

EVALUATION OF THE CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF HOFSTEDE IN AZERBAIJAN: AN APPLICATION ON UNIVERSITY ACADEMICS

Matanat Mammadova, Azerbaijan State University of Economics (UNEC)
Vasif Aliyev, Azerbaijan State University of Economics (UNEC)

ABSTRACT

Cultural differences are one of the most important management issues for companies operating in countries that are very different from each other at present when global interaction is intense. Globally, the ability of organizations to be sustainable and competitive depends on considering cultural elements and understanding and respecting the beliefs, norms and values of their employees, customers, suppliers and collaborators from the different culture and being sensitive.

This study aims to investigate the cultural scale of UNEC Academics in Azerbaijan based on the cultural dimensions put in place by Dutch sociologist Hofstede, who studies national and institutional intercultural interactions. In this context, in order to determine the cultural beliefs of Azerbaijan UNEC Academicians at the social level, the Five Dimensions of Cultural Values Scale developed by Hofstede et al. (2011) 's Five Dimensions of Cultural Values at the Individual level were used to determine the cultural dimensions with the data obtained as a result of a survey. As it appears as a result of the research, the academicians have low power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, they are collectivists, they are in long-term action in accordance with the dimension of Femininity.

The cultural dimensions of Hofstede with the results of the research conducted on IBM employees form the basis of this study. In the study, firstly, the definition of the culture and then the definition of the profession will be made; later, the characteristics of Hofstede's cultural dimensions will be discussed.

Keywords: Azerbaijan, Cultural Dimensions, Theory, Hofstede.

INTRODUCTION

After the 1980s, when it was revealed that social culture could be an important reason for the differences between organizations, the effects of social culture on the organization began to be discussed in various ways in many studies. In the studies carried out to date, many factors that social culture can cause on the organization have been revealed. When the literature is scanned, it is seen that social culture has a multidimensional impact on organizations. As it is known, the members of the organization are affected by the large social culture repertoire in which they are found and they take them to the organizations of which they are a member. A connection is established between social culture and organizational culture by transporting what is learned from social culture. As a result, social culture appears to be an important factor in showing cultural profile or organizational culture differences between organizations. Despite organizational differences, organizational culture is so influenced by the social culture that, as shown in some studies, members of the organization define their social cultures and organizational cultures with the same concepts.

The Concept of Culture

Culture is one of the main features that distinguish human communities. Culture is formed by the interaction of people living in communities and communicating with each other. Culture is a concept that encompasses the values, norms, material, and spiritual elements shared by people living in communities. Culture is varying from society to society. It also affects management processes in all areas where it differs.

Culture is a pattern of basic assumptions discovered, invented, and developed by a social community during its efforts to adapt to the external environment and integrate into the internal environment. Based on this definition, it can be said that culture has an impact on all the actions and values of the social community to which it belongs. The concept of culture is deeply connected to human history, and the area covered by the concept is much more than an institutional movement. As a matter of fact, institutions are a product of the societies and time in which the societies live. Today, it is estimated that more than 200 definitions of culture have been made. One of the main elements of culture is that culture is a kind of shaping process. For a culture to exist, members of society or group need to share common values, behaviors, and styles that change gradually but dynamically over time (Harris et al., 2003).

The word culture is considered to derive from "*colere*" or "*cultura*", one of the classical Latin verbs that means to look at or grow. This word, also used in French, was first used by Voltaire in the sense of the formation, development, and development of human intelligence. The word was used as *Cultur* in a 1793 German Language Dictionary that was transferred to German and later became a culture.

According to the anthropologist E.B. Taylor (1871), which is cited as the basis of contemporary cultural theories, culture is a complex process that encompasses knowledge, art, morality, traditions, and other abilities and habits gained by human beings as a member of society. In short, culture is made up of the sum of the variables of society, human, cultural content, and learning process that interact with each other (Hill, 2003).

