

Why are People in Luxembourg Happy?

Language as an Identifier of Culture in the Grand Duchy

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 'Individualism/Collectivism', 'Power Distance', 'Masculinity/Femininity', 'Uncertainty Avoidance', 'Long-Term Orientation/Short-Term Orientation', 'Indulgence versus Restraint' and 'Monumentalism', as well as Happiness, (Diener and 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 as well as 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. Happiness was found to be related to Indulgence and to Long-Term Orientation. Discussion and implications follow.

Keywords

Dimensions of culture, cross-cultural management, happiness, language, Luxembourg, values.

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; Diener and

Chan 2011; Hofstede et al. 2010; Mogilner et al. 2011; Myers et al. 1995; Veenhoven 2004), 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 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. Management scholars, such as Hofstede (1980; 1983; 2001; 2010) or House et al. (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 is comprised of 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

references 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. He later added a fifth dimension , Long-term versus Short-term Orientation (Bond and Hofstede, 1983), and has just added a sixth dimension - Indulgence versus Restraint (Hofstede, 2001) and together with Minkov (2011) is about to add a seventh dimension - Monumentalism.

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 into four 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 (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). Minkov defines **Monumentalism (MON)** versus Flexumility as: high pride, immutable identities, values, norms and beliefs (Minkov 2011).

Today, Hofstede’s work is known, accepted, praised, replicated, and also criticized. Some significant culture studies have followed Hofstede. They include culture research projects such as the Chinese Value Survey by Bond et al. (2004), Cameron and Quinn (2011), De Mooij (2011), Gert Jan Hofstede et al. (2002), the GLOBE by House et al. (2004), the European Value Survey and the World Value Survey by Inglehart (2005; 2008; 2011), Minkov (2011), Schein (2009), Schwartz (1990), Smith (2006; 2002), Triandis (1982; 1995), Trompenaars and Hamden-Turner (1997). Researchers besides the Hofstede era are Scholz and Böhm (2008) who specialize into Human Resources and Lewis (2006) who specializes in language programming. Researchers beyond the Hofstede’s era, such as Nakata (2009), Briley (2009), and Hong (2000), 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 with a sixth dimension of culture titled “indulgence versus restraint”, or “subjective well-being” or “happiness,” constructs. The influence of Minkov is not only felt by the addition of a seventh dimension of culture titled “Monumentalism”, but also Hofstede’s advice not to

invest further in data collection, but to rather use secondary data, as Minkov (2010) who analyzed Inglehart's data from www.worldvaluessurvey.org, has done.

Geert Hofstede's research has not only been subject to enthusiasm (Sorge 1983; Triandis 1982), or to reviews (Cooper 1982; Eysenck 1981, Smith 2002; Smith 2006) but also to criticism, contestation and controversy (McSweeney 2002; Roberts and 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 Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1997) about the validity of their filled-in questionnaires. The debate between Hofstede and the GLOBE led Smith to write his 2006 article about the famous elephants. 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."

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 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 two more such countries joined, establishing the current membership at 27 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 is Jean-Claude Juncker. The population is growing fast, as in

2009 it was approximately 493,000, in 2010 it was approximately 502,000 and in 2011 it was approximately 511,000. 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, OECD; 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 for a laugh: it consists of around 800 soldiers. There is no navy and no air force. Luxembourg is the host to 17 NATO AWACS airplanes, one A400M military cargo plane that are shared with Belgium, and 3 NATO Boeing 707.

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 the 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.

Luxembourg's total population consists of 511,800 inhabitants of whom 290,500 (56.76%) are Luxembourgers and 221,300 (43.24%) are foreigners (data from statec, 2011). During the day time, 138,700 cross-border workers come to Luxembourg to work: 74,100 French, 37,800 Belgian, and 37,500 German. This means a total of 357,800 for domestic employment. 357,800 people were working in Luxembourg in 2010, out of them 219,100 were residents and 138,700 were cross-border workers. 39% of the domestic employment consists of cross-border workers.

The capital of Luxembourg had approximately 94,000 inhabitants in 2011, 60% of whom were foreigners. During the day, this equation changes dramatically, as the work force is commuting into the town of Luxembourg from Germany, France and Belgium. The TGV 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 are 45,000 European civil servants, out of this number 9,500 are 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 following: 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 2005), 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, because to the Germans this small piece of land seemed to be German, did the linguistic aspect attain its importance.

