Convergences of the Romanian societal culture with European culture clusters in the process of European integration. The role of intercultural teams management in increasing European cohesion

Bibu, Nicolae Aurelian and Brancu, Laura

West University Timisoara (Romania), Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Management Department

23 February 2008

Convergences of the Romanian societal culture with European culture clusters in the process of European integration. The role of intercultural teams management in increasing European cohesion

Prof. Nicolae Bibu, Ph.D., lect. Laura Brancu, Ph.D.
West University Timişoara
Romania

Abstract

This paper is discussing the issue of European cohesion based on a management approach. It describes the positioning of Romania on the European map of cultures, in order to identify the convergence and divergence of its societal culture with various European cultural clusters. The paper is arguing that: a) European organizations have a major role to play in the process of increasing cohesion within the European Union; b) Organizational Management and leadership are paramount to their success and to society welfare; c) Performant Intercultural Knowledge Management is needed for achieving the most out of European organizations; d) Intercultural teams are one of the most effective ways to reduce the current cohesion-less of EU at individual and organizational level.

"We regard our **wealth of cultures, languages and traditions as a precious gift** from the past to be cherished and preserved. We regard the Union's increasing diversity as an asset, not as a threat or a problem. The fundamental challenge of our process of integration is in fact how to preserve distinct cultural identities while developing a multicultural society."
Jan Figel, EU commissioner for Education,Training, Culture and Youth (2006)

There is a need for more cohesion at various levels of integration, such as European Union level. Cohesion is **the feature** of a whole system which has all the component subsystems closely united (Larousse, 2004). Cohesion is mostly considered a **result** of an action, process. It is also an important **characteristic of the structure** of the system.
Cohesion is defined as "The **act or process** of holding together firmly as parts of the same mass, of adhering one to each other, and of becoming united in ideas or interests", too. (Longman Dictionary, 1995).

Cohesion is **multiple foundations-based**, such as categories **of links** between component subsystems of society/organization: technological, social, managerial, economical, legal, political, and cultural.

The **opposite of cohesion is cohesion-less,** in which the links between subsystems are quite weak.

However, the links should be strong enough to allow the system to exist and function as a whole.

Increasing cohesion means actually **less lack of cohesion.** More cohesion means a stronger link between components of the system that is more bonding, increased stickiness, less heterogeneity.

EU cohesion is stronger at macro level, societal level: institutional, political, and economical. EU cohesion is less strong at micro level that is people level, the common individual, the citizen. In other words, EU system has less cohesion at the level of individual and social fabric.

There are many barriers to cohesion due to divergence on interests, to cultural differences, and to historical factors. There are several types of cohesion based on the criteria of nature of factors considered. The one that will be discussed here will be the cultural factor, which has been longtime considered to be a second degree factor by the politicians and founders of European Union. There are strong arguments that the process of building the European Union, in the historical context of the 1950's in Europe and in the world, was very pragmatic, starting at macro-economic level. Hard systems such these are easier to build and reap positive outcomes as compared to soft systems, such as socio-cultural.

The GLOBE studies findings point out that there is **not a single typically European culture for Europe as a whole.** (House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (eds.) ,2004) **Also, Geert Hofstede (2002) reached the same conclusion. Basically, there are two main parts of Europe**: first component is North Western Europe from Great Britain to Austria, and the second part is South Eastern Europe from Spain to Georgia, through Central Europe (Koopman, Den Hartog, Konrad, e.a., 1999). The next level of differentiation indicates the existence of European cultural clusters, grouping countries based on cultural proximity. These are the following Anglo cluster, Eastern Europe, German Europe, Latin Europe, Nordic Europe.

An interesting hypothesis about it is that **every new enlargement of European union is a collective cultural shock** for the citizen of EU. Gerhard Fink and Nigel Holden point out that Central and Eastern European countries experienced a collective cultural shock after the collapse of the communism in their respective countries (2002). It took EU member states several years to understand it and adopt the strategy of integration into EU in order to avoid the strategy of marginalization of these former communist countries. The 10 new countries becoming members of EU in May 2004 hadn't been absorbed yet. Romania and Bulgaria new members beginning on January 1st 2007 are just at the beginning. In conclusion, The European union citizens were subject to a constant flow of "cultural shocks", following each new enlargement of the European Union through admission of new member states.