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

One of the most comprehensive studies on cultural values affecting the attitudes and behaviors of employees was conducted by Geert Hofstede. Unlike other researchers, Hofstede did not only conducted research on managers, but revealed that there were links between occupational-business types and levels and the hierarchy of needs, and conducted his research on different categories of work. In his study, which will be based on this research, which has a place in the literature, Hofstede saw culture as a variable that is outside the organization and affects the beliefs and basic assumptions of individuals within the organization. According to Hofstede, it is possible to find many variable patterns within the country's cultures. Hofstede called the four problem areas "*dimensions of culture*" supported by two surveys conducted with the participation of 116,000 people from over seventy different countries worldwide, where IBM operates. According to Hofstede, a "*dimension*" is the measurable aspect of culture in relations with other cultures. In his research, Hofstede found four dimensions of culture that help explain how and why people from different cultures behave as they are; power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism-collectivism, and masculinity-femininity (Hofstede, 1984). After his study covering Asian countries, Hofstede added the long-term orientation to these dimensions, which expresses the way societies view time.

Power Distance

Power is "*the ability of a person to influence someone else, to follow his or her orders or a rule of his choice*" (South, 2006). In the use of power, it is important to perceive power.

Significantly, those who follow in the implementation of legal power accept this power. An administrator who thinks that his power is not sufficiently approved and has legal power can resort to coercive force in the face of this situation (Arslan, 2001).

Power distance is the tendency to see distance between the upper layer and the lower layer of the social structure in social construction within society (Triandis, 1994).

There is inequality in every society. Some individuals are more effective in determining the behavior of others, due to the different characteristics they have. The individual can have physical strength, intelligence, wealth and status together. This discrepancy in different areas of inequality is generally considered a problem (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

In societies belonging to this culture, bosses and dignitaries are in the top positions. They have no obligation to know the truth to be right because their rightfulness stems from their (Sargut, 2015).

Individualism and Collectivism

While the majority of individuals live in societies where the interests of groups are more important than the interests of the individual; in contrast, a small number of individuals live in societies where the interests of individuals are more dominant than the interests of their groups (Hofstede, 1994). What is the reason for this differentiation in societies?

Individualism and collectivism (socialism) are good indicators to distinguish between cultures. In collective cultures, individuals put their individual goals second to the fixed goals of the group. Conversely, in individualist cultures, individuals are very committed to their own goals and tend to leave the group as the group's aspirations increase, no purpose can override their own goals. In collective societies, values such as fatalism and discipline are at the forefront; In individualist societies, values such as personal entertainment, excitement, equality and freedom are at the forefront (Solomon, 2009).

Failures are shared by the group as much as successes in organizations operating in a collectivist society and attributed to all group employees. Employees of the collectivist organization aim to work harmoniously with their colleagues without creating any conflict or tension (Griffin, 2003). There is competition among the employees of the individual organization, all employees aim to be the best. Hofstede explained the social and organizational consequences of the cultural dimension of individualism as follows.

Masculinity and Femininity

While evaluating the masculine and feminine value dimension, it is about the choices that show how the inter-individual relationship in society is (Dogan, 2012). These values, which show different preferences from society to society, may have more dominant values for men in some organizations, while in others, values specific to women may be more dominant (Fat, 2002). In short, masculinity and femininity values express the roles placed on the sexes in society (Hofstede, 1980). While affection, compassion, kindness, loyalty, harmony, and unity in human relations represent the characteristics of feminine behavior; competition, economic power, authoritarian and uncompromising power constitute the characteristics of masculine behavior (Dogan, 2012).

Uncertainty Avoidance

The phenomenon of uncertainty avoidance is related to how individuals in society feel about uncertain and variable situations and what they do to avoid them (Hellriegel et al., 1995). Often the environment of uncertainty evokes risk. However, these concepts should not be confused with each other.

