Why are people in Luxembourg happy?
An exploratory study of happiness and culture measured by the dimension of a language as identifier in the Grand Duchy

Ursula Schinzel, *United Business Institutes, Luxembourg**

Abstract The purpose of this study is to explain Luxembourg people's high scores on the measure of happiness by looking into the relationship between happiness and culture, as measured by the command of a language. More specifically, Hofstede's dimensions of culture, 'Individualism/Collectivism', 'Power Distance', 'Masculinity/Femininity', 'Uncertainty Avoidance', 'Long-Term Orientation/Short-Term Orientation', 'Indulgence versus Restraint' and 'Monumentalism', as well as 'Happiness', (Diener & Lucas, 2000) are measured and calculated by obtaining responses from 134 employees who work at Lindab Buildings in Luxembourg, France and Germany. No significant differences were found between Hofstede's estimates for the dimensions of culture in Luxembourg and his scores for Germany, and the current study's results for Lindab in Luxembourg and Germany. Differences were found between Hofstede's and Lindab results for France and for Luxembourgers who command the Luxembourgish language, indicating that language is an identifier of culture. Pearson Correlations were calculated, where Happiness was found to be related to Indulgence and to Long-Term Orientation. Discussion, implications, limitations, and future research suggestions follow.

Keywords Dimensions of culture, Cross-cultural management, Happiness, Language, Luxembourg, Values

*Correspondence details and a biography for the author are located at the end of the article.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explain Luxembourg people's high scores on the measure of happiness by looking into the relationship between happiness and culture, as measured by the command of a language. Happiness is an upcoming research topic (Argyle, 2001; Csikszentmihalyi & Hunter, 2003; Diener & Chan, 2011; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010; Mogilner, Aaker & Kamvar, 2011; Myers & Diener, 1995; Oswald, 1997; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989; Veenhoven & Hagerty, 2006), but no research has investigated the relationship between happiness and culture dimensions. It would be useful to test these relationships in a country where no empirical data exist for culture dimensions. While examining the empirical dimensions of culture it would also be useful to add two extra dimensions to Hofstede's classical five, namely Indulgence versus Restraint and Monumentalism. Hofstede is known for his classical four dimensions, namely 'Individualism/Collectivism', 'Power Distance', 'Masculinity/Femininity', and 'Uncertainty Avoidance'. He later added a fifth dimension: 'Long-Term Orientation/Short-Term Orientation'. The addition of a sixth dimension followed many years later and was more motivated by Minkov than by Hofstede himself: 'Indulgence versus Restraint'(Hofstede, 2001). Minkov suggested a seventh dimension: 'Monumentalism' (Minkov, 2011), that Hofstede then adopted. Management scholars, such as Hofstede (1980, 1983, 2001), Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010) or House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman and Gupta (2004) have indeed acknowledged that language has a major impact on culture. However, they tend to test their theory of culture across national borders rather than across languages. For example, Hofstede (1980) has acknowledged that Switzerland has four official languages, but in his study he had provided only one score, rather than four, for each of his cultural dimensions in Switzerland.

This study uses the case of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg to test the hypothesis that happiness could be partially explained by culture, as identified by language. Luxembourg has been selected over other countries because of its uniqueness in the fact that it awards national citizenship only to people who speak the local dialect, called Luxembourgish, yet the nation comprises many nationalities, mostly Portuguese, Belgians, French and German. Hence, by comparing Luxembourgers, both citizens and non-citizens, with French people from France and German people from Germany, Luxembourg's unique population provides the opportunity to test the relationship between happiness and culture, using the Luxembourgish language as well as national borders as the fault lines to measure the dimensions of culture.

The following sections of this article describe Hofstede's and others' dimensions of culture as well as current knowledge about happiness; depict the results of studies conducted in Luxembourg about culture and happiness and formulate research hypotheses; delineate the study's methods and results, and discuss those results within the framework of theories used. A reference list concludes the report. In the next section we describe the various dimensions of culture.

DIMENSIONS OF CULTURE

Geert Hofstede (1980), in his monumental research on culture at IBM, has instigated worldwide research efforts. Culture has been found to have dimensions, the question is not if, but how many. Hofstede initially came up with four dimensions - Individualism

versus Collectivism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, and Masculinity versus Femininity with the later addition of three more dimensions, Long-term versus Short-term Orientation, Indulgence versus Restraint, and Monumentalism, as previously described.

Hofstede (1980) defines culture as the "*collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another*". Hofstede defines **Uncertainty avoidance (UAI)** as "*the extent to which people feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid these situations*" (Hofstede, 2001). He defines **Individualism (IDV)** as "*people looking after themselves and their immediate family only, versus people belonging to in-groups that look after them in exchange for loyalty*" (Hofstede 2001). The individualism/collectivism cultural dimension has been researched in detail by Triandis (1995) and Triandis and Gelfand (1998) dividing it into four further dimensions: vertical and horizontal individualism and vertical and horizontal collectivism. **Power Distance (PDI)** is defined as "*the extent to which less powerful members of a society accept and expect that power is distributed unequally*" (Hofstede, 2001). **Masculinity/Femininity (MAS)** is defined as: "*the dominant values in a masculine society are achievement and success; the dominant values in a feminine society are caring for others and quality of life*" (Hofstede, 2001). Hofstede was largely influenced by Bond's Chinese Value Survey (Hofstede & Bond, 1988) and therefore incorporated his fifth dimension 'Long-Term/Short-Term Orientation'. Hofstede (2001) defines **Long-Term Orientation (LTO)** as "*the extent to which a society exhibits a pragmatic future-orientated perspective rather than a conventional historic or short-term point of view*". Hofstede defines **Indulgence versus Restraint (IVR)** as: "*Indulgence stands for a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun. Restraint stands for a society that suppresses gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms*" (www.geerthofstede.nl/dimensions-of-national-cultures). Minkov defines **Monumentalism (MON)** versus Flexumility as: high pride, immutable identities, values, norms and beliefs (Minkov, 2011).

Geert Hofstede's research has not only been subject to enthusiasm (Sorge, 1983; Triandis, 1982), to replications (House et al., 2004), or to reviews (Cooper, 1982; Eysenck, 1981; Smith, 2002, 2006), but also to criticism, contestation and controversy (McSweeney, 2002; Roberts & Boyacigiller, 1984; Søndergaard, 1994). Hofstede states: "*I made a paradigm shift in cross-cultural studies, and as Kuhn (1970) has shown, paradigm shifts in any science meet with strong initial resistance*" (Hofstede, 2002). The discussion exchange between Hofstede and McSweeney is regarded as closed by Hofstede. Hofstede also had an exchange with Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) about the validity of their filled-in questionnaires. The debate between Hofstede and the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) study (House et al., 2004) led Smith to write his 2006 article about the famous elephants which fight. The five main criticisms of Hofstede's approach have been enumerated by Hofstede (2002) himself:

(1) Surveys are not a suitable way of measuring cultural differences;

(2) Nations are not the best units for studying cultures;

(3) A study of the subsidiaries of one company cannot provide information about entire national cultures;

(4) The IBM data are old and therefore obsolete; and

(5) Four or five dimensions are not enough.

The GLOBE study reported by Robert House, Paul Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta (2004) involved 160 researchers worldwide in 62 cultures, producing nine dimensions of culture: Power Distance, Uncertainty avoidance, Humane Orientation, Collectivism I (Institutional Collectivism), Collectivism II (In-Group Collectivism), Assertiveness, Gender Egalitarianism, Future Orientation, and Performance Orientation. The exchange between the GLOBE advocates and Hofstede was vivid and produced several publications, among them Hofstede's (2006) "What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds" and the publication by Javidan, House, Dorfman, Hanges and Sully de Luque from 2006 entitled "Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: a comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches", both published one following the other in the same edition of the *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*. This, at times, aggressive discussion motivated Tung and Verbeke's (2010) "Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the quality of cross-cultural research" and others (Venaik & Brewer, 2010, 2011) to summarise this lively exchange.