On the other hand, there has been several "enlargements" trough immigration from all over Europe, and all over the world, mostly from Africa and Arabian countries.

These immigrations waves from new member countries have preceded their country accession, and to various extents, have made a first impact on the host countries culture.

We point out also that economic cooperation, local government cooperation, nongovernmental organizations cooperation have had a significant impact on increasing cultural awareness of people from various European cultures. People doing together all kind of activities, aiming at various outcomes, in various forms, is one of the most important ways of improving European cohesiveness al social and cultural level. It is accepted that there is no way for assimilation of people into the host country culture, or into a European culture, that does not exist, yet.

In the book The Enlarged European Union: Unity and Diversity, (coeditors Mair and Zielonka, 2007) restate the fact that "the European Union will be a much more diversified entity after the forthcoming eastward enlargement." The essays from the volume are trying to identify answers to "How much divergence is likely to be imported by the Union and will it hamper the process of European integration?"

A first conclusion of their book is that the map of convergence and divergence in the future EU will be very complex and will not correspond exactly with the old east-west divide. The same results are sustained by the results of (Bibu, Petrisor, et a. 2007) regarding the convergence of Romanian societal culture towards Eastern Europe cluster and Latin Europe cluster. We agree with their second conclusion that "the division lines are constantly changing with the enlargement process representing an important factor pushing individual states into a single regulatory frame, if not in a common political direction." Once again, this is representing a system and structural integration, of a "hard type". It is just a first step in the process of EU integration. Thirdly, Mair and Zielonka (2007) consider that "there are other "unifying" factors at play: globalization produces different models and loyalties than Europeanization. Moreover, the European pulling effect works unevenly in different functional fields and in different countries." Results of our analysis of convergence of Romanian societal culture indicates that at values level the Anglo American cluster is closer than German and Nordic cluster values. We consider it an intriguing result, explainable also through the effects of globalization on Romania.

The societal culture profile for Romania is discussed based on the GLOBE model of culture. The model has 9 cultural variables: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Institutional Collectivism, In-Group Collectivism, Gender Egalitarianism, Assertiveness, Humane Orientation, Performance Orientation and Future Orientation (House, R. J. and others (eds.), 2004). It uses some of the main findings of the research GLOBE[1] Project Romania. This project was carried out by a consortia cooperation of 12 Universities from different regions of Romania in 2006. Analysis is based on: 362 questionnaires on societal culture (national culture - Beta version).

The research methodology was identical with the methodology recommended by House, R.J. (House, R. J. and others (eds.), 2004).

The Romanian culture profile for societal practices is shown in Table 1. The maximum score is 7, while the minimum score is 1. Romania's societal practices in absolute measures are rated as high on Power Distance (5.63), In-Group Collectivism (5.43), and Gender egalitarianism - 3,88,it has low ratings on Uncertainty avoidance (3.66), Performance orientation (3.51), Future orientation (3.33), Institutional

---

[1] GLOBE – Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness

collectivism - 3,75, , Humane orientation - 4.09. One cultural dimension Assertiveness - 4,14 is rated in the mid-range. Subsequently, Romania is distinguished as having high power distance (hierarchical), highly group oriented (cohesive in closer communities), but societal practices encouraging individualism, and aggressiveness in social relationships, tolerating uncertainty, being very low on performance orientation and focusing on the present, rather than the future. (Bibu, Petrisor, et a., 2007)

Table 1: Romanian societal practice scores (n=355)

