for Denmark will be presented and concentration placed on the object of our study, Lithuania.

Results

The results for the dimensions are presented in Table 3. Scores for Lithuania were adjusted by adding or subtracting the difference between the obtained and Hofstede's scores for Denmark. We can observe rather large differences in all the dimensions between Lithuania and Denmark. Lithuania scores much lower on Individualism and significantly higher on Power

³ This is explainable in terms of the economic situation and the educational systems of the two countries. In Denmark it is acceptable practice to finish one's education before obtaining a career and temporary jobs are sought by students in order to supplement their university stipends. In Lithuania, because of the lack of specialists in many fields of business and because of the low financial aid provided to students, many students seek careers and obtain their university education simultaneously.

Table 3. Actual and Adjusted Dimension Scores for Both Countries

	IDV	PDI	UAI	MAS
Obtained Scores				
Denmark	100.58	19.56	15.75	-21.25
Lithuania	76.41	46.30	59.56	27.48
Hofstede's scores, Denmark	74	18	23	16
Adjusted scores, Lithuania	49.83	44.74	66.81	64.72

Table 4. Individualism (IDV) Scores and Rankings for 70 Countries

Rank	Country or region	Index	Rank	Country or region	Index	Rank	Country or region	Index
1	USA	91	24/25	Israel	55	49	Malaysia	26
2	Australia	90	26	Slovakia*	52	50	Hong Kong	25
3	Great Britain	89	27	Spain	51	51	Chile	23
4/6	Canada	80	28	Lithuania	50	52/57	West Africa	20
4/6	Hungary*	80	29	India	48	52/57	Singapore	20
4/6	Netherlands	80	30	Surinam*	47	52/57	Thailand	20
7	New Zealand	79	31/33	Japan	46	52/57	Bangladesh*	20
8	Italy	76	31/33	Argentina	46	52/57	China*	20
9	Belgium	75	31/33	Morocco*	46	52/57	Vietnam*	20
10	Denmark	74	34	Iran	41	58	Salvador	20
11/12	Sweden	71	35/38	Jamaica	39	59	South Korea	18
11/12	France	71	35/38	Russia*	39	60	Taiwan	17
13	Ireland	70	35/38	Brazil	38	61/62	Peru	16
14	Norway	69	35/38	Arab countries	38	61/62	Trinidad*	16
15	Switzerland	68	39	Turkey	37	63	Costa Rica	15
16	Germany	67	40	Uruguay	36	64/65	Pakistan	14
17	South Africa	65	41	Greece	35	64/65	Indonesia	14
18	Finland	63	42	Philippines	32	66	Columbia	13
19/21	Poland*	60	43/45	Mexico	30	67	Venezuela	12
19/21	Estonia*	60	43/45	Bulgaria*	30	68	Panama	11
19/21	Luxembourg*	60	43/45	Romania*	30	69	Equador	8
22	Malta*	59	46/48	East Africa	27	70	Guatemala	6
23	Czech Rep.*	58	46/48	Yugoslavia	27			
24/25	Austria	55	46/48	Portugal	27			

Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity.

The following tables depict the relative positions on the cultural dimensions of all the countries in Hofstede's database, including Lithuania and recent results for additional countries. Nasierowski and Mikula (1998) recently obtained results for Poland, and Hofstede

(2001) has published the results for 15 additional countries, obtained by various researchers in replication studies. These new countries are indicated with an asterisk (*). Lithuania is highlighted in boldface.

Table 4 depicts Lithuania's ranking on the Individualism dimension in comparison to other countries. We can see that Lithuania ranks about average for

Table 5. Power Distance (PDI) Scores and Rankings for 70 Countries

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Country or region</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Country or region</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Country or region</i>	<i>Index</i>
1/2	Malaysia	104	24/26	France	68	49	Trinidad*	47
1/2	Slovakia*	104	24/26	Hong Kong	68	50	Hungary*	46
3/4	Guatemala	95	27	Columbia	67	51/52	Jamaica	45
3/4	Panama	95	28/29	Salvador	66	51/52	Lithuania	45
5	Philippines	94	28/29	Turkey	66	53/55	USA	40
6	Russia*	93	30	Belgium	65	53/55	Estonia*	40
7	Romania*	90	31/33	East Africa	64	53/55	Luxembourg*	40
8	Surinam*	85	31/33	Peru	64	56	Canada	39
9/10	Mexico	81	31/33	Thailand	64	57	Netherlands	38
9/10	Venezuela	81	34/35	Chile	63	58	Australia	36
11/13	Arab countries	80	34/35	Portugal	63	59/61	Costa Rica	35
11/13	Bangladesh*	80	36	Uruguay	61	59/61	Germany	35
11/13	China*	80	37/38	Greece	60	59/61	Great Britain	35
14/15	Equador	78	37/38	South Korea	60	62	Switzerland	34
14/15	Indonesia	78	39/40	Iran	58	63	Finland	33
16/17	India	77	39/40	Taiwan	58	64/65	Norway	31
16/17	West Africa	77	41/42	Spain	57	64/65	Sweden	31
18	Yugoslavia	76	41/42	Czech Rep.*	57	66	Ireland	28
19	Singapore	74	43	Malta*	56	67	New Zealand	22
20/22	Bulgaria*	70	44	Pakistan	55	67	Denmark	18
20/22	Morocco*	70	45	Japan	54	69	Israel	13
20/22	Vietnam*	70	46	Italy	50	70	Austria	11
23	Brazil	69	47/48	Argentina	49			
24/26	Poland*	68	47/48	South Africa	49			