The risk is the possibility that a certain event will occur. In case of uncertainty, anything can happen, but we have no idea what this event will be. In other words, while the risk is a specific issue, an event, uncertainty refers to an environment in which it is not known what will happen or what is likely to happen (Whyte, 1991). The focus is on the level of tolerance for uncertainties in the community in the dimension of avoidance of uncertainty. When uncertainty avoidance is high, there is a society directed to the rules, and laws and regulations play a role in eliminating uncertainty in society. It is stated that in societies with low uncertainty avoidance, there is less sensitivity to uncertainty and more tolerance for the diversity of ideas (www.geert-hofstede.com). In organizations in countries with weak uncertainty avoidance, it is seen that managers can take risks more comfortably; employees are ambitious and seeking responsibility, and the speed of staff turnover increases due to employees and managers who cannot find what they hoped for (Ball & Wendell, 1995).

In organizations of cultures that tend to avoid uncertainty in the business environment, the form of formal regulation and rules are intense, the duties and responsibilities of the employees and managers working with the rules are clearly determined. Rulemaking is due to psychological needs. Employees at all levels of the organization are included in an organization by adhering to these rules because they want to feel safe. In countries with weak uncertainty avoidance, formal regulations are not accepted, they are considered to be used where they are very necessary, and relations are in order within themselves, although there are no laws and rules in organizations (Hofstede, 1991).

Long-Term Orientation (LTO)

Long-term orientation means giving importance to values that have a reward for the future. These values are examples of perseverance, patience, and conviction. On the contrary, in societies that turn to the short term, the values that look at the past and the present are given importance. Examples include values such as tradition, honor, and the fulfillment of social responsibilities (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). While in societies that are tending to the long term, the bad and the good vary according to the situation; bad and good are very clearly defined in short term societies. Material and spiritual values are kept separate in societies that turn to the short term; however, it is an intertwined situation in the long term societies. In the long term, for example, if A is true, B may also be true, which is the opposite of it. In the short-term, if A is true, the opposite B is wrong. While instincts are important in the long term, it is important to be rational in the short term (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). In long term thinking societies, values such as preserving the past values, patience, commitment, respect for the elderly gain importance and work is highly respected. Individuals in these societies know many things and allocate savings for investments. They are dynamic in their thinking and relationships are often regulated by status.

DISCUSSION

A study to be conducted throughout Azerbaijan and with a larger sample will be important in order to present broader and more comprehensive results in terms of comparing Azerbaijani cultural values with academic sub-culture.

Method of the Research

In this section, individual cultural values of UNEC Academicians were tried to be determined by using the cultural dimensions of Hofstede.

In turn, information about the hypotheses of the research, the population and sampling, the data collection method, and finally the methods used in data analysis are provided.

Research Population and Sampling

The study group of the study consisted of 400 randomly selected academicians working at UNEC in Baku city, taking into account the level of socio-economic development. Those who answered the survey were asked to what extent they agree with the sentences reflecting each of the variables on the five Likert scales. 103 people responded to the survey.

Data Collection Method

In this research conducted on the basis of the screening model, the expressions of the Individual Cultural Values Scale of Yoo et al. (2011), which deals with the Five-Dimensional Cultural Values Scale developed by Hofstede in an individual context, were used to determine cultural beliefs at the social level. In order to determine cultural beliefs at the social level, the Five-Dimensional Cultural Values Scale developed by Hofstede et al. (2011) reviewed in an individual context and conducted a validity and reliability study. The scale, the original form of which is "CVSCALE*-Individual Cultural Values Scale", has been translated into Azerbaijani as "Individual Cultural Values Scale". Individual Cultural Values Scale; It consists of a total of 26 items: power distance 5, uncertainty avoidance 5, collectivism 6, long term orientation 6 and masculinity 4 items. This research has been applied only to UNEC academicians working in the city of Baku.

Data Analysis Methods

The answers in the obtained questionnaire forms were coded and analyzed with 'SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences-Statistics Package for Social Sciences) for Windows 24 Edition'. In this research, Reliability Analysis, Single Sampling T-Test analysis, Independent Sampling T-Test, Frequency and Correlation Analysis were performed with the SPSS package program.

