

UDC [316.722:005.5](497.2)

M. Bakardzhieva,

PhD (Economics),

D. A. Tsenov Academy of Economics – Svishtov, Bulgaria

BEHAVIOUR OF MANAGERS AND MANAGEES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PECULIARITIES OF BULGARIAN NATIONAL CULTURE

Introduction

Studying and comparing a great number of national cultures today is completely possible as there are two ways of presenting visually the common and different things between them: typologizing and measuring. The present elaboration deals with the second one, following Geert Hofstede's model. The aim is to present the Bulgarian national culture according to the five dimensions included in this model, to reveal its peculiarities and on this basis to determine the group of which countries it falls into, to project these peculiarities on the behaviour of managers and managees and to find out the influence which the national culture has on it and on the organizational culture in typically Bulgarian organizations.

1. Typologizing and measuring of cultures

Studying and comparing a great number of national cultures all over the world today is completely possible as there are ways of presenting visually the common and different things between them. There are two ways: typologizing of cultures and measuring. In both ways the cultures which have something in common fall in one group.

In typologizing cultures are grouped in a small number of ideal types by using different criteria. Typologization is easy to adopt but it creates problems in empirical research as the real cases rarely correspond completely to one ideal type. Most cases are mixed and rules for their classification in separate groups have to be worked out. Nevertheless, this way of culture grouping has its adherents. Of practical value is culture typologization by the criteria: *way of gathering information and time organization*. These criteria involve the names of famous anthropologists: Edward Hall, Richard Lewis and Henry Gilbert¹.

Different *manifestations of culture which can be measured in comparing with other cultures* are used in *the measuring of cultures*. One manifestation, respectively dimension, combines several phenomena in a society, which are empirically proved to occur together. In their totality the measurements form a model of cultural

dimensions. We will present Geert Hofstede's five dimensions model². The first four dimensions are formulated by him on the basis of the main problem spheres common for the whole world and discovered by the sociologist Alex Inkels and the psychologist Daniel Levinson 20 years ago. Geert Hofstede defines these spheres as power distance, individualism against collectivism, femininity against masculinity and uncertainty avoidance. Hofstede borrowed (as he puts it) the fifth dimension (long-term against short term orientation) from Michael Harris Bond – a Canadian, who has been living for many years in the Far East and describes the peculiarities of the Far East cultures³.

Practically, typologies and multi-dimensional models can be viewed as mutually complementing. The typological approach is often used in explaining the particular dimensions. This is what Geert Hofstede himself does. For any of the five dimensions he describes two poles, which he views as ideal types.

2. Measuring of the national cultures according to Geert Hofstede

According to G. Hofstede, as we have already stated, the national cultures can be compared according to five dimensions. In their totality they make *five dimensions model* which describes and explains the national differences. *It is considered to be the most reliable model of cultural dimensions*. Created at the beginning of the 1980s it is constantly being renewed. For the purposes of his study G. Hofstede compares only IBM employees working in its branches all over the world. His explanation of this choice is that you cannot compare a Frenchman working for Coca Cola with a Greek working for ING Bank, because part of the differences between them can be due not to the national but to the organizational culture. For the same reason you cannot compare people belonging to one and the same national culture (employees, students, pensioners, etc.), as the differences between them can be due to the position they have in society. *The only way to compare cultures is to examine comparable quantities which differ mainly according to one indicator (national*

¹ For details see **Bakardzhieva, M.** Polikulturnostta i umeniето za efektivna mezhdukulturna komunikatsiya kato tsennosti na savremenniya menidzhmant. // Biblioteka Obrazovanie i nauka, D.A.Tsenov Academy of Economics - Svishtov, 2, 2012, pp. 38 – 43.

² See **Hofstede, G.** Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Sofia, 2001, pp. 16 – 19.

³ This dimension is also called „Confucian dynamism” and covers cultural values, included in Confucianism.

culture). Of course, in that case there could be distortion of data because of age and other differences, which should also be taken into account where possible.