GLOBE Societal practice variables	N	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank in GLOBE	Band
Power Distance	**355**	**3.4**	**7.00**	**5.6263**	**.8079**	**6th**	**A(highest)**
Uncertainty Avoidance	*355*	*1.0*	*6.25*	*3.6601*	*.9601*	*46th*	*C (relatively low)*
Institutional Collectivism	*355*	*1.5*	*5.75*	*3.7484*	*.8481*	*54th*	*C(relatively low)*
In-Group Collectivism	**355**	**2.6**	**7.00**	**5.4322**	**.8025**	**31st**	**A(highest)**
Gender Egalitarian	**355**	**1.6**	**5.80**	**3.8815**	**.7085**	**7th**	**A(highest)**
Assertiveness	355	1.5	6.75	4.1396	.8160	32nd	B (middle)
Humane Orientation	*355*	*1.0*	*7.00*	*4.0938*	*.9343*	*31st*	*C (relatively low)*
Performance	*355*	*1.0*	*7.00*	*3.5080*	*1.0719*	*56th*	*C (lowest)*
Future Orientation	*355*	*1.0*	*5.60*	*5.5605*	*.8755*	*53rd*	*C (relatively low)*

Romania's societal values are shown in Table 2 as means. In absolute measures they are rated high ratings on Uncertainty Avoidance (score 5,39), Assertiveness – (score 4,53), high In-Group Collectivism (score 6,12), relatively high Institutional Collectivism(score 4,98), Gender Egalitarianism – (score 4,63), Future Orientation (score 5,56); as medium on Power Distance (score 2,78), and it has relatively low ratings for Humane Orientation – (score 5,30) and among the lowest Performance Orientation (score 4,92). (Bibu, Petrisor, et a., 2007) Consequently, Romania is distinguished as preferring low power distance (less hierarchical), highly group oriented (cohesive in closer communities), having societal practices to encourage and reward collectivism, and encouraging high aggressiveness in social relationships, strong desire for more certainty, low on performance orientation and focusing on the future, rather than the present.

Table 2: Romanian societal values scores (n=354)

GLOBE Societal values variables	N	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank in GLOBE 62	Band
Power Distance	354	1.00	5.20	2.7771	0.8835	22nd	C (medium)
Uncertainty Avoidance	**354**	**2.75**	**7.00**	**5.3922**	**0.8390**	**3rd**	**A (highest)**
Institutional Collectivism	353	2.50	7.00	4.9773	0.8673	23rd	B (relatively high)
In-Group Collectivism	**353**	**3.25**	**7.00**	**6.1223**	**0.8051**	**9th**	**A (highest)**
Gender Egalitarianism	353	2.40	6.20	4.6285	0.6840	30th	B (relatively high)
Assertiveness	**353**			**4.5300**	**0.9000**	**11th**	**A (highest)**
Humane Orientation	*353*	*3.00*	*7.00*	*5.2958*	*0.7327*	*42nd*	*C (relatively low)*
Performance Orientation	*353*	*2.50*	*6.33*	*4.9240*	*0.6008*	*60th*	*E (lowest)*
Future Orientation	354	2.75	7.00	5.5605	0.8904	30th	B (relatively high)

4

A comparison of the societal culture practices and values variables for Romania with European clusters such as the Eastern European (EE) cluster (Bakacs et al., 2002), Latin European (LE) cluster (Jesuino J, (2002), Germanic Europe (GE) cluster (Szabo E.et al., 2002), Nordic Europe cluster and Anglo cluster (Askhanazi et al.,2002) and with world average scores. Data is presented in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

"Westernization" means for Romania, (Bibu, Petrisor, e.a., 2007) an evolution towards LE cluster, or GE cluster, or Nordic European cluster or Anglo cluster, as they are defined by Gupta, Hanges & Dorfman in (House et al., 2004). These clusters cover countries from Europe and North America, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa White population, and represent what is usually considered as the Western World. They used the Proximity matrix and Euclidian distance to analyze the data.

Proximity Matrix indicates the degree of similarity between Romania and each of the considered clusters. Their result for societal culture practices, 0,931239, indicates a very strong similarity to EE cluster, and a less strong one to LE cluster (0.848702). Their result for societal culture values, 0.863953 indicates also a strong similarity to EE cluster, however smaller than in the previous case, while for LE cluster it is (0.826215). This indicates that Romanian societal culture at values level is differentiating from EE cluster and to a lesser extent from LE cluster, too.