this dimension (rank 28/70). It is apparent that all of the Anglo countries score the highest on this dimension, followed by Western Europe. The Eastern European countries generally scored medium to medium-high.

Country rankings for Power Distance are depicted in Table 5. Lithuania has a medium power distance, ranking 51/52 out of 70 countries. Again most of the Anglo and Western European countries are clustered together on the low end, while the Eastern and Central European countries fall in the middle. Lithuania resembles Estonia in its position.

Uncertainty Avoidance rankings are displayed in Table 6. We see that Lithuania scores medium high on this dimension (rank 38/39), and is similar to Germany. Again the Anglo and Scandinavian countries score low in this

dimension, while the Latin cluster scores the opposite. The German-speaking countries fall in between, as do most of the Central and Eastern European countries.

The last table of rankings presents scores for the Masculinity dimension. We find that all of the Scandinavian countries are on the very low end of this dimension, and the Anglo countries are on the higher side, as is Lithuania (rank 14). Once again we see that Lithuania scores fairly similarly to Germany.

Conclusions

Because this is the first such study on Lithuanian cultural values, the results open the doors for further cross-cultural studies in virtually all areas of management and marketing. One

Table 6. Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) Scores and Rankings for 70 Countries

Rank	Country or region	Index	Rank	Country or region	Index	Rank	Country or region	Index
1	Greece	112	24/25	Hungary*	82	49	Netherlands	53
2	Portugal	104	26	Israel	81	50	East Africa	52
3	Guatemala	101	27	Columbia	80	51/52	Australia	51
4	Uruguay	100	28/29	Venezuela	76	51/52	Slovakia*	51
5	Malta*	96	28/29	Brazil	76	53	Norway	50
6	Russia*	95	30	Italy	75	54/55	South Africa	49
7/8	Belgium	94	31	Czech Rep.*	74	54/55	New Zealand	49
7/8	Salvador	94	32/34	Pakistan	70	56/57	Indonesia	48
9	Poland*	93	32/34	Austria	70	56/57	Canada	48
10/11	Japan	92	32/34	Luxembourg*	70	58	USA	46
10/11	Surinam*	92	35	Taiwan	69	59	Philippines	44
12	Romania*	90	36/37	Arab countries	68	60	India	40
13	Yugoslavia	88	36/37	Morocco*	68	61	Malaysia	36
14	Peru	87	38/39	Ecuador	67	62/63	Great Britain	35
15/20	France	86	38/39	Lithuania	67	62/63	Ireland	35
15/20	Chile	86	40	Germany	65	64/65	Vietnam*	30
15/20	Spain	86	41	Thailand	64	64/65	China*	30
15/20	Costa Rica	86	42/43	Estonia*	60	66/67	Hong Kong	29
15/20	Panama	86	42/43	Bangladesh*	60	66/67	Sweden	29
15/20	Argentina	86	44/45	Iran	59	68	Denmark	23
21/23	Turkey	85	44/45	Finland	59	69	Jamaica	13
21/23	Bulgaria*	85	46	Switzerland	58	70	Singapore	8
21/23	South Korea	85	47	Trinidad*	55			
24/25	Mexico	82	48	West Africa	54			

study has already been conducted (Mockaitis 2002), in which the effects of culture on attitudes toward management were isolated and found to be quite strong, adding validity to the results presented above as well as to Hofstede's hypotheses regarding the influence of his dimensions on attitudes. However, to date there have been few studies relating cultural values to marketing. This field has only recently begun to increase in interest, and most such studies focus on the effects of culture on consumer behavior and advertising. Some of the implications of culture on these areas will be briefly touched upon below. However, it must be stressed that this discussion is only of a speculative nature, as no studies have yet been conducted to confirm whether culture does

in fact have an effect on these areas in Lithuania.