Here are the dimensions⁴: 1) *power distance* (measures the degree to which the weaker members of institutions and organizations in a country expect and accept the unequal distribution in society); 2) *individualism – collectivism* (measures the degree to which society prefers the weaker commitment between members); 3) *masculinity – femininity* (measures the degree to which society prefers male values when there are clearly defined social roles between genders); 4) *uncertainty avoidance* (measures the degree to which society members feel threatened or uncertain in unfamiliar situations); 5) *long-term – short-term orientation* (measures the degree to which society thinks in a long-term perspective).

G. Hofstede explains⁵, that *the five dimensions can be used in describing and comparing only of nations (and ethnical groups), as only they represent integrated social systems*. Gender, generation and class, according to the theory of the six cultural layers⁶, are only part of the social systems (a category of people and not groups) and therefore all dimensions cannot be applied to them. The culture of gender, generations and classes must be described independently based on special research.

The Bulgarian researcher M. Minkov interprets the first four dimensions of G. Hofstede as: non-isocracy and isocracy; non-familiness and familiness; hardness and softness; anxiety and calmness⁷.

2.1. Cultural dimension „Power distance”

Power distance measures the degree to which the weaker members of institutions and organizations expect and adopt the unequal distribution of wealth.

National cultures in which power distance is small (Austria, Denmark) *tolerate the participation of workers and employees in management*. Thus stereotypes are created according to which the subordinates expect always to have access to their manager, and the using of

power by itself is neither good nor bad – it all depends on the goals and ways of using the power mechanisms. And, what is more important – the managers and subordinates view hierarchy as a temporary inequality of the performed roles, so that today’s subordinate may tomorrow become a manager.

In national cultures, in which power distance is large and the perception regarding the existing differences in social status is intense (the Arab countries, India), *managers use the authority they were granted with after taking the post to influence their subordinates’ behaviour*. In cultures of that type those having power enjoy certain rights and privileges. Furthermore, managers and subordinates are considered to be different categories of people. *Such cultures do not stimulate management through subordinates’ participation*. They themselves have a negative attitude to the possibility to make an important decision and to take responsibility for its implementation. That justifies the use of authoritarian style of management by the managers and of the non-personal, information-seeking and authoritarian style of interpersonal communication, which still increase the power distance⁸.

2.2. Cultural dimension „Individualism – collectivism”

In spite of the popularity of G. Hofstede’s five dimensions there is unanimity only regarding the continuum „*individualism – collectivism*”, maybe because it is the most suitable for comparing cultures in practice. Over 80% of humanity live in societies, which to one degree or another divide people into „family” and „strangers” and oppose their family and friends’ circle to the rest of the people. These societies can be called „collectivist” or, using M. Minkov’s terminology „family”. *That is almost the whole world without the developed western countries – North America, North-western Europe, Australia and New Zealand*. In western cultures family in many cases is of little or of no significance, therefore they can be called „individualistic” or „non-family”⁹. In fact, these are the

⁴ For details see Hofstede, G. Ibid., part II, p.p. 27 – 245.

⁵ Hofstede, G. Ibid., p. 23.

⁶ Depending on „the collective programming of mind” we can speak of six cultural layers:
 · *national layer*, according to the country (or countries – for people who migrate in their lives);
 · *regional and/or ethnical and/or religious and/or language layer*, as most nations are made up of regional and/or ethnical and/or religious and/or language groups, which differ in cultural aspect;
 · *different gender layer*, according to which an individual is born a boy or a girl;
 · *generation layer*, which differentiates grandparents from parents and children;
 · *social class layer*, related to educational capabilities and job or profession of the individual;
 · *for the employed – organizational or corporate layer*, depending on the way, in which employees are socialized by the organization, in which they work” (Hofstede, G. Ibid., p. 13).

⁷ Minkov, M. *Zashto sme razlichni*. Sofia, 2007, pp. 21, 77, 93, 119.