Subsequently, the divergence from EE cluster is greater than the divergence from LE cluster in the case of societal values. The conclusion is that Romanian managers would like their societal culture to evolve from EE cluster towards LE cluster and also towards the Anglo cluster, as the third in line (score 0.462425). The difference between Anglo cluster and Romania is reducing dramatically at values level (score 0.764644). We agree with (Bibu, Petrisor, e.a., 2007) that it is a surprising result for Romanian societal culture, since it indicates that an old eastern European culture is wishing to adopt the Anglo-American model. Their explanations are: first, the strong influence of American culture in Romania, second, the intensive transfers of business and management know-how through US and global multinationals active in Romania, and also through business and management schools, and third, a fascination of Romanian people with America. Finally, we appreciate that it should be considered also as a part of a specific response of Romanians to the process of globalization lead by American companies.

The main conclusion is that the societal culture is changing more slowly at societal practice level is different than the societal values level. The societal practices level is still quite similar to the Eastern European cluster as described by Bakacs (Bakacs et. al., 2002), and the societal values are partially moving from the Eastern European cluster towards the Latin Europe cluster and also towards the Anglo cluster. It has to be noticed that the EE cluster is changing itself, meaning that countries belonging to it are changing to some extent towards a more westernized type of culture.

EE Cluster societal practices are characterized by tolerating uncertainty, highly group cohesion, hierarchical and gender egalitarian that is also the main profile of Romanian societal practices. EE cluster's societal values is characterized by much more performance, future oriented, humane, lower level of power differentiation, a higher level of structure (uncertainty avoidance), and a higher level of gender egalitarianism. The profile of Romanian societal values is quite similar to EE scores, with the exception of

"Assertiveness", where Romania scores much higher than EE average score, and "Performance Orientation" where the score is much lower. Other cultural researches (Hofstede, 2002), (Bibu, 2000) indicated high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, collectivism and feminine type of culture, that is common to CEE countries, in Hofstede model, with individualism stronger in Central European countries.

The main explanation resides in the fact that Romania belongs to Central and Eastern Europe, sharing many of its history, geography, civilization, religion and culture. There are two main distinctions: first, the Latin character of Romanian language, unique in the region. The second distinction is the predominance of Christian Orthodox religion, due to the early adoption of the Christian faith, in the first century AD, and the consequent belonging to the Orthodox Church, and little adoption of Catholicism, or protestant religion. Several historians and researcher, Romanian and other, consider that Latin-based language and Christian Orthodox religion contributed decisively to preserving by Romanian language speaking population of its distinct identity, in spite of the fact that for centuries they lived divided in three main political entities: Moldova, Walachia, and Transylvania. The political unification process happened between 1859, when Moldavia united with Walachia, and 1918, when Transylvania and other Romanian provinces, united to Romania and formed the Kingdom of Romania. The Romanian state is quite young, but the common civilization of Romanians, and subsequently, their culture, is two millenniums old. An excellent description is that "Romania is an island of Latinity in a Slavic sea", while being the only Latin Orthodox country in the world.

Romanian managers are aware of the cultural differences between Romania and European clusters as a reference basis. Therefore, their aspirations are related to LE cluster and to Anglo-Saxon cluster than the perceived existing culture.

We agree that Romania is in the process of westernization of its institutions and its societal culture. (Bibu, Petrisor, e.a., 2007)

We conclude that Romanian societal culture is converging at societal practices level with Eastern European cluster as defined by GLOBE research, while being very different as compared to Nordic Europe.

The GLOBE research also pointed out that there are several European cultural clusters and for the current period there is no common European culture. Diversity exists in Europe, and it will exist for some time in the future, as the societal values level indicates.