Individualism (IDV). This dimension has been argued to influence brand positioning (De Mooij 1998b). In highly individualistic cultures, for example, products are positioned as standing out from other brands, and appeals are made to the individual consumer. In collectivist cultures, however, where opinions and social needs are largely determined by the group to which one belongs, we may expect group appeals, as standing out from the crowd is socially undesirable. In fact, De Mooij (1998a) has shown that in highly collectivist cultures, several people (as opposed to one) are featured in advertisements. The same advertisement may receive different reactions, for example, in highly individualistic

Table 7. Masculinity (MAS) Scores and Rankings for 70 Countries

Rank	Country or region	Index	Rank	Country or region	Index	Rank	Country or region	Index
1	Slovakia*	110	24/26	Greece	57	48/50	Romania*	42
2	Japan	95	24/26	Hong Kong	57	48/50	Peru	42
3	Hungary*	88	27/28	Argentina	56	51	East Africa	41
4	Austria	79	27/28	India	56	52/54	Salvador	40
5	Venezuela	73	29	Bangladesh*	55	52/54	Vietnam*	40
6/7	Italy	70	30	Belgium	54	52/54	Bulgaria*	40
6/7	Switzerland	70	31/32	Arab countries	53	55	South Korea	39
8	Mexico	69	31/32	Morocco*	53	56	Uruguay	38
9/10	Ireland	68	33	Canada	52	57/58	Guatemala	37
9/10	Jamaica	68	34/36	Malaysia	50	57/58	Surinam*	37
11/13	Great Britain	66	34/36	Luxembourg*	50	59	Russia*	30
11/13	Germany	66	34/36	Pakistan	50	60	Thailand	34
11/13	China*	66	37	Brazil	49	61	Portugal	31
14	Lithuania	65	38	Singapore	48	62	Estonia*	30
15/17	Philippines	64	39/40	Israel	47	63	Chile	28
15/17	Colombia	64	39/40	Malta*	47	64	Finland	26
15/17	Poland*	64	41/42	Indonesia	46	65/66	Yugoslavia	21
18/19	South Africa	63	41/42	West Africa	46	65/66	Costa Rica	21
18/19	Equador	63	43/44	Turkey	45	67	Denmark	16
20	USA	62	43/44	Taiwan	45	68	Netherlands	14
21	Australia	61	45	Panama	44	69	Norway	8
22/23	Trinidad*	58	46/47	Iran	43	70	Sweden	5
22/23	New Zealand	58	46/47	France	43			
24/26	Czech Rep.*	57	48/50	Spain	42			

Estonia, than in the slightly more collectivist Lithuania.

Power Distance (PDI). Since PDI largely determines how status differences and authority are perceived and accepted, this dimension too may be expected to influence advertising appeals and consumer behavior. In large PDI cultures, visible symbols of status and prestige are more valued. In small PDI societies, on the other hand, individuals try to minimize visible differences in status. What may be seen as a luxury good in small PDI cultures may be viewed as a necessity or a means of attaining respect from peers in large PDI cultures. Marketing strategies should also differ in large vs. small PDI societies. For example, where PDI is large, product differentiation and mar-

ket segmentation may be more necessary than in small PDI societies. Advertisements may also stress special product features, appealing to status and prestige-conscious consumers. Alden et al (1993) found that television advertisements in large PDI societies featured individuals with more status differences between them than in small PDI countries.

Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). Several studies have shown how the UAI dimension influences consumption. De Mooij, for example, found that automobile purchases in 15 European countries depended much more on UAI than on wealth (Hofstede 2001). More uncertainty avoiding cultures, which depend on expert knowledge and value security, tended to prefer new to used cars. This may suggest the

need to stress dependability and warranties in advertising to high UAI societies. On the other hand, Lynn and Gelb (1996) related the purchasing trends of innovative consumer goods to Hofstede's dimensions and found positive correlations with IDV and negative correlations to UAI, indicating that lower UAI societies are more willing to try new or modern products.

Masculinity (MAS). More apparent differences in consumer behavior as relate to this dimension have been exemplified by researchers. Highly MAS cultures stress assertiveness, performance, material success and value fast, big and powerful traits, while feminine societies stress nurturance, harmony, the environment and slow and small traits. As the role of women and men differ depending on the degree of MAS, so too may their roles as consumers differ. In high MAS societies, occupational and salary differences between genders are greater than in low MAS cultures, and men are expected to be assertive, while women nurturing. We may thus expect more gender differentiation in targeting consumers, with "masculine" qualities appealing to men and "feminine" qualities to women. While purchasing may be a matter of necessity in low MAS cultures, in high MAS societies it may be a way of asserting oneself. De Mooij (1998b) found that owning a second automobile served this function, and reported a positive correlation between MAS and second car ownership. Consumers in higher MAS cultures may also prefer larger, more powerful automobiles, as opposed to compact, economy cars in feminine societies. Likewise, environmental consciousness may have more positive effects on sales in low MAS societies. The greatest difference between Lithuanian and Estonian cultural values is seen on this dimension (Table 7), where Estonia scores very low, while Lithuania scores highly masculine. We may expect to find differences between the-

se countries not only in who makes the buying decisions (in the family), but also in the types of products preferred and the characteristics that are seen as important.