⁸ For details see Bakardzhieva, M. *Bizneskomunikirane*, Svishtov, 2007, p. 97.

⁹ An explanation is necessary here: some Bulgarian ideas of individualism differ seriously from what science means. The notion “individualism” is not equal to the notion “egoism”. Western peoples are not egoists. They really do care for their families less than in the other countries, but at the same time they join a great number of citizens’ initiatives to protect the rights of people (protecting the rights of unfamiliar people all over the world), of women, children, animals, the sick, the underfed, the victims of natural disasters, etc.

countries using the Germanic languages¹⁰. The list can be extended by Finland and some of the Romance language-speaking countries in Europe, e.g. France, Belgium and maybe North Italy. They have also set up societies in which there are manifestations of non-familiness to quite a high extent, whereas Spain and especially Portugal seem to be still collectivist (family) cultures or somewhere in-between. Greece has a relative family culture. The Central European and Baltic countries are in the middle, of which Slovenia is closest to the western culture.

In order not to confuse the notions of „individualism” and „collectivism” we will complement the presented so far by the explanation which M. Minkov makes: „Individualism and collectivism, as cultural dimensions do not refer to the inclination of forming groups and working individually or collectively, but they refer to *how privileges are distributed: on the grounds of one’s own merits or on the grounds of belonging to a group*. In collectivist, family societies people can get privileges only because they belong to a certain group – a family or a friends’ circle. In individualistic, non-family societies that phenomenon is seldom met. Belonging to a family is not that important. What is important is who and what individual you are”¹¹.

2.3. Cultural dimension „Masculinity – femininity”

G. Hofstede introduced the „masculinity – femininity” dimension in order to designate the place of qualities like insistence, dominance and independence within the framework of the national culture. In order to understand what is referred here we will explain that *masculinity* is characteristic of societies which clearly differentiate between social gender roles (men are expected to be pushy and tough, to have a competitive spirit and to be oriented to material success, and women are expected to be modest, tender and concerned about the quality of life), and *femininity* is characteristic of societies in which social gender roles overlap (both men and women are expected to be modest and concerned about others and the interrelations with them, to emphasize equality, solidarity and quality of work life, to solve conflicts by means of compromises and negotiations, to sympathize with the weaker, etc.).

In countries in which „masculinity” prevails as a cultural dimension (Japan, Italy and Switzerland) people consider it normal to direct their efforts to career advancement. „Femininity is characteristic of cultures which emphasize such values as mutual help and interdependence, sympathy and concern about the quality of life and environment (Sweden, Norway and Holland).

2.4. Cultural dimension „Uncertainty avoidance”

Uncertainty avoidance is a cultural manifestation which is related to stress and its accompanying phenomena like nervousness, intolerance, tension, anxiety, uneasiness, etc. which appear in a situation of risk and uncertainty. There are two types of uncertainty avoidance: high and low. *The high level of uncertainty avoidance* is expressed in the very great need of risk avoidance and uncertainty and of increasing foreseeability through using a multitude of written and unwritten rules and procedures. The cultures with a high level of uncertainty avoidance (Greece, Portugal, Belgium, etc.) perceive the different as dangerous, whereas for those with a low degree of uncertainty avoidance, the different is fun. Cultures with high values for this dimension are characterized with more stress in work, unwillingness for changes, fear of risk ventures and strict adherence to the rules. Underlying that is the fear of uncertainty.

2.5. Cultural dimension „Long-term – short-term orientation”

This is the fifth cultural dimension which G. Hofstede, as was shown, borrowed from M. Bond who called it „Confucian dynamism” or „time orientation”, as it includes cultural values of Far East cultures, underlying Confucianism. The values referred here are insistence, thriftiness, sense of shame, reputation preservation and respect for traditions. „Confucian dynamism” determines to what extent an individual is attached to the values of his/her culture.