It has to be noted that there is a convergence between European clusters at values level. The European clusters common features are: reduced power distance actually very low, increased in group collectivism to a very high level, increased humane orientation to a high level, increased performance orientation to a very high level, (exception is Romania), increased Future orientation to a high level, increased gender egalitarianism to a medium to high level, increased Institutional collectivism, with exception of Nordic Europe. For the other two dimensions: Assertiveness level is decreasing remaining still in the medium range, exception is Eastern Europe and Romania where it is highly increasing; Uncertainty Avoidance where Eastern Europe and to a slighter level , Latin Europe, desire more of it, while the rest of Europe want less of it.

The preferred solution by European Union Commission is summed up in the axiom "Unity in diversity". Unity in diversity could become a major source and factor of progress, once it is acknowledged by more and more Europeans as desirable and positive.

The real challenges for the future, as expressed by commissioner Fiegel, "are about sharing a space, finding better ways to live together, helping each other build our common future … because they address the issues of social cohesion and inclusion, of solidarity and peace, of a positive impact of the EU on the world scene. They address the core reasons that **keep us together**." (2006)

The leaders of the European Union are realizing that winning hearts and minds of European citizens is of main importance. They need to address the "Soul" of Europeans. The return to <u>cultural</u> and political values in Europe will avoid confusing means and ends. Europe's most spectacular achievements are tangible: the internal market, the Euro, the agricultural policy. These are means to achieve a more cohesive and integrated European Union. However, these things touch only the minds of EU citizens, not their hearts. As **Jacques Delors**, a former President of the European Commission, said: **"You can't fall in love with the single market.** We need to **bring Europe**—its values, its debates and its policies—**closer to the citizen."**

The most important way is intercultural dialogue between Europeans. Recognising Europe's **<u>cultural diversity</u>** lies at the foundation of the European Union Commission's idea of intercultural dialogue. The European Union's increasing diversity is considered to represent an asset, not a threat or a problem. It is clearly stated that "the fundamental challenge of our process of [European Union] integration is in fact how to preserve distinct cultural identities while developing a multicultural society." (Figel, 2006)

Based on the above, we consider that we need to find answers to the following question: How to **act to increase cohesion** in Europe at people and organizational level?

Our proposals to find answers to the above question are from a management point of view, based on the following assumptions:

1**. European organizations have a major role to play in the process of increasing cohesion**

2. Organizational M**anagement and leadership are paramount to their success and to society welfare**

3. Performant Intercultural Knowledge Management is needed for achieving the most out of European organizations.

4. Intercultural teams are one of the most effective ways to reduce the current cohesion-less of EU at individual and organizational level. **(Bibu, 2005)**

We want to emphasize that organizational level cohesion is desirable for each organization in order to increase its performance. Consequently, it is desirable for European organizations in their quest for achieving competitiveness at global level.

European organizations are organizations that do business (**for profit** organizations) or perform activities (**not for profit**) in more than two European countries (Bibu, 2005). That is quite an encompassing definition; however, we consider it to be an adequate one. The first reason for it is that doing business or perform activities in at least two European countries means that is not anymore a national organization. It is an international organization and subject to the practices of intercultural management. The second reason is that people from at least two more or less similar cultures are working together in the same organization and/or project, and that they have at least a common goal that is the goal of the organization and/or of the project. So, they have a possibility

to get in touch with one other, to work together, to cooperate, under the same management.

By extension, we could include in this category **several types of alliances** between national/international organizations, such as: partnerships, strategic alliances, networks, joint-ventures

Organizations, as socio- technical systems, **achieve cohesion** in several ways, such as:

a) Convergence of interests of shareholders, in case of companies

b) Convergence of interests of various groups of stakeholders

c) Shared ideas, values, purpose, meaning

d) Strong organizational culture,

e) formal power structure and informal structure,

f) process structure: technical, financial.

My hypothesis is that European organizations are **one of the most suited means to increase cohesion** in Europe. Why?

First, is because people from various countries have the opportunity to **work together** towards achievement of common organizational purposes, as mentioned above.

Second, the **setting is organized**, is structured and is able to allocate resources to the process of working towards reaching common organizational goals.

Third, there is a **primary quest** for cohesion at organizational level, between subsystems that can be managed towards achieving common goals.