Hypotheses of the research

- H₁:** *Academics' responses regarding power distance differ significantly in terms of gender groups.*
- H₂:** *Academics' responses regarding collectivism differ significantly in terms of gender groups.*
- H₃:** *Academics' responses regarding uncertainty avoidance differ significantly in terms of age groups.*
- H₄:** *Academics' responses to long-term orientation differ significantly in terms of age groups.*
- H₅:** *Academics' responses regarding power distance differ significantly in terms of marital status groups.*
- H₆:** *Academics' responses to masculinity/femininity do not differ significantly in terms of marital status groups.*
- H₇:** *There is a meaningful relationship between academics' power distance and levels of uncertainty avoidance.*
- H₈:** *There is a significant relationship between academicians' power distance and sociality level.*
- H₉:** *There is no meaningful relationship between the power distance of academics and the levels of masculinity/femininity levels.*

H₁₀: *There is a significant relationship between academicians' power distance and long-term orientation level.*

Testing Hypotheses

Reliability Analysis was performed before testing the hypotheses. The Reliability analysis of the Individual Cultural Values Scale of Yoo et al. (2011), consisting of 26 items, was done by calculating the Cronbach alpha value. The reliability coefficient of the scale (α) is 0.90 (Table 1).

This value shows the internal consistency of the 26 items that make up the scale. The internal consistency value is higher than 0.70, which is acceptable. Hypotheses can be tested.

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	No of Items
0.894	0.900	26

The T test was used to test the hypothesis "*H₁: Academics' responses regarding power distance differ significantly in terms of gender groups*". The results of the T test are in Table 2.

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PO	Equal variances assumed	0.437	0.510	1,376	101	0.172	0.19929	0.14484	0.08804	0.48662
	Equal variances not assumed			1,356	81,541	0.179	0.19929	0.14694	0.09305	0.49163

And according to the results of the test, since the Sig 2 tailed value (0.172) is greater than 0.05, the responses of the academicians regarding the power distance do not differ in terms of gender groups. H₁ hypothesis was rejected.

H₂: *Academics' responses regarding collectivism differ significantly in terms of gender groups.*

Independent Samples Test		
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means

		F	Sig	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
CO	Equal variances assumed	0.005	0.944	2.495	101	0.014	0.40205	0.16111	0.08245	0.72164
	Equal variances not assumed			2.465	82.132	0.016	0.40205	0.16312	0.07756	0.72653

Independent Sampling T Test was used to test H_2 . According to the Test results in Table 3, we can say that the thoughts of men and women regarding collectivism differ significantly, since the value of Sig 2- tailed (0.014) is less than 0.05. H_2 has been accepted.

Table 4 SAMPLING STATISTICS					
Group Statistics					
	SEX	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
CO	Male	41	3,5203	0.82932	0.12952
	Female	62	3,1183	0.78080	0.09916

According to the results in Table 4, the average of the answers regarding Collectivism was higher in men.

ANOVA (Variance Analysis) Test was conducted to test the hypothesis that " H_3 : Academics' responses regarding uncertainty avoidance differ significantly in terms of age groups". The results of the variance analysis are included in Table 5.

Table 5 ANOVA TEST RESULTS REGARDING UNCERTAINTY AND AGE					
ANOVA					
UN					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4,686	2	2,343	3,705	0.028
Within Groups	63,229	100	0.632		
Total	67,915	102			

According to the results of the ANOVA Test, the Sig value is ,028. The answers of academics, for whom this value is less than 0.05, regarding uncertainty avoidance differ significantly in terms of age groups. H_3 has been accepted. Tukey Multiple Comparison Test was conducted to see in which groups this differentiation occurred. Test results are included in Table 5.