Hofstede's work was strongly criticised by Brendan McSweeney (2002), who published his article "Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith - a Failure of Analysis" in *Human Relations*. McSweeney has not a single good word for Hofstede's study, and says "*extreme, singular, theories, such as Hofstede's model of national culture are profoundly problematic*" (McSweeney, 2002, p. 113), instead, McSweeney says, "*we need to engage with and use theories of action which can cope with change, power, variety, multiple influences - including the non-national - and the complexity and situational variability of the individual subject*" (McSweeney, 2002, p. 113). McSweeney states the following example "*although the state 'Great Britain' is composed of at least three nations - England, Scotland and Wales - Hofstede treats it as a single entity with a single 'national culture'*" (McSweeney, 2002, p. 92). The discussion between Hofstede and McSweeney, again as for the GLOBE, was vivid, aggressive, and this exchange is considered by Hofstede as closed (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

In 1997 Ronald Inglehart started with a "European Values Survey" (EVS) that expanded to a "World Values Survey" (WVS, Inglehart, 2011). Both are large-scale, cross-national and longitudinal survey research programs. The headquarters of the WVS is in Stockholm, Sweden. For the moment Ronald Inglehart's "World Values Survey" is the most impressive and the most complete existing database, much more complete than the database of GLOBE or Hofstede. Hofstede praises the database and the research of Inglehart. Hofstede would use the database of Inglehart to perform his research, if he had to restart today (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 49). Since the early 1980s, a network of social researchers has been applying the standardised questionnaire consisting of about 360 questions in over 100 countries with over 420,000 respondents all together. The questionnaires are used in face-to-face interviews. In the majority of cases countries participated in EVS or in WVS, seldom in both.

The WVS and EVS show the changes in peoples' values, in what they want from life and what their beliefs are in the domains of religion, gender roles, work motivations, democracy, good governance, social capital, political participation, tolerance of other groups, environmental protection and subjective well-being (Inglehart, 2011, Foreword to the WVS brochure). He further states in the foreword, that "*the WVS network is analysing the impact of global cultural change on economic development, creativity, quality of life and democracy*".

Despite all the criticism, Hofstede's merit is huge. Kirkman, Lowe and Gibson (2006) provide a summary of "A quarter century of Culture's Consequences: a review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework". They show how many culture studies have followed Hofstede.

Appendix 1 (Schinzel, 2013) provides a comparison of different authors in different eras researching Luxembourg/France/Germany. Richard D. Lewis (2006) specialises in research in language programming. Scholz and Böhm (2008) specialise in Human Resources. Researchers like Nakata, Briley, Hong and others have extended cultural research into psychology, anthropology, and philosophy.

In 2010, together with his son Gert Jan Hofstede and Michael Minkov, Hofstede published *Cultures and Organizations, Software of the Mind, Third Edition*. In this edition Hofstede et al. surprised readers and researchers by coming up with a sixth dimension of culture entitled "indulgence versus restraint", or "subjective well-being" and "happiness" constructs. This addition of a new dimension shows the influence of Michael Minkov. The influence of Minkov is not only felt by the addition of a seventh dimension of culture titled "Monumentalism", but also by Hofstede's advice not to invest further in data collection, but to rather use secondary data, as Minkov (2011, 2013), who analysed Inglehart's (2011) data from www.worldvaluessurvey.org, has done.

This study takes on the second challenge of Hofstede's criticism, namely, that national boundaries are not the best unit of analysis of studying culture, and uses the example of Luxembourg to demonstrate that language is a better identifier of culture rather than geographical boundaries of nations. It compares data collected in three subsidiaries of one company in Germany, France and Luxembourg, to demonstrate that Luxembourg's dimensions of culture are not proxies for the average values found by Hofstede in France and Germany, but rather are unique and a result of Luxembourgish, which, along with French and German, is one of the official languages of the Grand Duchy. Hence, the next section delineates background information about Luxembourg, such as economic, geographical, political, social, historical and language, as well as some research reports about culture and happiness in Luxembourg, followed by a set of hypotheses.

ECONOMIC, GEOGRAPHICAL, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXT IN LUXEMBOURG

Luxembourg is a parliamentary democracy with a constitutional monarch at its head. Along with Belgium, Germany, France, Italy and the Netherlands, the Grand Duchy was one of the signatories of the Treaty of Rome in 1957. The ensuing creation of the EEC (European Economic Community) and EURATOM (European Atomic Energy Community) formed the nucleus of the later EU. On 18 April 1951 it was a founding member of the CECA (Communauté Européenne du Charbon et de l'Acier, or in English, European Coal and Steel Community), the Paris treaty, together with the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Belgium. In Luxembourg, European cultures meet on a small piece of land that hosts people with a high level of tolerance. The European Commission has its seat in Brussels and Luxembourg. On May 1st, 2004, ten new countries joined the European Union, including seven former Eastern Bloc countries. On January 1st, 2007 Bulgaria and

Romania, two more former Eastern Bloc countries joined, and on July 1st, 2013 Croatia, establishing the current membership at 28 countries.

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg's motto is: "*Mir wölle bleiwe wat mir sinn*", which in English means "*We want to remain what we are*". The capital of Luxembourg carries the same name as the monarchy. Official languages are German, French, and Luxembourgish. The Government is a Parliamentary Democracy and a Constitutional Monarchy. The Grand Duke's name is Henri; the Prime Minister at the time of writing was Jean-Claude Juncker. The population is growing fast, as in 2009 it was approximately 493,000, in 2010 it was approximately 502,000, in 2011 it was approximately 511,800 and by January 1st 2013 it is estimated at 537,000 by STATEC (2013, p. 9). It is the world's only remaining Grand Duchy. It has the second highest Gross Domestic Product per capita ($84,829; IMF, 2011) in the world. It is a founding member of ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community), European Union, NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation), OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development); it has been part of the euro zone since 1999. This shows its high interest in European integration. The small army often is the subject of a laugh: it consists of around 800 soldiers. There is no navy and no air force.

Luxembourg is one of the smallest European countries, it measures 2,586 km², 82 km long and 57 km wide at its longest and widest points. Until 1960, the steel industry was the engine of Luxembourg's economy; after 1960, the banking and financial sector took over. The Luxembourgish language is a German dialect from the Mosel region, filled with French and Dutch words and expressions. Luxembourgish is one of the three national languages. In school, pupils speak and study in German, French, Luxembourgish, and may later study English, Portuguese and Italian.

To show the specific position Luxembourg holds, the data from STATEC from 2013 were taken, where Luxembourg's total population consisted of 537,000 inhabitants (STATEC 2013, estimation by January 1st) of whom 298,200 were Luxembourgers and 238,800 were foreigners (data from STATEC, 2013, p. 9). Resident foreigners are from Portugal (88,200), from France (35,200), from Italy (18,300), from Belgium (17,600), Germany (12,400), Britain (5,700), the Netherlands (3,900), other EU countries (24,800) and Other (32.700). During the day time, 156,900 non-resident cross-border workers came to Luxembourg in 2012 to work: 77,900 from France, 39,500 from Belgium, 39,600 from Germany (STATEC, 2013, p.12). Domestic employment was 379,000 in 2012, out of them 156,900 were non-resident cross-border workers from France, Belgium and Germany. 10,700 resident cross-border workers commuted from Luxembourg for work to the three neighbouring countries.

Again following the data from STATEC (2013, p. 11), Luxembourg-City had 103,600 inhabitants, 60% of whom were foreigners. During the day, this equation changes dramatically, due to the non-resident cross-border workers, see above. The foreign citizens brought not only their language, their skills, their everyday customs, but also folklore, religious and cultural customs and traditions (Hausemer, 2013, p.10). The TGV (train à Grande Vitesse) link makes Luxembourg only two hours away from Paris. RTL (Radio Television Luxembourg) and SES ASTRA (Société Européenne des Satellites); European Skype, eBay and Amazon are headquartered in Luxembourg.

There were 45,000 European civil servants, out of this number 9,500 were present in Luxembourg; this means 5.5% of the Luxembourg active population. 42.3% of the Luxembourgers are civil servants (IPSE, 2010). The European Institutions in Luxembourg are: Secretariat of the European Parliament, European Council (2nd),

Court of Justice and Court of Auditors. There are also: European Investment Bank, European Investment Fund, European Union Publications Office, and Eurostat. The European Institutions are distributed as follows: Brussels hosts the Commission, Council of Ministers, European Council (1st), Parliament (2nd). Strasbourg hosts the Parliament, Luxembourg hosts the Parliament (secretary), Council (2nd), Court of Justice, Court of Auditors. Frankfurt hosts the European Central Bank.