Increasing cohesion at individual level is desirable and also possible **through the creation and development of European organizations.** European organizations are using several management methods, instruments for ensuring an increased level of interaction and cooperation among **their employees**, **coming from various countries, cultures. Thus, European union should increase its support for sustaining, financing, developing various forms on cross european coperation, and to support intercultural dialogue at organizational and people level.**

An initiative is the 2008 <u>European Year of Intercultural Dialogue</u> that is attempting to get European **Union members to talk to each other**, involving especially the civil society and the countries that joined in 2004. **S**econd, it is opening avenues for **dialogue between the Union and the rest of the world**, because history teaches us that international relations work best when there is a deep understanding of the culture, the motives, and the aspirations of the other.

A powerful managerial instrument are teams. European organizations are making large use of **groups and teams**. **Groups and teams are the level of integration for individuals, while the organization is the level of integration for groups and teams.** Consequently, increased cohesion at individual level is done through **increasing cohesion of groups and teams. T**hat leads to the task of increasing cohesion of the organization **through management of groups and teams,** using organizational culture as an adhesive.

Intercultural team is a team whose members belong to several national cultures, at least two (three). Usually, they are called international teams, too. A intercultural team is a much **more complex** version of a team when compared to a national team. They are

the most appropriate organizational form **currently existing** to make the best use of new technologies and of the knowledge, competencies and creativity of people from various cultures.

Teams are organized networks supporting the organization's mission, goals and strategy through creating, acquiring and transferring knowledge. There are new kinds of intercultural forms of teams such as inter**cultural project teams** evolving towards becoming "project teams-based organizations". There is also a shift from traditional model of building cross-cultural teams to improved models of **building multicultural virtual teams for knowledge** creation.

Multicultural teams are diverse and hence their potential for creativity is higher than culturally homogenous teams. To maximize its use through synergistic effects, team members should be encouraged and supported to create common solutions in a collaborative manner to achieve their task effectively and efficiently.

Intercultural Knowledge management IKM is the collaborative knowledge creation, knowledge sharing and organizational learning that happens in an intercultural organizational setting, such as an international organization, international team or. or among international organizations. It involves individuals belonging to various cultures, national cultures mainly, working collectively, face to face or virtual, to achieve a common purpose.

Intercultural Knowledge Management principles in teams are the following:

1.Knowledge originates and resides in people's minds.

2. Teams are well suited to extract knowledge from minds of members,

3. Maximizing explicit knowledge could be a measure of highly performing teams.

4. The creation, sharing and transfer of intercultural know-how through participative competence is the **key to reach high performance** in intercultural teams, in addition to all the other factors specific to homogenous teams.

5. Information Technology is well placed **to support** this process, if well designed and used.

6. Technology enables Intercultural Knowledge Management IKM. When "technology" is associated with new forms of "organization" that fit to each other and both are fine tuned to "people", than that organization is in harmony and fit for performing at high level according to the anthropocentric model of organizations, "People-Organization-Technology"-**POT model of organizations** (Danaiata, Bibu and Prediscan, 2002) **.**

Our final conclusions are the following:

1. Intercultural teams using modern information technology, including IKM Portals are one of the **modern forms of work organization** for knowledge creation, sharing and using within an organization, and among different organizations

2. In order to increase their cohesion, and to contribute to the increase of European Union cohesion, European organizations **should use highly performing intercultural teams, learn to amplify the potential existing in diversity in order to increase unity.**

3. European organizations **should use modern technology and modern forms of knowledge creation, sharing and using co-creatively, such as Knowledge**

9

management Support Systems, mainly Intercultural Knowledge Management Portal, (Brandas, 2003),(Bibu, Brandas, 2004)