Table 6 TUKEY MULTIPLE COMPARISON TEST MULTIPLE COMPARISONS						
Dependent Variable: UN						
Tukey HSD						
(I) AGE	(J) AGE	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
25-35	36-50	0.26577	0.16723	0.255	0.1321	0.6636
	51+	0.67622*	0.26389	0.032	0.0484	0.13041
36-50	25-35	0.26577	0.16723	0.255	0.6636	0.1321
	51+	0.41045	0.27072	0.288	0.2336	1.0545
51+	25-35	0.67622*	0.26389	0.032	0.13041	0.0484
	36-50	0.41045	0.27072	0.288	0.10545	0.2336

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

According to the results in Table 6, there is a significant difference between the group aged 25-35 and the group aged 51 and over in terms of uncertainty avoidance.

ANOVA (Variance Analysis) Test was conducted to test the hypothesis that "***H₄: Academics' responses to long-term orientation differ significantly in terms of age groups***". The results of the variance analysis are included in Table 7.

Table 7 Long Term Orientation and ANOVA Test Results Regarding Age					
ANOVA					
LT					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.385	2	1.693	1.117	1.331
Within Groups	62.000	100	1.620		
Total	63.385	102			

According to the results of the ANOVA Test, the Sig value is 0.331. The answers of academics with this value greater than 0.05 regarding the long-term orientation do not differ significantly in terms of age groups. H_4 has been rejected.

H₅: *Academics' responses regarding power distance differ significantly in terms of marital status groups.*

Table 8 T-TEST RESULTS REGARDING POWER DISTANCE AND MARITAL STATUS										
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PO	Equal variances assumed	0.051	0.822	2.034	101	0.045	0.30571	0.15031	0.60389	0.00754
	Equal variances not assumed			2.012	61.149	0.049	0.30571	0.15194	0.60952	0.00191

Independent Samples T Test was applied to test H_5 . According to the results in Table 8, the Sig (2-tailed) value is less than 0.045 or 0.05. In this case, the thoughts of married and single academics regarding the power distance differ significantly. H_5 has been accepted. Looking at the sampling statistics (Table 9), the average of single academics' responses regarding the power distance was higher than the married ones.

Table 9 SAMPLING STATISTICS					
Group Statistics					
	PS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PO AVERAGE	married	70	2.2943	0.70503	0.8427
	Single	33	2.6000	0.72629	0.12643

Independent Samples T Test was used to test the hypothesis that "*H₆: Academics' responses to masculinity/femininity do not differ significantly in terms of marital status groups*". The results of the T Test are in Table 10.

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
M A	Equal variances assumed	2.292	0.133	0.423	101	0.673	0.07457	0.17630	0.42429	0.27516
	Equal variances not assumed			0.451	74.219	0.653	0.07457	0.16520	0.40372	0.25459

According to the results of the Independent samples T Test, the Sig (2-tailed) value was 0.673. Since this value is greater than 0.05, the thoughts of married and single academics about masculinity/femininity do not differ significantly. *H₆* has been accepted.

Correlation Analysis (Table 11) was performed to test the hypothesis that "*H₇: There is a meaningful relationship between academics' power distance and levels of uncertainty avoidance*".

Correlations			
		PO	UN
PO	Pearson Correlation	1	0.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.430
	N	103	103
UN	Pearson Correlation	0.079	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.430	
	N	103	103

According to the analysis results in Table 11, there is no significant relationship between power distance and uncertainty avoidance, since the Sig (2-tailed) value is 0.430 > 0.05. *H₇* has been rejected.

Simple Correlation Analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis "*H₈: There is a significant relationship between academicians' power distance and sociality level*". The results of the analysis are presented in Table 12.

Correlations			
		PO	CO
PO	Pearson Correlation	1	0.245*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.013

	N	103	103
CO	Pearson Correlation	,245*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,013	
	N	103	103
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

The results of the analysis showed a significant and positive relationship between power distance and collectivism at the level of 0.05 ($r(103) = .245$ $p < 0.05$). H8 has been accepted.