There is very little research in general about Luxembourg. The existing literature is mostly descriptive. The most recent publication, in French, on history and politics in Luxembourg has been written by Haag (2011) and includes excellent photographs underlining his detailed historical overview. One recent publication is from IPSE (2010), in German, but it does not relate in any way to Hofstede's dimensions, nor does Spizzo's book published in 1995.

Luxembourg's history

Despite all the wars in Europe Luxembourg still survives. Despite all the requests from the European partners for fiscal homogeneity, despite the demands to abolish the borders and the ending of bank secrecy, and the exchange of information on bank accounts, Luxembourg still survives. Luxembourg is a small country, and it is strongly attached to the rock it is built on, like a medieval defensive city (Spizzo, 1995).

Luxembourg has always stayed politically 'neutral'. This 'neutrality' has often been compared with Switzerland's neutrality. Luxembourg was able to stay neutral between its two mighty neighbouring countries, France and Germany. Therefore the 'privileges', namely, low direct and indirect taxes, low or non-existent income tax, work opportunities, low unemployment, high salary, cheap gasoline, cigarettes, alcohol, and more, are seen as a unifying identifier for the Luxembourgers. These privileges make the difference between the 'in-group' and the 'out-group' (Briley, 2002, 2009), between 'being Luxembourger or not'.

After World War I the need was to assure national identity, to make people understand why it was important to be 'Luxembourgers', to give value to the concept of 'citizenship', and being a 'Luxembourg citizen'. Only when Nazism engulfed this small country, and Luxembourg was placed under German administration, did the linguistic aspect attain its importance. "*In a 1941 population census, a majority responded with "Luxembourgish" to the three crucial questions of national, ethnic and linguistic affiliation*" (Thewes, 2008, p.15).

History shapes the character of a nation. Haag (2011, p. 529) states, that Luxembourg developed from a provincial town to a European capital, an international financial centre, and a worldwide freight centre. In 2008, the Clausen zone was created for entertainment, in 2005, the Philharmonic Orchestra was inaugurated, the MUDAM (Grand Duke Jean Museum of Modern Art) in 2006 and the Congress Centre in 2012 (Haag, 2011, p. 539). The 2010 Mercier report puts Luxembourg in 20th position among 221 towns for its quality of life (Haag, 2011, p. 541). Prominent European personalities, such as Robert Schumann, Jean-Claude Juncker, and Jacques Santer are from Luxembourg (Haag, 2011). RTL - Radio Television Luxembourg, SES Astra - Société Européenne des Satellites, and EIB - European Investment Bank - are important companies from Luxembourg (Haag, 2011, pp. 479-493). Luxembourgers are trilingual, sometimes quadri-lingual or quinti-lingual, or command even more languages, as described in the following.

Culture and language

The relationship between 'culture and language' has been studied by Kashima and Kashima (1998), testing the use of first- and second-person singular pronouns ('I' and 'you') in correlation with Individualism, and by doing so correlating language and culture. The relationship between 'cultural background', 'language', 'geographic region' and 'ethnic identity' was researched by Taylor, Bassili and Aboud (1973). Lewis (2006) specialises in research on 'language programming' in relation to cross cultural leadership. Sherzer (1987) investigates the relationship between grammar and culture, where language conditions thought, perception and world view. Bi-culturals' ability of frame switching through language has been researched by Briley, Morris and Simonson (2005) and Hong, Morris, Chiu and Benet-Martínez (2000). Language has been identified as a manipulator of consumers' behaviour (Briley et al., 2005; Hong et al., 2000).

As argued earlier, Luxembourg with its special Luxembourgish language as well as other official languages, and its unique demand for the command of Luxembourgish as a condition for citizenship, provides an appropriate background for testing the role of language as an identifier of culture. Luxembourg's language is described next, followed by the relevant hypotheses.

Luxembourgish language

Today, 320,000 people are Luxembourgish native speakers. The Luxembourgish language (Spizzo, 1995) has become the discriminating factor to distinguish between those who are able to benefit from Luxembourgish citizenship and those who are not. Luxembourgish possesses the characteristics of a dialect, proven by the fact that there is no translation of the Bible into Luxembourgish. Luxembourgish is a spoken language and does not have a long written tradition (Spizzo, 1995). The language defines the in-group (Briley, 2005) and the out-group. Those who speak Luxembourgish are part of the in-group and those who do not speak the language are part of the out-group. Official documents are in French or in German. Mostly, French is used for bureaucratic issues, and German is used for the religious ceremonies. This dialect has become the discriminating element for citizenship. Citizenship is only awarded to people who speak Luxembourgish (Spizzo, 1995). The language, therefore, provides access to the advantages and rights associated with citizenship.

Luxembourgish authorities are an example of long-term orientation; they were able to adapt and react to some of the crises in the steelmaking industry and in the banking system, always with the objective of guaranteeing stability and wealth for the people. It seems as if there was stability and wealth guaranteed throughout the centuries. Typical words for the national identity are wealth, privileges, and stability through the maintenance of the attractiveness of the country compared to neighbouring countries, because of its industry, its labour market, and its fiscal benefits, all key for the success of the country. Being part of this system and the feeling it gives is the glue of the country, the sense of being part of it (Spizzo, 1995).

Following the description of Luxembourg and its culture, it is argued that Luxembourg's dimensions of culture are not proxies for the average values found by Hofstede in France and Germany, but rather are unique and a result of Luxembourg's language, which is also an official country language since 1984. The following hypotheses are offered:

> **Hypothesis 1**: *Native Luxembourgers scores on the **PDI, UAI, IDV, MAS, LTO, IVR, MON** cultural dimensions are significantly different from the scores of non-Luxembourgers in Luxembourg.*

If hypothesis 1 is corroborated then the scores on Hofstede's dimensions should reflect a tendency of Luxembourgish native language speakers to score differently from the scores of French, German and Foreigners in Luxembourg. The following hypothesis is offered:

> **Hypothesis 2:** *There are significant differences between Hofstede et al.'s (2010) **PDI, UAI, IDV, MAS, LTO, IVR, MON** cultural dimensions estimates for Luxembourg and the empirical values found in this study for Luxembourgers with Luxembourgish Nationality.*

HAPPINESS

The dependent variable in this study is happiness. Though not denying humanity's flaws, the new tack of positive psychologists recommends focusing on people's strengths and virtues as a point of departure. One of the branches of this trend is the focus on the concept of happiness. Research on 'Happiness' has focused on economics (Oswald, 1997), well-being (Diener & Lucas, 2000; Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999; Myers & Diener, 1995; Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989), psychology (Argyle, 2001; Carr, 2004), politics (Veenhoven, 2004), democracy (Frey & Stutzer, 2000), freedom (Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, & Welzel, 2008), wealth (Hagerty & Veenhoven, 2003; Veenhoven & Hagerty, 2006), happiness measurements (Diener, 2000), and happiness consequences, such as longevity (Diener & Chan, 2011).

Merriam-Webster's *Collegiate Dictionary* (2009) defines 'happiness' as "*a state of well-being and contentment, a pleasurable or satisfying experience*". Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 281) define their sixth cultural dimension 'Indulgence versus Restraint (IVR)' as follows:

> *Indulgence would mean that one can act as one pleases, spend money, and indulge in leisurely and fun-related activities with friends or alone. All this predicts relatively high happiness. At the opposite pole, we find a perception that one's actions are restrained by various social norms and prohibitions and a feeling that enjoyment of leisurely activities, spending, and other similar types of indulgence are somewhat wrong.*

In this study, we adopt both the individual measure of happiness and the cultural dimension of happiness to identify the relationships between culture and happiness in Luxembourg.