It may be useful to conduct similar studies as outlined above in the Baltic countries. It has been seen that large differences exist in cultural values among the Eastern European countries, and between the two Baltic countries, Estonia and Lithuania. These differences, at least between Estonia, Poland and Lithuania, have been shown to largely determine differences in attitudes toward leadership and motivation (Mockaitis 2002). This already leads one to question whether uniform methods, whether they pertain to management or marketing, will be effective in all the countries of the region. Because of the small size of the individual markets of each of the Baltic countries, it is common for marketers to use common advertisements throughout the region, adapting them only insofar as translation to the appropriate languages. Often, these advertisements are also taken directly from other countries. Whether the reaction in a highly feminine country such as Estonia and a highly masculine country as Lithuania to a given advertisement will be equally effective is doubtful. The costs of creating advertisements for each separate market in the Baltic region, of course, outweigh the benefits. Differences, however, should not be ignored. Wherever possible, marketers should attempt to adapt advertisements to the local culture, even if this means simple translation of different available advertisements for the same product best suited to each individual market, instead of identical strategies in all markets. The reactions of consumers toward products and advertisements in the Baltic countries and the influence of culture on advertising effectiveness in these countries are an area that warrants further exploration.

REFERENCES

1. Alden, D., Hoyer, W., and Lee, C. (1993). Identifying Global Culture-Specific Dimensions of Humor in Advertising: A Multinational Analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 57, no. 2: 64–75.
2. Cook, M. et al (10 authors in 5 countries). (1998). Personality Profiles of Managers in Former Soviet Countries: Problem and Remedy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 8: 567–579.
3. De Mooij, M. (1998 a). Global Marketing and Advertising: Understanding Cultural Paradoxes. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
4. De Mooij, M. (1998b). Masculinity / Femininity and Consumer Behavior. In: G.Hofstede et al (eds). *Masculinity and Femininity: The Taboo Dimension of National Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 55–73.
5. Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills, Sage Publications.
6. Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. London, McGraw-Hill International.
7. Hofstede, G. Values Survey Module 1994 Manual. Maastricht, IRIC, University of Limburg.
8. Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
9. Kluckhohn, F and Strodtbeck, F. (1961). Variations in Value Orientations. New York, Row, Peterson and Co.
10. Lynn, M. and Gelb, B. (1996). Identifying Innovative National Markets for Technical Consumer Goods. *International Marketing Review*, vol. 13, no. 6: 43–57.
11. Mockaitis, A. (2002). Lithuanian Value Orientations and their Influence on the Management Attitudes of Organizational Members: A Comparative Study across Three Nations. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Vilnius University.
12. Nasierowski, W. and Mikula, B. (1998). Culture Dimensions of Polish Managers: Hofstede's Indices. *Organization Studies*, vol. 19, nr. 3: 495–509.
13. Schwartz, S. H. (1994). *Beyond Individualism / Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values*. In: U. Kim, H.Triandis et al (eds.). Individualism and Collectivism, Theory, Method and Applications. London, Sage Publications.
14. Triandis, H. C. (1982). *Review of Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. *Human Organization*, 41: 86–90.
15. Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London, Brealey.
16. Usunier, J. C. (1998). *International and Cross-Cultural Management Research*. London, Sage Publications.
17. Usunier, J. C. (2000). *Marketing across Cultures*. London, Pearson Education.

LIETUVOS NACIONALINĖS KULTŪROS DIMENSIJOS

Audra I. Mockaitis

Santrauka

Straipsnyje pateikiami Lietuvos tyrimo rezultatai remiantis G. Hofstedes nacionalinių kultūros dimensijų metodologija. Pateikiama Lietuvos santykinė pozicija tarp septyniadsesimties šalių pagal individualizmo, hierarchiškumo, netikrumo vengimo bei vyriškumo dimensijas. Lietuvos pozicija pagal individualizmo dimensiją vidutiniškai aukšta ir šiek tiek žemesnė, palyginti su artimiausių šalių kaimynių Lenkijos ir Estijos. Hierarchiškumas Lietuvoje santykinai žemas, panašus

į JAV ir Estijos, Lenkijoje – vidutiniškai aukštas, Rusijoje – labai aukštas. Lietuvos netikrumo vengimo dimensijos pozicija vidutiniškai žema, panašiai kaip ir Estijos, o Lenkijos ir Rusijos – labai aukšta. Lietuvos ir Lenkijos vyriškumo rodiklis santykinai aukštas, Estijos labai žemas, panašiai kaip ir Skandinavijos šalių. Aptariamos šių dimensijų taikymo galimybės marketingo srityje ir tikėtini Baltijos šalių marketingo praktikos skirtumai.