3. Bulgarian national culture according to G. Hofstede’s five dimension model

According to most cultural dimensions, included in G. Hofstede’s model Bulgaria is quite an obvious case. Only the dimension „masculinity-femininity” creates some problems.

We will begin with the dimension „*individualism-collectivism*”. Probably because of the different interpretations of the notions „individualism” and „collectivism” (see above) some of the Bulgarian researchers, incl. T. Chavdarova¹², S. Karabeliova and H. Silgidzhiyan¹³ prove in a purposely empirical study that Bulgarian culture is predominantly individualistic and that collectivism is not perceived as a psychological source of identity and social prosperity. The only sphere in which collectivist cultural practices continue regulating the everyday relations in Bulgaria according to S. Karabeliova and H. Silgidzhiyan is the *working environment*.

The results of other Bulgarian studies including those

¹⁰ The group of Germanic languages includes English, German, Dutch and the various Scandinavian languages and dialects.

¹¹ Minkov, M. Ibid., p. 26.

¹² Chavdarova, T. The Small Entrepreneur: Culture and Economic Action (The Case of Sofia and Skopje), www.cas.bg/obg/downloads/3_3/Tanya_Chavdarova_project_results_ed.doc

¹³ Karabeliova, S., Silgidzhiyan, H. Priemstvenost i promyana na tsennostite i kulturnite praktiki v Bulgaria, p. 3 (sonia-karabelioyahaiganush-silgidjian-doklad. Type: Adobe Acrobat Document)

of Y. Genov¹⁴, M. Minkov¹⁵ and T. Davidkov¹⁶, however, position Bulgaria in the collectivist part of the continuum. This is confirmed by G. Hofstede's attitude¹⁷, according to which ***Bulgaria is collectivistic rather than individualistic***. Like in many non-western European cultures in our country society is divided into two main groups: my family and friends and I (inside group) and all the others (outside group), or as we pointed out above into „family” and „strangers”. „Family” enjoys favours and concessions, cares, preferences in applying for a job and in creating partnerships in business, very often the professional qualities being shelved. According to a study of Y. Genov around 70% of the people surveyed in our country think that nothing depends on the individual, that life is controlled by chances, that chance is very important, that success is not achieved through high professional competence but through luck, pulling strings, etc.¹⁸. Furthermore, Bulgarians prefer indirect communication and the use of a vague language instead of a hard refusal or direct criticism (except in bursts of anger), they do not feel to blame personally, aspire to a personal expression, but at the same time they make use of every opportunity to hide behind the team, etc.

All this contrasts sharply with the culture of Northwestern Europe and especially of North America, which is individualistic, non-family. With the globalization and Bulgaria's EU accession more and more Bulgarians begin behaving like representatives of non-family culture, but the final transition from collectivism to individualism in all spheres is still far ahead in the future.

Regarding the other cultural dimensions, according to the studies of Y. Genov, S. Karabeliova, H. Silgidzhiyan, T. Davidkov, M. Minkov¹⁹ and other researchers of the national culture and according to the author's own observations and comparisons with other countries and cultures, **the Bulgarian national culture is:**

– **with large power distance**. The power distance is the largest in the systems of authority and labour activity, followed by the family and it is the smallest in the sphere of political ideas. And that is obvious. Contradicting a manager in the workplace is considered to be rather dangerous, or at least a nonsensical deed.

Because of the paternalistic approach an ideal manager is assumed to be the „good father”, who knows what is best for his „children”. The subordinates are expected to carry out his commands and not initiate unnecessary interpersonal communications.

Put in another way, the Bulgarian managers are not inspired by managing with their subordinates' participation. The subordinates themselves like to be asked regarding their feelings and preferences in one or another respect, but they are not inspired when it comes to them to make an important decision or to take the responsibility for its implementation. They would rather their manager did it. All this points to large power distance at an organizational level.

Such is the power distance at a national level²⁰, especially if the significant dependence of Bulgarian government on the decisions of international institutions and the apparent weakness are taken into account, when these institutions give the government the opportunity to make decisions important for Bulgaria and to take responsibility for their implementation.