Happiness in Luxembourg

In 2009 in Luxembourg, the 'Conseil économique et social' (CES) and the 'Conseil supérieur pour un développement durable' (CSDD) were mandated by the Government with the development of an indicator system for the measurement of happiness (Gantenbein, 2012). As the gross domestic product (GDP) does not say enough about peoples' quality of life, new indicators for the measurement of

well-being are being developed in Luxembourg. The OECD has defined eleven criteria that play an important role in connection with well-being: health, place of residence, income, work, environment, social relationships, and involvement in social life, governmental guidance, life satisfaction, security and work-life balance (Gantenbein, 2012). Also in 2009, the 'PIBien-être' project started in Luxembourg. The project aims at measuring the population's morale. Following STATEC Director, Serge Allegrezza, Luxembourg is missing indicators on social relationships, honorary engagement, governmental guidance, education and satisfaction. Martine Durand, director of the OECD statistics authority says that these indicators are difficult to measure, and that the growth of the GDP does not automatically lead to the growth of well-being (Gantenbein, 2012). More information is to be found under www.yourbetterlifeindex.org

In the World Database of Happiness (http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl), Veenhoven (2012) compares nations' Happiness. Veenhoven scores for Luxembourg are: 'Average Happiness' on a scale 0-10 is 7.7 for Luxembourg, with the highest score 8.5 for Costa Rica and the lowest score 2.6 for Togo; 'Happy Life Years' on a scale 1-100 are 60.1 for Luxembourg, with the highest score 66.7 for Costa Rica and the lowest score 12.5 for Zimbabwe; 'Inequality of Happiness' on a scale 3.5-0 is 1.96 for Luxembourg, with the lowest score 1.42 for the Netherlands and the highest score 3.19 for Angola, showing that the inequality of happiness is highest in Angola and lowest in the Netherlands, with Luxembourg at 1.96 close to the Netherlands; 'Inequality Adjusted Happiness' on a scale 0-100 is 64 in Luxembourg, with the highest score 73 for Denmark and the lowest score 16 for Tanzania; These results are based on survey questions such as "*Taking all together, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your life-as-a-whole these days?*". The 'stability' of the Luxembourgish nationality is considered to be the backbone for its culture and for its people's happiness. Stability means that there is not much change taking place over time and life is quite predictable and therefore people can make long-term plans. We therefore predict that happiness will significantly correlate with Long-Term Orientation (LTO).

Hypothesis 3: *There is a strong relationship between Luxembourgers' scores on the dimension of Happiness and their scores on Long-Term Orientation (LTO).*

The dimension of Indulgence vs. Restraint (IVR) has been defined as a measure of free gratification of basic and natural human drives related to enjoying life and having fun. It would be only logical to assume that people who would score high on these attitudes would perceive themselves to be happy. Thus:

Hypothesis 4: *There is a strong relationship between Luxembourgers' scores on the dimension of Happiness and their scores on Indulgence vs. Restraint (IVR).*

METHODS

Respondents

Lindab Buildings Company, that included Lindab Luxembourg, Lindab France and Lindab Germany, has been chosen for the distribution of Hofstede's original questionnaire. The questionnaire was completed by a total of 134 employees as follows: 106 employees at Lindab Luxembourg (out of a total headcount of 160), 10

employees at Lindab France (total 12), and 18 employees at Lindab Germany (total 23). The respondents' average age was 45 years at Lindab Luxembourg, 37 years at Lindab France and 45 years at Lindab Germany. The average length of service is 12.5 years at Lindab Luxembourg and 7.5 years at Lindab France and Germany. 92% of the respondents were males.

At Lindab Luxembourg, the following languages are native languages: French (49), German (18), Luxembourgish (33), Portuguese (6), English (3), Slovak (1), Polish (1), and Russian (2). At Lindab France, native languages are: French (7), Arabic (1), Poular (1), Lari (1). At Lindab Germany, native languages are: German (16), Turkish (1) and Luxembourgish (1). The 33 Luxembourgers with Luxembourg Nationality (abbreviated Lux. Nat. in the following), have all Luxembourgish as their mother tongue. There is an equal distribution of all diplomas at Lindab Luxembourg, whereas at Lindab France 8 out of 10 have an Associate degree, and at Lindab Germany most employees hold a Bachelor degree (8) or Master's degree (6). Concerning job type, at Lindab Luxembourg, the distribution consists of 34 managers, 30 academic professionals, 21 technicians, 15 office workers, 6 other, and 111 blue collar workers. At Lindab France, there are 4 managers, 4 academic professionals, and 2 technicians. Lindab Germany counts 3 Managers, 11 academic professionals, 2 technicians, and 2 others.

Instruments

Hofstede's (2001) original questionnaire has been used to measure his cultural dimensions, see Hofstede's Value Surveys Module VSM 2008 Questionnaire, available at http://www.geerthofstede.com/vsm-08. Questions were added to measure respondents' happiness and background information. A five-point Likert-type scale was employed to indicate responses. Sample items from the questionnaire included: "Please think of an ideal job, disregarding your present job, if you have one. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you:" with a response scale ranging from 1=of utmost importance to 5=of very little or no importance. Options included "to have sufficient time for your personal or home life", "to have a boss you can respect", "to have pleasant people to work with", "to do work that is interesting", "to have a job respected by your family and friends", "to have chances for promotion". Other questions included: "Are you a happy person?", response scale ranging from 1=always, to 5=never; and "How proud are you to be a citizen of your country?", response scale ranging from 1=not proud at all, to 5=very proud.

In addition, Hofstede's "Inventory of questions regarding practices" was also used, which contained questions designed to measure the dimensions of Power Distance (7 questions), Uncertainty Avoidance (7 questions), Individualism/Collectivism (2 questions), Long-Term vs Short-Term Orientation (4 questions), Indulgence vs Restraint (2 questions), Monumentalism (2 questions), and Masculinity/Femininity (7 questions).

One question was used to measure Happiness: "Are you a happy person always, usually, sometimes, seldom, or never?

The following demographic data served as control variables: native language, command of other languages, gender, age, hierarchical rank and education. Age was measured in an eight-point scale, educational background and rank were measured on a seven-point scale.

Process

Nationality does not always correspond to native language and therefore questionnaires were distributed in English, French and German. A pilot study was conducted to pre-test the questionnaire's face validity. As ethical concerns may emerge at all stages of the research (Elms, Brammer, Harris, & Phillips, 2010), precautions have been taken to ensure confidentiality. Questionnaires have been anonymous. Equity in treatment regardless of gender, race or nationality was always guaranteed (Robertson, 2008). After the initial screening and cleaning of the collected data, Hofstede's (2010) original formulas were used to calculate Hofstede's cultural dimensions **PDI (Power Distance), UAI (Uncertainty Avoidance), IDV (Individualism/Collectivism), MAS (Masculinity/Femininity), LTO (Long-Term vs Short-Term Orientation), IVR (Indulgence vs Restraint),** and **MON (Monumentalism)** for Lindab Luxembourg, Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality, Lindab France and Lindab Germany.

The original formulas for the cultural dimensions calculation can be found in Values Survey Module 2008 Manual (Hofstede, Hofstede, Minkov & Vinken, 2008) which can be downloaded from http://geerthofstede.com/vsm-08.

The mean values and standard deviations were calculated for each question. These studies' results were compared with Hofstede's estimates. Pearson Correlations were calculated among all variables.

RESULTS

Following the original formulas the calculation of the cultural dimensions of Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish Nationality gives the results as shown here (Schinzel, 2012).

PDI = 35 x (1.9 - 2.0) + 25 x (3.5 - 1.8) - 10 (C = - 10)
PDI = -3.5 + 22.5 - 10
PDI = 39 - 10
PDI = 29

UAI = 40 x (2.0 - 3.0) + 25 x (3.3 - 2.3) + 110 (C = + 110)
UAI = -40 + 25 + 110
UAI = -15 + 110
UAI = 95

IDV = 35 x (1.6 - 2.2) + 35 x (2.8 - 1.8) + 20 (C = + 20)
IDV = -21 + 35 + 20
IDV = 14 + 20
IDV = 34

MAS = 35 x (1.9 - 1.7) + 35 x (2.4 - 2.2) + 40 (C = + 40)
MAS = 7 + 7 + 40
MAS = 14 + 40
MAS = 54

LTO = 40 x (2.3 - 1.8) + 25 x (2.6 - 2.0) + 30 (C = + 30)
LTO = 20 + 15 + 30
LTO = 35 + 30
LTO = 65

IVR = 35 x (2.7 - 2.1) + 40 x (3.2 - 2.1) - 10 (C = - 10)
IVR = 21 + 44 - 10
IVR = 65 - 10
IVR = 55

MON = 35 x (2.1 - 2.2) + 25 x (3.7 - 3.4) + 20 (C = + 20)
MON = -3.5 + 7.5 + 20
MON = 4 + 20
MON = 24

From this general table, specific results for, e.g., Lux.Nat., can be extracted. These results for Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality are shown in Table 1 in comparison with: first, Lindab Luxembourg (comprising all nationalities); second, with Hofstede's estimates for Luxembourg; third, Lindab France and Hofstede's results for France; and fourth, Lindab Germany and Hofstede's result for Germany. This is shown for the respondents' scores on the seven cultural dimensions. Hofstede didn't provide data for MON. See Table 1.