H₉: *There is no meaningful relationship between the power distance of academics and the levels of masculinity/femininity levels.*

Table 13 CORRELATION ANALYSIS RESULTS ON POWER DISTANCE AND MASCULINITY/FEMININITY LEVELS			
Correlations			
		PO	MA
PO	Pearson Correlation	1	0.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.317
	N	103	103
MA	Pearson Correlation	0.100	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.317	
	N	103	103

Correlation analysis was performed to test H9. The results of the analysis are included in Table 13. According to the results of the analysis in Table 13, there is no significant relationship between power distance and masculinity/femininity as the Sig (2- tailed) value is 0.103. $0 > 0.05$. H9 has been accepted.

"H₁₀: *There is a significant relationship between academicians' power distance and long-term orientation level."*

Table 14 CORRELATION ANALYSIS RESULTS ON POWER DISTANCE AND LONG-TERM ORIENTATION			
Correlations			
		PO	LT
PO	Pearson Correlation	1	0.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.577
	N	103	103
LT	Pearson Correlation	0.056	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.577	
	N	103	103

According to the results of the analysis in Table 14, there is no significant relationship between power distance and long-term orientation as the Sig (2-tailed) value is 0.577 > 0.05 . H₁₀ has been rejected.

Frequency Analysis

Frequency analysis was performed within the framework of descriptive analysis, the arithmetic mean results based on this analysis were included in the Table 15 below.

Table 15 RESULTS OF FREQUENCY ANALYSIS	
Statistics	

		PO	UN	CO	LT	MA
N	Valid	103	103	103	103	103
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.3922	3.9553	3.2783	3.7039	3.1917
Std. Deviation		0.72270	0.81598	0.82062	0.78830	0.83152

As can be inferred from the table, the average power distance is 2.39, which means that the power distance is low. Low power distance shows that the people from lower positions participate in decisions, that employees consider themselves equal to other employees, the tops are not autocratic, that the bottom-up access in organizations is easy, the differences in salaries may be low. This means that high-ranking officials should not make decisions without consulting subordinates, seek their opinions, there is companionable communication in the workplace, and at the same time employees want to be able to challenge decisions and gain authority.

The uncertainty avoidance level is 3.96, which means that the love of uncertainty is high. Avoidance of uncertainty is related to the fear that individuals feel in the face of uncertain situations in the organization. This fear can show itself as stress, as individuals' inclination to guaranteed work, need for written and unwritten rules, a low tendency to take risks, resistance to change. There is low job satisfaction, hesitations about leaving work, and guaranteed jobs are sought. In cultures that avoid uncertainty, individuals attach great importance to job security, career, retirement. and wages.

Our findings on collectives are equivalent to 3.28. That means collectivity. In such organizations, social bonds between individuals are frequent. At this time, they want the organization hosted by the employees to protect and look after them in return for belonging without question.

In community cultures, the characteristics that a good employee should have are trust, loyalty and harmony with other employees, the ability to act on his own and The middle class has little development, the individual is a part of large groups, the determinants of social behavior are norms, duties and responsibilities, collective decisions are believed, the interest of the organization is more important than personal interest, employees are seen as one of the family members and a part of the social environment, harmony is emphasized, conflicts are suppressed.

Another dimension, masculinity-femininity is equivalent to 3.2. This value is suitable for the femininity dimension of the sample.

Those who work in feminine organizations have values such as dependency, affection, compassion, empathy, sentimentalism, substantiality, sensitivity and helpfulness. Work is for living, coordination and relationship with the boss in the workplace is very important, the place and job security are important, there is low job stress, group decisions are trusted, small departments are preferred to work, protecting others and warm relationships are important, managers attach importance to common sense and compromise norms are essential.

If we look at the results obtained in the Long Term-Short Term Adaptation dimension, it seems that the employees in the organization are in long term action of 3.70. This means that employees postpone the most important events in life to the future, that their needs are met in the future, what is good and what is bad varies according to conditions, traditions are compatible with changing conditions, they have expectations such as focusing on future positions in the business life.