A certain reduction of power distance is observed at family and school levels. Indications for this are the changed relations in the family and at school: the parents' and teachers' roles are diminishing and so does the dependence on them. At political ideas level the independence as such is attractive, but it does not always work.

The power distance index as a whole depends on the preceding historic development, on the belonging to one or another language group, as well as on the impact of such important factors like the country's geographic latitude, the number of the population and wealth. None of these factors is indicative of a forthcoming rapid reduction of power distance in our country²¹.

– **moderate feminine**. There are problems only regarding this dimension and maybe because of that there is a difference between the evaluation of the authors cited above and G. Hofstede. In his opinion Bulgaria is *feminine rather than masculine* which means that the total index of masculinity is below 50. That assumption is proved by the studies of S. Karabeliova and H. Silgidzhiyan –

¹⁴ Genov, Y. Zashto tolkova malko uspyavame. Razmisli varhu tova kolko mnogo prechat nyakoi nazadnichavi cherti na nashata kultura. Sofia, 2004.

¹⁵ Minkov, M. Hofstede i znachenieto na negovite trudove za Bulgaria – Hofstede, G., Ibid., p. XIII.

¹⁶ Sotirova, D., Davidkov, T. Novata administrativna kultura. Organizatsionni i lichni strategii za promyana. Sofia, 2005, pp.106 – 110.

¹⁷ Work is not the most important thing for the Bulgarians: The expert on intercultural studies Prof. G. Hofstede in The Capital newspaper (interview with G. Hofstede), // In: „The Capital”, issue. 42, 2001.

¹⁸ Genov, Y. Kulturata kato osnovna determinanta na produktivnostta i vazmozhnostite za prosperitet. Sofia, 2002.

¹⁹ See Minkov, M. Hofstede i znachenieto na negovite trudove za Bulgaria – Hofstede, G., Ibid., pp. X – XVI.

²⁰ The large power distance at a national level can be explained by the two models of one of the greatest pundits in the use of political power – the Italian Nikolo Makiaveli – *the model of the fox and the model of the lion*. Countries of small power distance are accustomed to the *model of the fox*, which by cunningness manages to avoid the traps, and countries of large power distance – to the *model of the lion*, which relies on its strength to threaten the wolves.

²¹ See Hofstede, G. Ibid., pp. 57 – 63

for 2005 they measured an index of 47.7 and defined Bulgarian culture as *moderately feminine*²². In earlier studies (2001) Y. Genov and S. Karabeliova reached the conclusion that the people studied in our country are with prevailing „feminine” attitudes²³. The most important index of society’s feminine orientation is the value attitude toward achievement and success. In Bulgaria people envy those who are successful and sympathize with those who are less successful. That additionally increases the preference for the behaviour models common for the two genders in which modesty, and individual anonymity in particular, dominates.

In the context of organizational behaviour femininity emphasizes such values as equality by gender, ethnicity, religion, solidarity, caring for others, mutual assistance, tendency to improve the quality of working life, etc.

– **with high uncertainty avoidance**, expressed in a very great need of increasing the foreseeability by using a number of written and unwritten rules and procedures. *The high uncertainty avoidance is a cultural manifestation caused by high levels of stress with accompanying phenomena such as nervousness, intolerance, tenseness, anxiety, uneasiness, etc.* Stress in Bulgaria starts from an early age and continues at school, where children are taught to differentiate between the explicitly forbidden from the explicitly allowed things, the wrong from right, the incorrect from correct, etc. Unshakable truths are sought which are not subject to personal interpretation. One and the same problem is thought to have two or more correct solutions. *The high uncertainty avoidance at the workplace in organizations and in authorities is expressed in tenseness, weak initiative, striving to avoid risk, unwillingness for teamwork, negative attitude and resistance to change, suppression of non-standard ideas, total frustration with everything.* At this background the appeals for greater initiative, teamwork, accepting the change as something normal and inevitable, etc. become easily explainable. Unfortunately appeals are one thing but reality – another. In the above cited study S. Karabeliova and H. Silgidzhiyan register an increase in the uncertainty avoidance index – from 66.7 in 2000 to 71.5 in 2005²⁴. As of today it is probably higher because of the high stress in the Bulgarian society, the rising demand of law and order and the increased frustration not only with work but also with the state and life as a whole. Politicians usually refer this frustration to poverty, which in G. Hofstede’s words is not binding. There are