Contrary to the belief that Luxembourg is culturally close to France and linguistically to Germany, Hofstede's cultural dimensions show the limitations of this.

Power Distance is found to be low for Lux.Nat. (29), similar to UK (35) and USA (40), different from France (68) and China (80). Luxembourg being small, hierarchy is not felt that much, boss and employees meet in the same sport clubs, supermarkets, bars, and events.

TABLE 1 Comparison of the seven cultural dimensions on various databases

	Lindab Luxembourg (n = 106)	Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality (Lux.Nat.) (n = 33)	Hofstede's estimates for Luxembourg	Lindab France (n = 10)	Hofstede's France	Lindab Germany (n = 18)	Hofstede's Germany
PDI	36	29	40	32.5	68	37	35
UAI	97	95	70	28.8	86	67.5	65
IDV	51.5	34	60	41	71	65.5	67
MAS	47	54	50	43.5	43	64.5	66
LTO	69	65	64	37	63	84.5	83
IVR	53.5	55	56	80	48	46	40
MON	10	24	-	31	16.5	6.5	9.9

Uncertainty Avoidance is high (95), compared to China (30), UK (35), and USA (46), similar to Japan (92). Lux.Nat. avoid uncertain and unknown situations, a secure, regulated, clear life without surprises is preferred. Lux.Nat. are afraid of any uncertainty. For Lux. Nat. everything must be planned, organised, regulated, restricted and foreseen. Nothing has been left to surprise. They prefer that every day is the same and every year brings the same events with always the same people at the same place and the same procedure. They distinguish themselves from their mighty neighbours Germany/France/Belgium, and they created their own language (Briley, 2005; Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000), habits (Spizzo, 1995), and peculiarities (IPSE, 2010; Haag, 2011), that they hold on to strongly as if they were their identity savers (Hermans and Kempen, 1998) or their rescue plan.

Individualism is low (34), which means Collectivism is high (66), compared to USA (91), UK (89). Lux.Nat. are highly collective people preferring the well-being of the group and country to the individual's pleasure.

Masculinity is medium (54), compared to UK (66), USA (62), Japan (95), Italy (70). The characteristics of a masculine dominant country = competition and success, and those of a feminine dominant country = caring for others, quality of life, are equally distributed.

Long-Term Orientation is high (65), compared to USA (26), UK (51), not as high as in Germany (83), which is characterised for foreseen, and planned events and by perseverance and thrift.

Indulgence versus Restraint is medium (55/100), compared to UK (69), USA (68), Italy (30), China (24). Lux.Nat. in general indulge in life, love profiting from the benefits of life, and enjoy life. Concerning the cultural dimensions Indulgence versus Long-Term Orientation, Luxembourg is culturally close to France.

Monumentalism for Lux.Nat. is low (24/100), compared to USA (54.2), UK (35.4), Italy (35.2), but high compared to Germany (9.9), France (16.5) or Japan (4). Lux.Nat. love their national traditions and nationality, the Grand Ducal family, National Day, their National Hymn, and are living their national identity.

France scores low on Power Distance (PDI = 32.5), low on Individualism (IDV = 41), and low on Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI = 28.8). France's divergence from Hofstede's France is due to the migration background. Hofstede's France is positioned in the upper left quadrant next to Belgium FR, respectively in the lower right quadrant next to Bulgaria, Turkey, Chile, Peru, and Slovenia in the original maps of the world by Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010).

Germany finds its position right next to Hofstede's Germany, with no significant cultural shift. Germany has a flat hierarchy and individualistic people. Germany is a country whose inhabitants feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid these situations and people who accept that power is distributed unequally.

The correlations between all variables are shown in Table 2. Luxembourg people's high scores on the measure of happiness are shown in this table. 'Happiness' was significantly correlated with 'Indulgence versus Restraint IVR' (.293) and with 'Long-Term-Orientation LTO' (.268). "*This correlation matrix shows that Luxembourgers are characterised for being long term oriented, they indulge in life, they are uncertainty avoidant and they are happy*" (Schinzel, 2013).

So, why are Luxembourgers happy? You might say, because of their wealth - second highest GDP in the world, after Qatar. On the other hand, Hofstede et al. (2010) demonstrated that wealth is not a factor of happiness. The results of the present study show the reason for happiness of Luxembourgers: Luxembourgers are happy because 1) they are highly uncertainty avoidant, 2) they are long term-oriented, 3)

AUTHOR COPY

TABLE 2 Correlations among all variables (N = 134)

	PDI	UAI	IDV	MAS	LTO	IVR	MON	HAPPY	GENDER	AGE	EDUCATION
PDI	-										
UAI	-.021	-									
IDV	.135	-.011	-								
MAS	.206*	-.060	.517**	-							
LTO	.138	.059	.030	.000	-						
IVR	.031	.043	.318**	.272**	.042	-					
MON	.068	.023	.245**	.129	-.089	.244**	-				
HAPPY	.038	.160	.045	.014	.268**	.293**	.001	-			
GENDER	-.030	.073	-.041	-.012	.004	-.029	-.105	.029	-		
AGE	-.117	.031	-.059	.022	-.076	.108	-.312**	.040	-.128	-	
EDUCATION	.037	-.155	.106	.094	.119	.112	.060	.082	.120	-.025	-
RANK	.230**	.210*	-.001	.016	.080	-.043	.090	.006	.162	-.490**	-.084

* p < .05; ** p < .001

they have low power distance, 4) they are highly collectivist, and 5) they use their language as an identifier.

LANGUAGE AS IDENTIFIER

After World War I the need was to assure the national identity, to give value to the concept of 'citizenship', why it is important to be a 'Luxembourger' and the advantages that come with citizenship. When Nazism and World War II engulfed small Luxembourg, the Luxembourgish language attained its importance, the discriminating factor to distinguish between who is able to benefit from Luxembourgish citizenship and its advantages, and who not. The Luxembourgish language defines the in-group. In order to benefit from all of the advantages of Luxembourgish nationality, one has to be able to speak Luxembourgish. Luxembourgish is not only a dialect, but the key giving access to the advantages of the rights of the citizenship. French is for bureaucratic problems, German for religious ceremonies, Luxembourgish to define the in-group (Spizzo, 1995).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explain Luxembourg people's high scores on the measure of happiness by looking into the relationship between happiness and culture, as measured by the command of a language. Why are Luxembourgers happy? The results of this research show that Luxembourgers are happy because 1) they are highly uncertainty avoidant, 2) they are long term-oriented, 3) they have low power distance, 4) they are highly collectivist, and 5) use their language as an identifier. Hofstede did not have empirical scores for Luxembourg in his study of culture (1980), this motivated the author to replicate Hofstede's study. Hofstede has collected his data from IBM subsidiaries but the sample from IBM in Luxembourg was too small at that time. Yet, in recognition of Luxembourg's role in the European Union (European Economic Community at the time) he has extrapolated the scores for France and Germany as proxies for the scores in Luxembourg. After all, the Grand Duchy is located in between these two large economic powers and most of the country's people speak German and French. By using those proxies, Hofstede has continued with the tradition of identifying cultures across political boundaries (countries) while ignoring the role of language in the formation and maintenance of culture.

Hofstede's original work was criticised for being focused on one company. Now, the irony of this replication is the fact that the replication, for the sake of being a replication, had to be a parallel study focused again, on one company. IBM Luxembourg, the most fitting choice, unfortunately was not available to participate in this study, but instead Lindab was willing to participate. The next irony of this replication is, that Hofstede while reviewing his own work states that "*surveys are not a suitable way of measuring cultural differences*", the author had to follow the same path of surveys, again with the objective of replicating the original research.

By employing a unique sample that includes respondents who speak French, German and Luxembourgish in France, Germany and Luxembourg, this study has managed to corroborate the notion that language is a good identifier of culture. While

scores in this study for French and Germans in France and Germany resemble to a great extent Hofstede's scores for these two countries, and while scores in this study resemble Hofstede's estimates for Luxembourgers who speak any official language of the Grand Duchy, Hofstede's estimates varied to a great extent from this study scores for Luxembourgers who command Luxembourgish as their mother tongue. This is a unique testimony for the relationships between language and culture, while controlling for country.