CONCLUSION

In this research, it has been tried to determine the individual cultural values of UNEC Academicians in Azerbaijan by using the cultural dimensions of Hofstede. The study group of

the study was composed of 400 randomly selected academicians from UNEC who settled in Baku, considering the level of socio-economic development. The respondents were asked to what extent they agree with the sentences reflecting each of the variables on the five-point Likert scale. 103 people returned from the survey. In this research conducted based on the scanning model, to determine cultural beliefs at the social level, the expressions of the Individual Cultural Values Scale of Yoo et al. (2011), which deals with the Five-Dimensional Cultural Values Scale developed by Hofstede in an individual context, were used. To determine cultural beliefs at the social level, the Five-Dimensional Cultural Values Scale developed by Hofstede, Yoo et al. (2011) was reviewed in an individual context and conducted a validity and reliability study. The scale, the original form of which is "CVSCALE*-Individual Cultural Values Scale", has been translated into Azerbaijani as "Individual Cultural Values Scale". Individual Cultural Values Scale; It consists of a total of 26 items: power distance 5, uncertainty avoidance 5, collectivism 6, long term orientation 6, and masculinity 4 items. This research has been applied only to UNEC academicians working in the city of Baku. The answers in the obtained questionnaire forms were coded and analyzed with "SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for Windows 24 Version". In this study, Reliability Analysis, Single Sample t-Test analysis, Independent Sample t-Test, Frequency, and Correlation Analysis were performed with the SPSS package program. Reliability analysis was made and analysis results were 0.90. A total of 10 Hypotheses have been developed regarding the research. T-Test, ANOVA Test, and Correlation Analysis were performed in SPSS 24 with the data obtained to test the hypotheses. Among the hypotheses, H₂, H₃, H₅, H₆, H₈, H₉ were accepted, and H₁, H₄, H₇, H₁₀ were rejected. As can be seen from the frequency analysis, the average of the Power Distance corresponds to 2.39, which indicates that the power distance is low, the value of Uncertainty Avoidance is 3.96, which indicates that the level of uncertainty is high, the findings we obtained about collectivism correspond to 3.28. This means collectivity. Another dimension, masculinity-femininity, corresponds to 3.2. This value is following the femininity dimension of the sample. If we look at the results we obtained in the Long Term-Short Term Adaptation dimension, it is seen that the employees in the organization are in long term action of 3.70.

REFERENCES

- Arslan, M. (2001). Some Basic Concepts of Management and Organization. Management and Organization, Editor: Salih Guney, Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Ball, Donald A., McCulloch, Wendell H. (1995). International Business, Texas, Business Publication Inc.
- Dogan, B. (2012). Organization culture. Istanbul: Beta Publications.
- Ricky, W., Pustay, M.W., Block, M.D., & Gerlach, G. (2005). *International business: A managerial perspective* (Vol. 50). Prentice Hall.
- Harris, H., Brewster, C., & Sparrow, P. (2003). International Human Resource Management. CIPD Publications, London.
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum ve J.J. & Woodman R.W. (1995). Organisational Behavior, 7th Ed., West Publishing Co, USA, s.471.
- Hill, Charles, & W.L. (2003). Global Business. 2. bs. McGrawHill.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequence: International Differences in Work-Related Values. London: Sage Publication.
- Hofstede, & Geert. (1991) Cultures and Organizations, England, McGraw-Hill Book.
- Hofstede, G., & Geert. (1984) Culture's Consequences, USA: Sage Publication, Abridged Ed.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G.J. (2005). Cultures and Organizations Software of the Mind (Second Edition). McGraw.Hill. <http://www.geert-hofstede.com>, date of access: 19/01/2008.
- Sargut, A., & Selami. (2015). Intercultural Differentiation and Management, Image Publications.: Ankara.
- Solomon, M.R., White, K., Dahl, D.W., Zaichkowsky, J. L., & Polegato, R. (2017). *Consumer behavior: Buying, having, and being*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Triandis, H.C. (1994). Culture and social behavior.
- Whyte, G., (1991). Decision failures: Why they occur and how to prevent them. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 5(3), 23-31.