rich countries in which people are frustrated and are always complaining (Italy) and poor ones in which people accept the hardships in life comparatively easily (Indonesia, India).

– **with prevailing short-term time orientation**. This is the only criterion according to which Bulgaria gets closer to the western cultures. *The readiness of the Far East peoples to sacrifice personal time and efforts for the sake of the organization for a comparatively low payment, as well as the willingness to carry out any orders, at that consciously, and not for appearance’s sake – is met neither in Bulgaria nor anywhere else in Europe or America.* These values, as is well-known are related to Confucianism which is not popular in our countries. An essential reason is also that people think short-term and mainly about themselves but not about investing the profit with the aim to develop the organization in future. Stockholders in their greatest part are private persons and institutions which are more interested in dividends than in the organization’s success in the far future. What is worrying is that this short-term orientation is deepening – the total index of the long-term against short-term orientation dimension decreased from 40.0 in 2000 to 38.0 in 2005²⁵.

Conclusion.

It is obvious that according to the national culture dimensions every country can be compared to the others, particularly to those which it wants to establish stable cooperation with in the different spheres of life. The large power distance and the very strong trend of uncertainty avoidance refer Bulgaria to the group of South and East European countries, which surprises neither G. Hofstede nor Bulgarian researchers. In Edward Hall’s typologization according to time organization this is the group of polyactive cultures²⁶.

National culture influences the behaviour of managers and managees at all levels, organizational in particular, as well as the organizational culture. This elaboration makes it clear that the emphases in organizational behaviour argue for collectivistic organizational culture, rather than individualistic one, for a culture of explicitly expressed femininity and fear of uncertainty. These common characteristics influence its specificity and it becomes process-oriented rather than result-oriented; employee-oriented rather than job-oriented; ordinary rather than professional; closed rather than open; liberal rather than strict; normative rather than practical²⁷.

²² Karabeliova, S., Silgidzhiyan, H. Ibid., p. 3.

²³ Genov, Y., Karabeliova, S. Heobhodimi promeni v tsennostnitate orientatsii na balgarite v protsesa na evrointegratsiya. // Human resource management: National conference with international participation. – Borovets, 2001.

²⁴ See Karabeliova, S., Silgidzhiyan, H. Ibid., p. 4.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 3.

²⁶ For details see Bakardzhieva, M. Polikulturnostta, pp. 40 – 42

²⁷ For details regarding the six dimensions of organizational culture see Hofstede, G. Ibid., pp. 263 – 270.

That conclusion stands good only for organizational culture in typically Bulgarian organizations. *In polycultural organizations based in Bulgaria the personal values of the managers, who are in most cases not Bulgarian, also have their influence.*