Another interesting country to research the relationship between language and culture is Switzerland. Switzerland has four languages but is one country. It would be interesting to replicate Hofstede's study in Switzerland by dividing Switzerland into four countries, depending on the language spoken by the surveyed people.

The same replications could be made in Germany, one of the countries of Hofstede's original study, which was then two countries. Hofstede in later studies divided Germany into two countries, East and West. It also would be interesting to compare the former East and West of today, with the East and West Germany before the reunification to observe if there have been cultural shifts or not, and if so, which ones. If not, it would be interesting to research the reasons. There is also a big Turkish community in Germany, another interesting community for research. If and how did the Turkish people's culture shift due to the German environment? If and how did their culture change compared to the culture of Turkish people living in Turkey? In general, given the present uproars, clashes, and demonstrations in Turkey, why and how did the Turkish culture change over the last years? What is the influence on Germany?

IMPLICATIONS

Some proven relationships between culture, represented by such dimensions as Long Term Orientation, and a high level of Indulgence, and Happiness, have been corroborated in this study. It is self-evident that two measures that measure similar concepts, namely, Indulgence on a national level and Happiness on the individual's level should be related to each other.

One must genuinely accept and understand the meaning of "*Mir wëlle bleiwe wat mir sinn*" - "*We want to remain what we are*". If one does not make an effort to integrate into Luxembourg's specific business culture, success in Luxembourg may never be possible.

The Grand Duchy's political, social and economic stability allows people to plan for the long term, thereby providing support for people's need for security and life predictability. It is possible that this is the key for the relationship between Long Term Orientation and Happiness in Luxembourg found in this study. To validate this argument it is worth citing Hofstede himself:

> At 60 Luxembourg has a high score on uncertainty avoidance which means that as a nation they are quiet reluctant to test unknown territories. Security is a key word in Luxembourg: there is not one activity which is not depending on some sort of security control from authorities; from banker's money to safety exits in a restaurant. It makes the life in Luxembourg very safe, but some would argue a bit boring. New ideas, new methods, new management techniques must first be proven to work in other countries in order to be accepted in Luxembourg. Historically, more "farmers" than "traders", the

> *inhabitants kept that good old "common sense" made of cautiousness which has proven to be profitable for a country who managed not to be at war since the Napoleonic time!*
> (http://geert-hofstede.com/luxemburg.html)

Since this is the first time that such efforts are being made to find the relationship between happiness and culture, those results should be taken cautiously.

Not surprisingly, Indulgence was found to be significantly related to Individualism and Masculinity, two concepts that are part of the Indulgence definition. The significant relationship between Indulgence and Monumentalism, and the significant negative relationship between Monumentalism and age, may indicate that younger people tend to be more individualistic, monumental and, therefore, happy. This hypothesis could only be corroborated by enlarging the sample size, which would allow conducting more sophisticated statistics than mere correlation.

LIMITATIONS

As a single researcher, there are limitations to my research, in size, in time and in the number of companies researched. Only one company was researched: Lindab Buildings. The difficulty in finding a company willing to participate represents a limitation. A possible research limitation could be the strong management involvement in this research by applying a 'top down' decision for all employees to participate in this research. Lindab France is a small entity of 12 people, of which 10 responded and this small size represents a limitation. At Lindab France the company level is looked at and not really the nation level. Lindab France is influenced culturally by Lindab in general, a Swedish company, and by the migration background of its employees, France's African and South-American former and/or present territories and colonies.

Out of the 23 employees at Lindab Germany 18 responded. Their migration background reflects Germany's migration background in general, i.e., from Turkey, and Lindab's in particular, i.e., from Luxembourg. Furthermore, Lindab is a mostly male population; out of 134 respondents, 118 were male and 16 female. At Lindab Luxembourg, there were 93 male and 13 female respondents. This is a limitation to my research in a country - the Grand-Duchy - where there are more women than men. The role of gender in happiness studies was discussed in previous studies, and it was stated that the role of gender does not have a strong impact (Csikszentmihalyi & Hunter, 2003), which justifies the author's sampling method. Finally, it must be said that this study is exploratory in nature.

Thus, the comparatively small sample size, the data collected only in one company, and the lack of a strong theory to link culture and happiness, could all have biased the results and their interpretations. Yet, it is likely that scores that were found to be significant in a small sample are likely to be made even more significant in a larger sample. Also, focusing on one small country and one company has provided the opportunity to indirectly control for many exogenous variables that otherwise would have the potential to 'contaminate' the relationships between the variables.

FUTURE RESEARCH

First, future research should engage with a wider sample, by e.g., replicating Hofstede's studies in other bigger companies in Luxembourg or by e.g., following Hofstede's suggestion of investigation of the primary data collected by Inglehart's

(2011) World Values Survey WVS (http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/html). Second, it could be worth investigating more into "Happiness" studies in Luxembourg (Aaker & Smith, 2010; Mogilner et al., 2011). Third, further research could link culture and Social Media (Aaker & Smith, 2010).

Fourth, future research could focus on two branches of the current research: first, focus on the topic 'Language as identifier', especially on the relationship between language and culture, and empirically validate it for other languages. Language is an identifier for in-group or out-group attendance (Briley, 2005). Thus, in-country studies comparing the dimensions of culture could be conducted in places such as Switzerland that contains four official languages, in Germany where a minority command Turkish as a mother tongue, or even in China, where the people of the north command Mandarin while the people of the south command Cantonese, and yet they all belong to the same Hun group. A second possible avenue for future research could focus on the influence of culture over people's happiness. Since a new cultural dimension, namely Indulgence, is now available, happiness could be measured at both the national culture level and the individual's state of mind. Expansion of the current research model and the use of its instruments in a number of other organisations and countries has the potential to strengthen the validity of the current research findings by generalising them over new populations, and by making them more specific. In any case, be it the study of language and culture or culture and happiness, larger samples would allow for the application of more sophisticated statistical methods, such as regression models, that would allow the exploration of the relative influence of language over culture, and cultural dimensions over happiness. Thus despite its limitations the current study has paved the way for major replications and refinements and the substantiation of very important hypotheses that have theoretical as well as practical implications for researchers, managers and others, across the globe.

In this world, where millions of people migrate from one country to another, and where communities become increasingly diverse, the use of countries' national boundaries as the fault lines that define culture dimensions, to explain and predict management and other societal behaviours, is very limited. Students of culture should make it their habit to measure social units' cultural dimensions by varying the respondents across languages, and maybe even across dialects, rather than across common national boundaries.

REFERENCES

Aaker, J., & Smith, A. (2010). *The Dragonfly Effect. Quick, Effective, and Powerful Ways to Use Social Media to Drive Social Change*. San Francisco, CA, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Jossey-Bass.

Argyle, M. (2001). *The Psychology of Happiness* (2nd ed.). London, GB: Routledge.

Bond, M.H. (2002). Reclaiming the Individual from Hofstede's Ecological Analysis - A 20-Year Odyssey: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 73-77. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.73

Bond, M.H., Leung, K., Au, A, Tong, K.K., & Chemonges-Nielson, Z. (2004). Combining Social Axioms with Values in Predicting Social Behaviors. *European Journal of Personality, 18*(3), 177-191. doi: 10.1002/per.509

Briley, D.A. (2009). Cultural Influence on Consumer Motivations: A Dynamic View. In C. Nakata (Ed.), *Beyond Hofstede. Culture Frameworks for Global Marketing and Management* (pp. 181-197). New York, NY, USA: Palgrave MacMillan.

Briley, D.A., Morris, M.W., & Simonson, I. (2005). Cultural Chameleons: Biculturals, Conformity Motives, and Decision Making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 15*(4), 351-362. doi:10.1207/s15327663jcp1504_9

Briley, D. A., & Wyer, R. S. (2002). The effect of group membership salience on the avoidance of negative outcomes: implications for social and consumer decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research, 29*, 400-415. Retrieved 6 February 2014 from http://works.bepress.com/briley/3

Brislin, R.W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In H.C. Triandis & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Methodology* (pp. 137-164). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Brislin, R.W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In Lonner, W.J. & Berry, J.W. (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 137-164). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Cameron, K.S., & Quinn, R.E. (2011). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture. Based on the Competing Values Framework* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Carr, A. (2004). *Positive Psychology. The Science of Happiness and Human Strengths.* Carr, Hove: Brunner-Routledge.