APPENDIX 1

Comparison between Romania and other clusters

Societal Variable	Romania	Eastern Europe	Latin Europe	German Europe	Nordic Europe	Anglo culture	World average
As is (Practices)							
1. Power Distance	5.63	5.25	5.21	4.95	4.54	4.97	5.17
2. Uncertainty Avoidance	3.66	3.57	4.18	5.12	5.19	4.42	4.16
3. Institutional Collectivism	3.75	4.08	4.01	4.03	4.88	4.46	4.25
4. In group Collectivism	5.43	5.53	4.80	4.21	3.75	4.30	5.13
5. Gender Egalitarianism	3.88	3.84	3.36	3.14	3.71	3.40	3.37
6. Assertiveness	4.14	3.51	3.99	4.55	3.66	4.14	4.14
7. Humane Orientation	4.09	3.84	3.71	3.55	4.17	4.20	4.09
8. Performance Orientation	3.51	3.71	3.94	4.41	3.92	4.37	4.10
9. Future Orientation	3.33	3.37	3.68	4.40	4.36	4.08	3.85
Should be (Values)							
1. Power Distance	2.78	2.84	2.57	2.51	2.55	2.86	2.75
2. Uncertainty Avoidance	5.39	4.93	4.36	3.46	3.76	4.09	4.62
3. Institutional Collectivism	4.98	4.33	4.84	4.69	4.08	4.32	4.72
4. In group Collectivism	6.12	5.56	5.66	5.16	5.65	5.84	5.66
5. Gender Egalitarianism	4.63	4.46	4.77	4.91	4.82	4.90	4.51
6. Assertiveness	4.53	3.88	3.72	3.07	3.56	3.89	3.82
7. Humane Orientation	5.30	5.41	5.58	5.48	5.64	5.40	5.42
8. Performance Orientation	4.92	5.81	5.94	5.90	5.84	6.03	5.94
9. Future Orientation	5.56	5.37	5.33	5.01	4.76	5.33	5.48

APPENDIX 2

The gap between Romanian and various clusters at societal culture level

Societal Variable	Ro / EE	Ro / LE	Ro/ GE	Ro / Nordic	Ro / AC	Minim Distance	Maxim Distance	Ro / World score
As is (Practices)								
1. Power Distance	0.38	0.42	0.68	1.09	0.66	EE	NE	0.46
2. Uncertainty Avoidance	0.09	-0.52	-1.46	-1.53	-0.76	EE	NE	-0.50
3. Institutional Collectivism	-0.33	-0.26	-0.28	-1.13	-0.71	LE	NE	-0.50
4. In group Collectivism	-0.10	0.63	1.22	1.68	1.13	EE	NE	0.30
5. Gender Egalitarianism	0.04	0.52	0.74	0.17	0.48	EE	GE	0.51
6. Assertiveness	0.63	0.15	-0.41	0.48	0	AC	EE	0.00
7. Humane Orientation	0.25	0.38	0.54	-0.08	-0.11	NE	GE	0.00
8. Performance Orientation	-0.20	0.43	0.90	0.41	0.86	EE	GE	-0.59
9. Future Orientation	-0.04	-0.35	-1.07	-1.03	-0.75	EE	GE	-0.52
Should be (Values)								
1. Power Distance	-0.06	0.21	0.27	0.23	-0.08	EE	GE	0.03
2. Uncertainty Avoidance	0.46	1.03	1.93	1.63	1.30	EE	GE	0.77
3. Institutional Collectivism	0.65	0.14	0.29	0.90	0.66	LE	NE	0.26
4. In group Collectivism	0.56	0.46	0.96	0.47	0.28	AC	GE	-1.02
5. Gender Egalitarianism	0.17	-0.14	-0.28	-0.19	-0.27	LE	GE	0.46
6. Assertiveness	0.65	0.81	1.46	0.97	0.64	AC/EE	GE	0.71
7. Humane Orientation	-0.11	-0.28	-0.18	-0.34	-0.10	AC/EE	NE	-0.12
8. Performance Orientation	-0.89	-1.02	-0.98	-0.92	-1.11	EE	AC	-1.02
9. Future Orientation	0.19	0.23	0.55	0.80	0.23	EE	NE	0.08

References

Ashkanasy, N., Trevor-Roberts E., Earnshaw L., (2002). The Anglo Cluster: Legacy of the British Empire, Journal of World Business 37, page 28-39

Bakacsi G., Takacs S., Karacsonyi A., Imrek V., (2002). Eastern European cluster: Tradition and transition, Journal of World Business 37, page 69-80

Bakacsi, Gy.(2005) Culture: Asset or Liability? in: Bota, Anton Florin (ed.), Integration and Globalization. Vol. 1. Piteşti, pp: 35-44.