References

1. **Bakardzhieva, M.** Polikulturnostta i umenieto za efektivna mezhdokulturna komunikatsiya kato tsenosti na savremenniya menidzhmant. // Biblioteka Obrazovanie i nauka, D.A.Tsenov Academy of Economics – Svishtov, 2, 2012.
2. **Bakardzhieva, M.** Bizneskomunikirane. Svishtov, 2007.
3. **Genov, Y.** Kulturata kato osnovna determinanta na produktivnostta i vazmozhnostite za prosperitet. Sofia, 2002.
4. **Genov, Y.** Zashto tolkova malko uspyavame. Razmisli varhu tova kolko mnogo prechat nyakoi nazadnichavi cherti na nashata kultura. Sofia, 2004.
5. **Genov, Y., Karabeliova, S.** Neobhodimi promeni v tsennostnite orientatsii na balgarite v protsesa na evrointegratsiya. // Human resource management: National conference with international participation. – Borovets, 2001.
6. **Work** is not the most important thing for the Bulgarians: The expert on intercultural studies G. Hofstede in The Capital newspaper (interview with G. Hofstede), // In: „The Capital”, issue. 42, 2001.
7. **Karabeliova, S., Silgidzhian, H.** Priemstvenost i promyana na tsennostite i kulturnite praktiki v Bulgaria <sonia-karabelioyahaiganush-silgidjian-doklad>. Type: Adobe Acrobat Document
8. **Minkov, M.** Zashto sme razlichni. Sofia, 2007.
9. **Sotirova, D., Davidkov, T.** Novata administrativna kultura. Organizatsionni problemi i lichni strategii za promyana. Sofia, 2005.
10. **Hofstede, G.** Cultures and organizations: software of the mind. Sofia, 2001.
11. **Chavdarova, T.** The Small Entrepreneur: Culture and Economic Action (The Case of Sofia and Skopje) <www.cas.bg/obg/downloads/3_3/Tanya_Chavdarova_project_results_ed.doc>

Бакерджієва М. Поведінка керівників і підлеглих у контексті особливостей болгарської національної культури

Вивчення і зіставлення безлічі національних культур наразі цілком можливо, оскільки існують два способи наочного представлення схожості і відмінностей між ними: типологізація культур і вимірювання. У справжньому викладі представлений другий підхід з використанням моделі п'яти вимірювань культури, запропонованої всесвітньо відомим дослідником Гертом Хофстеде. Мета: представити болгарську національну культуру по включених в цю модель вимірюваннях, розкрити її особливості і на цій основі визначити, в групу яких держав потрапляє, спроекувати ці особливості на поведінку тих, що управляють і керованих і встановити вплив, який національна культура надає на нього і організаційну культуру в типово болгарських організаціях.

У статті показано, що для болгарської національної культури характерний високий ступінь дистанції влади, у ній домінує колективізм над індивідуалізмом, з високим ступенем уникнення невизначеності, високим показником жіночого начала, ніж чоловічого і більшою мірою з короткостроковою орієнтацією, ніж з довгостроковою. Охарактеризована таким чином, Болгарія потрапляє в групу південно- і східно-європейських країн, які, згідно з типологізацією Едварда Холла, потрапляють до групи поліактивних культур.

Друга констатація: болгарська національна культура, подібно до національних культур інших країн, робить вплив на поведінку тих, що управляють і керованих на всіх рівнях і особливо на організаційному, а також і на організаційну культуру. Акценти в організаційній поведінці, швидше за все, говорять про колективістську організаційну культуру, ніж про індивідуалістичну, про культуру з яскраво вираженим жіночим началом і страхом перед невизначеністю. Ці загальні характеристики роблять вплив на її специфіку. Визначена згідно шести вимірюванням, розробленим Г. Хофстеде спеціально для організаційних культур, вона більшою мірою орієнтована на процес, чим на результати; більш орієнтована на службовців, чим на роботу, більшою мірою простонародна, чим професійна; їй властива закритість, ніж відвертість; вона відрізняється більшою ліберальністю, чим строгістю; більш нормативна, ніж практична.

Цей висновок дійсний тільки для організаційної культури в типово болгарських організаціях. У полікультурних організаціях впливають і персональні культурні цінності керівників, які в більшості випадків мають іншу національність.

Ключові слова: національна культура, болгарська національна культура, вимірювання культури, поведінка керівників і підлеглих, організаційна культура.