CIA (2014). *The World Factbook*. Central Intelligence Agency (US). Retrieved 6 February 2014 from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/lu.html

Cooper, C.L. (1982). Untitled Review of Geert Hofstede's Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 3*(2), 202-204. doi:10.2307/3000087

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Hunter, J. (2003). Happiness in Everyday Life: The Uses of Experience Sampling. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 4*(2), 185-199. doi: 10.1023/A:1024409732742

De Mooij, M. (2010). *Global Marketing and Advertising: Understanding the Cultural Paradox* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Mooij, M. (2011). *Consumer Behavior and Culture: Consequences for Global Marketing and Advertising* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective Well-Being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 34-43. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34

Diener, E., & Chan, M. (2011). Happy People Live Longer: Subjective Well-Being Contributes to Health and Longevity. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 3*(1), 1-43. doi: 10.1111/j.1758-0854.2010.01045.x

Diener, E., & Lucas, R.E. (2000). Explaining Differences in Societal Levels of Happiness: Relative Standards, Need Fulfilment, Culture, and Evaluation Theory. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 1*(1), 41-78. doi: 10.1023/A:1010076127199

Elms, H., Brammer, S., Harris, J.D., & Phillips, R.A. (2010). New Directions in Strategic Management and Business Ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 20*(3), 401-425. doi: 10.5840/beq201020328

Eysenck, H.J. (1981). The Four Dimensions. Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's Consequences. *New Society*, 16 April.

Frey, B.S., & Stutzer, A. (2000). Happiness Prospers in Democracy. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 1*(1), 79-102. doi: 10.1023/A:1010028211269

Gantenbein, M. (2012). Was macht Menschen glücklich? [What makes people happy?] *Luxemburger Wort*, 19. Januar 2012, Jahrgang 164, Nummer 16, Seite 4. Saint-Paul Luxembourg.

Haag, E. (2011). *Une réussite originale. Le Luxembourg au fil des siècles.* [An original success story. Luxembourg through centuries]. Luxembourg: Editions Guy Binsfeld.

Hagerty, M.R, & Veenhoven, R. (2003). Wealth and Happiness Revisited: Growing National Income Does Go With Greater Happiness. *Social Indicators Research, 64*(1), 1-27. doi: 10.1023/A:1024790530822

Hausemer, G. (2013). *About… Festivals and Traditions in Luxembourg*. Information and Press Service of the Luxembourg Government, Publishing Department.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Doubleday Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Hall, E.T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences. Germans, French and Americans*. Boston, MA, London, UK: Nicholas Brealey International.

Hermans, H.J.M., & Kempen, H.J.G. (1998). Moving Cultures. The Perilous Problems of Cultural Dichotomies in a Globalizing Society. *American Psychologist, 53*(10), 1111-1120. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.53.10.1111

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Boston, MA: World Publishing Co.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA, USA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1983). National Cultures Revisited. *Behavior Science Research*, *18*(4), 285-305. doi: 10.1177/106939718301800403

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations across Nations (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2002). Dimensions do not Exist: a Reply to Brendan McSweeney. *Human Relations, 55*(11), 1355-1361. doi: 10.1177/00187267025511004

Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really Measure? Researchers' Minds versus Respondents' Minds. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(6), 882-896. doi: 10.1057/palgrave. jibs.8400233

Hofstede, G.J. (2009). Research on cultures: how to use it in training? *European Journal of Cross-Cultural Competence and Management, 1*(1), 14-21. doi: 10.1504/EJCCM.2009.026729

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1988). The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots To Economic Growth. *Organizational Dynamics, 16*(4), 5-21. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(88)90009-5

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the mind. Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY, USA: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M. & Vinken, H. (2008). Values Survey Module 2008 Manual. Retrieved from http://geerthofstede.com/vsm-08

Hong, Y.-Y., Morris, M.W., Chiu, C.-Y., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural Minds. A Dynamic Constructivist Approach to Culture and Cognition. *American Psychologist*, *55*(7), 709-720. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709

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

IMF (2014). International Monetary Fund. Retrieved 6 February 2014 from http://www.imf.org/ and http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2012/cr12160.pdf

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (2011). *Values Change the World. World Values Survey*. Brochure, retrieved from www.worldvaluessurvey.org

Inglehart, R., & Baker, W.E. (2000). Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review, 65*(1), 19-51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657288

Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., & Welzel, C. (2008). Development, Freedom, and Rising Happiness. A Global Perspective (1981-2007). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*(4), 264-285. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00078.x

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IPSE – Identités, Politiques, Sociétés, Espaces. (2010). *Doing Identity in Luxembourg. Subjektive Aneignungen – institutionelle Zuschreibungen – sozio-kulturelle Milieus, Kultur und soziale Praxis*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Javidan, M., House, R.J., Dorfman, P.W., Hanges, P.J., & Sully de Luque, M. (2006). Conceptualizing and Measuring Cultures and their Consequences: a Comparative Review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's Approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(6), 897-914. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400234

Jenner, S., MacNab, B., Briley, D. A., Brislin, R., & Worthley, R. (2008). Cultural Change and Marketing. *Journal of Global Marketing, 21*(2), 161-172. doi:10.1080.08911760802135582

Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (1999). *Well-Being: the Foundations of Hedonic Psychology.* New York, NY, USA: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kashima, E.S., & Kashima, Y. (1998). Culture and Language. The Case of Cultural Dimensions and Personal Pronoun Use. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, May 1998, 29*(3), 461-486. doi: 10.1177/0022022198293005

Kirkman, B.L., Lowe, K.B., & Gibson, C.B. (2006). A Quarter Century of Culture's Consequences: a Review of Empirical Research Incorporating Hofstede's Cultural Values Framework. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(3), 285-320. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400202

Kluckhohn, F.R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago, IL, USA: Chicago University Press.

Leung, A. K.-Y., Chiu, C.-Y., & Hong, Y.-Y. (Eds) (2011). *Cultural Processes. A Social Psychological Perspective.* Cambridge University Press.

Leung, K. (2006). Editor's introduction to the exchange between Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37,* 881. Retrieved 6 February 2014 from jstor database. doi: 10/1057/palgrave.jibs.8400232

Leung, K., Bhagat, R.S., Buchan, N.R., Erez, M., & Gibson, C.B. (2005). Culture and international business: recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 36,* 357-378. Retrieved 6 February 2014 from jstor database. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400150

Lewis, R.D. (2006). *When cultures collide. Leading across cultures* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA, London: Nicholas Brealey International.

Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D. (1961). *The Achieving Society.* Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith – a Failure of Analysis. *Human Relations, 55*(1), 89-118. doi: 10.1177/0018726702551004

Merriam-Webster (2009). Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/

Minkov, M. (2011). *Cultural Differences in a Globalizing World.* United Kingdom, North America, Japan, India, Malaysia, China: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Minkov, M. (2013). *Cross-Cultural Analysis. The Science and Art of Comparing the World's Modern Societies and Their Cultures.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1993). The pitfalls of strategic planning. *California Management Review 36*(1), 32-47. Retrieved 6 February 2014, from Ebsco Database.

Mintzberg, H. (2011). *Managing.* San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler.

Mogilner, C., Aaker, J., & Kamvar, S.D. (2012). How Happiness Impacts Choice. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(2), 429-443. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/663774

Myers, D.G., & Diener, E. (1995). 'Who is Happy?' *American Psychological Society, 6*(1), 10-19. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00298.x

Nakata, C. (2009). Going beyond Hofstede: Why we Need to and how. In: C. Nakata (Ed.), *Beyond Hofstede. Culture Frameworks for Global Marketing and Management* (pp. 3-15). New York, NY, USA: Palgrave MacMillan.