Bakacsi, Gy.: Leadership and cultural variation. (2005), in: Gică, loan Adriana (ed.): The Impact of European Integration on the National Economy. The Proceedings of the International Conference, Cluj-Napoca, pp.248-256.

Bibu, N. , Petrisor, I., Ionescu Gh. Gh., Cazan, E., Bizoi, G., Saratean, E., Vlad S. (2007): Romanian Societal Culture: a Culture towards Westernization?, Proceedings of the VIII East West Forum, Chemnitz, Germany

Bibu, N. (2007): The role of performant teams in intercultural knowledge management, 9th International Symposium in Management, Timisoara, Romania

Bibu, N., (2005): Managing European intercultural teams and their role for increasing eu cohesion at people and organizational level , 8th International Symposium in Management, Timisoara, Romania

Bibu, N: (2000): Comparative Management. The cultural approach, Mirton Publishing House, Romania, pp.9-10.

Bibu, N., Brandas, C. (2004): The Role of Knowledge Management Support Systems in the Intercultural Teams Knowledge Management, Information Systems in E-Business and E-Government Conference, EMISA 2004, Luxembourg, 6-9 October.

Brandas, Cl. (2003): Intercultural Knowledge Management Support Systems, Paper presented at InterKnow – EuroWorkshop II, Regensburg, Germany

Danaiata, I, Bibu, N., Prediscan M, (2002): Management. Bazele teoretice, Timisoara, Mirton Publisher

Catana Doina, Catana Alexandru. (1996): Aspects of transformation of corporate cultures in Romania, Wandel von Unternehmenskulturen in Ostdeutschland und Osteuropa, Vergal, pp.195-208

Figel, J. (2006): Unity and Diversity: Europe's Approaches to Culture and Languages, Speech at Georgetown University Washington, DC, 7 February 2006, http://www.eurunion.org/News/speeches/2006/060207jf.htm

Fink, G, Holden, N (2002): Collective culture shock: contrastive reactions to radical systemic change, IEF Working Paper Nr. 45, October 2002, Vienna, Austria, http://www.wu-wien.ac.at/europainstitut/pub/workingpaper/wp45

Gupta, V., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002): Cultural clusters: Methodology and findings. Journal of World Business, Vol. 37, No. 1. pp. 11-15.

Hanges, P.J. - Dickson, M.W. - Sipe, M.T. (2004): Rational for GLOBE Statistical analysis. Societal Rankings and Test of Hypothesis. (in: House et al, 2004. pp. 219-221.

Hofstede, G (1993): Cultural constraints in management theories. Academy of Management Executive. Vol. 7, No.1. pp: 81-93.

Hofstede, G., (2001): Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organizations across nations, Sage: Thousand Oaks, California

House, R. J. - Hanges, P. J. - Javidan, M. - Dorfman, P. W. - Gupta, V. (eds.) (2004): Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies, (Vol. 1), 2004. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., (2003): Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: an introduction to project Globe, Journal of World Business 37, page 3-10

Jesuino J., (2002): Latin Europe cluster: from South to North, Journal of World Business 37, page 81-89

Ong, A. (1999): Flexible Citizenship, The Cultural Logics of Transnationality, Durham & London: Duke University Press

Petrisor, I. (2007): Strategic Management. The Potentiological Approach, Brumar Press, Timisoara

Szabo E., Brodbeck F., Hartog D., Reber G., Weibler J., Wunderer R., (2002): The Germanic Europe Cluster: where employees have a voice, Journal of World Business 37, page 55-68

Longman Dictionary: Merriam-Webster, inc. and Longman group limited, 1995

Le Petit Larousse Illustre: Paris, ed. 2004