Бакерджієва М. Поведение управляющих и управляемых в контексте особенностей болгарской национальной культуры

Изучение и сопоставление множества национальных культур в настоящее время вполне возможно, так как существуют два способа наглядного представления сходства и различий между ними: типологизация культур и измерение. В настоящем изложении представлен второй подход с использованием модели пяти измерений культуры, предложенной всемирно известным исследователем Гертом Хофстеде. Цель: представить болгарскую национальную культуру по включенным в эту модель измерениям, раскрыть ее особенности и на этой основе определить, в группу каких государств попадает, спроектировать эти особенности на поведение управляющих и управляемых и установит влияние, которое национальная культура

ра оказывает на него и организационную культуру в типично болгарских организациях.

В статье показано, что для болгарской национальной культуры характерна высокая степень дистанции власти, в ней доминирует коллективизм над индивидуализмом, с высокой степенью избегания неопределенности, высоким показателем женского начала, нежели мужского и в большей степени с краткосрочной ориентацией, нежели с долгосрочной. Охарактеризованная таким образом, Болгария попадает в группу юго- и восточно-европейских стран, которые, согласно типологизации Эдварда Холла, попадают в группу полиактивных культур.

Вторая констатация: болгарская национальная культура, подобно национальным культурам других стран, оказывает влияние на поведение управляющих и управляемых на всех уровнях и особенно на организационном, а также и на организационную культуру. Акценты в организационном поведении, скорее всего, говорят о коллективистской организационной культуре, нежели об индивидуалистической, о культуре с ярко выраженным женским началом и страхом перед неопределенностью. Эти общие характеристики оказывают влияние на ее специфику. Определенная соответственно шести измерениям, разработанным Г. Хофстеде специально для организационных культур, она в большей степени ориентирована на процесс, чем на результаты; более ориентирована на служащих, чем на работу, в большей степени простонародна, чем профессиональна; ей присуща закрытость, нежели открытость; она отличается большей либеральностью, чем строгостью; более нормативна, чем практична.

Этот вывод действителен только для организационной культуры в типично болгарских организациях. В поликультурных организациях влияние оказывают и персональные культурные ценности управляющих, которые в большинстве случаев лица не болгарской национальности.

Ключевые слова: национальная культура, болгарская национальная культура, измерения культуры, поведение управляющих и управляемых, организационная культура.

Bakardzhieva M. Behaviour of Managers and Managees in the Context of the Peculiarities of Bulgarian National Culture

Studying and comparing a great number of national

cultures today is completely possible as there are two ways of presenting visually the common and different things between them: typologizing of cultures and measuring. The present elaboration deals with the second one, following Geert Hofstede's five dimensions model. The aim is to present the Bulgarian national culture according to the dimensions included in this model, to reveal its peculiarities and on this basis to determine the group of which countries it falls into, to project these peculiarities on the behaviour of managers and managees and to find out the influence which the national culture has on it and on the organizational culture in typically Bulgarian organizations.

The analysis shows that the Bulgarian national culture has large power distance, and is collectivistic rather than individualistic, with high uncertainty avoidance, feminine rather than masculine and short-term oriented rather than long-term oriented. Characterized in that way Bulgaria falls into the group of South and East European countries, which according to Edward Hall's typologization belong to the group of polyactive cultures.

The second finding is that Bulgarian national culture like the national cultures of the other countries influences the behaviour of managers and managees at all levels and particularly at organizational level, as well as the organizational culture. The emphases in the organizational behaviour argue for collectivistic organizational culture, rather than individualistic one, for a culture of explicitly expressed femininity and fear of uncertainty. These common characteristics influence its specificity. Defined according to the six dimensions worked out by G. Hofstede especially for organizational cultures it is process-oriented rather than result-oriented; employee-oriented rather than job-oriented; ordinary rather than professional; closed rather than open; liberal rather than strict; normative rather than practical.

That conclusion stands good only for organizational culture in typically Bulgarian organizations. In polycultural organizations the personal cultural values of the managers, who are in most cases not Bulgarian, also have their influence.

Key words: national culture, Bulgarian national culture, cultural dimensions, behaviour of managers and managees, organizational culture.

Received by the editors: 23.08.2012
and final form 20.11.2012