Oswald, A.J. (1997). Happiness and Economic Performance. *The Economic Journal, 107*(445), 1815-1831. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0297.1997.tb00085.x

Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2005). Orientations to Happiness and Life Satisfaction: The Full Life versus the Empty Life. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 6*(1), 25-41. doi: 10.1007/s10902-004-1278-z

Roberts, K.H., & Boyacigiller, N.A. (1984). Cross-National Organizational Research. The Grasp of the Blind Men. In: B.L. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research on Organizational Behaviour* (pp. 423-475). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Robertson, C. (2008). An Analysis of 10 Years of Business Ethics Research in Strategic Management Journal: 1996-2005. *Journal of Business Ethics, 80*(4), 745-753. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9466-5

Rokeach, M. (1971). *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1979). *Understanding Human Values. Individual and Societal*. New York, NY, USA, The Free Press.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudemonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 141-166. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141

Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness Is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(6), 1069-1081. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Schein, E.H. (2009). *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Schein, E.H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Schinzel, U. (2012). *Hofstede in Luxembourg. An Intercultural Comparison with France and Germany. Applying Geert Hofstede. In Collaboration with Lindab*. (Doctoral Thesis). Paris School of Business, London Graduate School of Management, Millennium City Academy, London, Paris, May 2012.

Schinzel, U. (2013). *How to Get a Doctorate - and More - with Distance Learning*. Berlin: Frieling Verlag.

Scholz, C., & Böhm, H. (2008). *Human Resource Management in Europe*. London, UK, New York, NY, USA: Routledge.

Schwartz, S.H. (1990). Individualism-Collectivism: Critique and Proposed Refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*, 139-157. doi: 10.1177/0022022190212001

Schwartz, S.H. (1994). *Beyond individualism/collectivism: new dimensions of values*, in: Ki, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagiçibasi, C., Choi, S. C., & Yoon, B. (Eds.): *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Application and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 85-119.

Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Universalism values and the inclusiveness of our moral universe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*(6), 711-728. doi: 10.1177/0022022107308992

Schwartz, S.H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value Hierarchies Across Cultures: Taking a Similarities Perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(3), 268-290. doi: 10.1177/0022022101032003002

Sherzer, J. (1987). Discourse-Centered Approach to Language and Culture. *American Anthropologist, 89*(2), 295-309. doi: 10.1525/aa.1987.89.2.02a00010

Smith, P.B. (2002). Culture's Consequences: Something Old and Something New. *Human Relations*, *55*(1), 119-35. doi: 10.1177/0018726702551005

Smith, P.B. (2006). When Elephants Fight, the Grass Gets Trampled: the GLOBE and Hofstede Projects. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(6), 915-921. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400235

Smith, P. B. (2008). Book Review: Michael Minkov, What Makes Us Different and Similar: A New Interpretation of the World Values Survey and Other Cross-Cultural Data. Bulgaria: Klasika y Stil Publishing House 2007. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 8*(1), 110-112. doi: 10.1177/1470595880080010602

Søndergaard, M. (1994). Hofstede's Consequences: A Study of Reviews, Citations and Replications. *Organization Studies, 15*(3), 447-56. doi: 10.1177/017084069401500307

Sorge, A. (1983). Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's Consequences. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 625-629.

Spizzo, D. (1995). *La Nation Luxembourgeoise. Genèse et Structure d'une Identité*. [The Luxembourgish Nation. Genesis and Structure of an Identity]. Paris: L'Harmattan.

STATEC (2013). *Luxembourg in Figures*. Luxembourg: Editions Saint Paul. Retrieved from http://www.statec.public.lu

Taylor, D.M., Bassili, J.N., & Aboud, F.E. (1973). Dimensions of Ethnic Identity: An Example from Quebec. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 89*(2), 185-192. doi:10.1080/00224545.1 973.9922590.

Thewes, G. (2008). *About...History of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg*. (C. Weyland, Trans.) Information and Press Service of the Luxembourg Government, Publishing Department. Retrieved from http://www.luxembourg.public.lu/catalogue/histoire/ap-histoire/ap-histoire-2008-EN.pdf

Triandis, H.C. (1982). Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's Consequences. *Human Organization, 41*(1), 86-90.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & Collectivism*. New York, USA: Simon & Schuster.

Triandis, H.C., & Gelfand, M.J. (1998). Converging Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1), 118-128. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.118

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business* (2nd ed.). London: Nicholas Brealey.

Tung, R.L., & Verbeke, A. (2010). Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the Quality of Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 41*(8), 1259-1274. doi:10.1057/jibs.2010.41

Veenhoven, R. (2004). Subjective Measures of Well-being. Discussion Paper No. 2004/07. Retrieved from http://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/52848/1/389142379.pdf

Veenhoven, R. (2012). World Database of Happiness. Retrieved from http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl

Veenhoven, R., & Hagerty, M. (2006). Rising Happiness in Nations 1946-2004: a Reply to Easterlin. *Social Indicators Research, 79*(3), 421-436. doi: 10.1007/s11205-005-5074-x

Venaik, S., & Brewer, P. (2010). Avoiding Uncertainty in Hofstede and GLOBE. J*ournal of International Business Studies, 41*(8), 1294-1315. doi: 10.1057/jibs.2009.96.

Venaik, S., & Brewer, P. (2011). Individualism-Collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies, 42*(3), 436-445. doi: 10.1057/jibs.2010.62

APPENDIX 1

Comparison of different authors in different eras researching Luxembourg/France/Germany

Author	Luxembourg	France	Germany
The era before Hofstede			
Maslow (1970)	No	No	No
McClelland (1961)	No	No	No
McGregor (1960)	No	No	No
Herzberg (1959, 1966)	No	No	No
Rokeach (1979)	No	No	No
Hall (1976) Hall & Hall (1990)	No	Yes, descriptive	Yes, descriptive
Kluckhohn, Strodtbeck (1961)	No	No	No

Cont'd...

Author	Luxembourg	France	Germany
The Geert Hofstede era			
Hofstede (1980, 2001), Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov (2010)	1980: No 2001: Yes, a few notes 2010: estimates in PDI, UAI, IDV, MAS 2011: estimates in LTO, IVR No estimates in MON	Yes, in detail	Yes, in detail
The era initiated by Geert Hofstede			
Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1997)	No	Yes, in detail	Yes, in detail
De Mooij (2010, 2011)	No	Yes	Yes
Triandis (1995)	No	Yes	Yes
Schwartz (1990, 1994, 2007), Schwartz & Bardi (2001)	No	Yes	Yes
Smith (2002, 2006)	No	Yes	Yes
Inglehart (1997, 2011), Inglehart & Baker (2000), Inglehart & Welzel (2005), Inglehart et al. (2008)	1997: No 2005: Yes 2011: Yes	Yes, in detail	Yes, in detail
Cameron & Quinn (2011)	No More organisational research than national	No More organisational research than national	No More organisational research than national
Schein (2009, 2010)	No More organisational research than national	No More organisational research than national	No More organisational research than national
Mintzberg (1989, 1993, 2011)	No More organisational research than national	No More organisational research than national	No More organisational research than national
Minkov (2011)	2011: Yes, especially on murder rates	Yes	Yes
Hofstede, G.J. (2009)	No More a cultural trainer	Yes More a cultural trainer	Yes More a cultural trainer
Bond, Leung, Au, Tong, & Chemonges-Nielson, (2004)	No Chinese Values Survey	No, little Chinese Values Survey	No, little Chinese Values Survey
House et al. (2004) GLOBE	No	Yes	Yes

Cont'd...

Author	Luxembourg	France	Germany
The era beyond Hofstede			
Briley (2009), Briley, Morris, & Simonson (2005)	No	No, little	No, little
Nakata (2009)	No	No, little	No, little
Kirkman et al. (2006) Hong, Morris, Chiu, Benet-Martínez (2000) Hermans and Kempen (1998) Jenner (2008) Brislin (1980, 1986) Leung (2005, 2006, 2011)	No	No, little	No, little
The era besides Hofstede			
Scholz and Böhm (2008)	No	Yes	Yes
Lewis (2006)	No	Yes, good description	Yes, good description

(Schinzel, 2013)

ABOUT THE AUTHOR AND CORRESPONDENCE

Dr Ursula Schinzel, Doctorate in Business Administration, studied international business, management, human resources and economics in London (UK), Paris (France), Saarbrücken (Germany) and in the USA. With nearly 20 years' experience, she has held different positions in leading American and European multinational corporations in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. For the last 30 years she has been a sports instructor with several sport clubs and for 20 years with Sports pour Tous, Ville de Luxembourg. She has published articles and books and delivered lectures at conferences in German, English, French, Italian and Luxembourgish.

Dr Ursula Schinzel, United Business Institutes, Château de Wiltz, 35 rue du Château, L-9516 Wiltz, Luxembourg.

E ursula_schinzel@yahoo.com