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 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 Taylora et al. (1973). Lewis (2006) specializes in research on 'language programming' in relation to cross cultural leadership. Sherzer (2009) investigates the relationship between grammar and culture, where language conditions thought, perception and world view. Bi-cultural's ability of frame switching through language has been researched by Briley et al. (2005) and Hong et al. (2000). Language has been identified as a manipulator of consumers' behavior (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

speaking 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. In order to benefit from all of the advantages of the Luxembourgish nationality one has to be able to speak Luxembourgish. 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 an invisible line of stability and wealth that was guaranteed throughout the centuries. Typical words for the national identity are wealth, privileges, stability through the maintenance of the attractiveness of the country compared to neighbouring countries, because of its industry, its labor market, 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 the 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 dimension should reflect a tendency of Luxembourgish native language speakers to score differently than 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 Luxembourgish 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 and Lucas 2000; Kahneman et al. 1999; Myers and Diener 1995; Peterson et al. 2005; Ruff 1989; Ryan and Deci 2001), psychology (Argyle 2001; Carr 2004), politics (Veenhoven 2004), democracy (Frey and Stutzer 2000), freedom (Inglehart et al. 2008), wealth (Hagerty and Veenhoven 2003; Veenhoven and Hagerty 2006), happiness measurements (Diener 2000), and happiness consequences, such as longevity (Diener and 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 individual measure of happiness and 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 moral. 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 highest score 1.42 for the Netherlands and the lowest score 3.19 for Angola; '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 planning. 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 of 45 years at Lindab Luxembourg, 37 years at Lindab France and 45 years at Lindab Germany. The average seniority 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 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 Masters 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 colour 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.

Questions have been added to measure respondents' happiness and background information. The variables are described here. A five-point Likert-type scale was employed to indicate responses that ranged from 1=of utmost importance, 2=very important, 3=of moderate importance, 4= of little importance, 5= of very little or no importance. Sample items from the used scale 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: (1) to have sufficient time for your personal or home life; (2) to have a boss you can respect; (3) to get recognition for good performance; (4) to have security of employment; (5) to have pleasant people to work with; (6) to do work that is interesting; (7) to be consulted by your boss in decisions involving your work; (8) to live in a desirable area; (9) to have a job respected by your family and friends; (10) to have chances for promotion. Other questions were: 'Are you a happy person?', 'Are you the same person at work and at home?', 'How would you describe your state of health?', 'How important is religion in your life?', 'How proud are you to be a citizen of your country?'

The questions for measuring **Power Distance** were the following: 1 means 'All important decisions are taken by individuals', 5 means 'All important decisions are taken by groups or committees'. 1 means 'Subordinates have to work according to detailed instructions from their superiors', 5 means 'Subordinates organize their own work within broad standards set by superiors'. 1 means 'Some mistakes are accepted as a normal consequence of initiative', 5 means 'Mistakes are severely punished'. 1 means 'Managers resent being contradicted', 5 means 'Managers want to hear people's opinions, even if different from theirs. 1 means 'Newcomers are helped to adapt quickly to the job and to the group', 5 means 'Newcomers are left to find their own way'. 1 means 'Changes are implemented in consultation with the people concerned',

5 means 'Changes are implemented by management decree'. 1 means 'Ordinary members of the organization never meet their top managers', 5 means 'Ordinary members of the organization regularly meet their top managers'.

The questions for measuring **Uncertainty Avoidance** were the following: 1 means 'People are uncomfortable in unfamiliar situations, they try to avoid taking risks', and 5 means 'People are comfortable in unfamiliar situations, they do not mind taking risks'. 1 means 'Each day brings new challenges', versus 5 means 'Each day is pretty much the same'. 1 means 'Everybody is highly conscious of the cost of time and/or materials, 5 means 'Nobody ever thinks of the cost of time and/or materials'. 1 means 'Meeting times are kept very punctually', 5 means 'Meeting times are only kept approximately'. 1 means 'The major emphasis is on meeting the needs of the customer', 5 means 'The major emphasis is on correctly following organizational procedures'. 1 means 'Correct procedures are more important than results, 5 means 'Results are more important than following correct procedures'. 1 means 'Contacts are mostly verbal, few things are written down', 5 means 'Everything is put down in writing'.

The questions for measuring **Individualism/Collectivism** were the following: 1 means 'People's private lives are considered their own business', 5 means 'The norms of our organization cover people's behaviour both on the job and at home'. 1 means 'We always dress and behave formally and correctly', 5 means 'We often dress and behave informally and casually'.

The questions for measuring **Long-Term versus Short-Term Orientation** were the following: 1 means 'We do not think more than a day ahead', 5 means 'We think three years ahead or more'. 1 means 'In our technology and working methods, we are rather traditional', 5 means 'In our technology and working methods, we are ahead of others'. 1 means 'We let quality prevail over quantity', 5 means 'We let quantity prevail over quality'. 1 means 'We are

strongly aware of the competition of other organizations’, 5 means ‘We are not aware of any competition of other organizations’.

The questions for measuring **Indulgence versus Restraint** were the following: 1 means ‘Our company/organization takes a major responsibility for the welfare of its employees and their families’, 5 means ‘Our company/organization is only interested in the work our employees do’. 1 means ‘Much attention is paid to our physical work environment’, 5 means ‘Little attention is paid to our physical work environment’.

The questions for measuring **Monumentalism** were the following: 1 means ‘Diplomas and academic titles are very important’, 5 means ‘Job competence is what counts, regardless of how it was acquired’. 1 means ‘We never talk about the history of our company/organization’, 5 means ‘People tell a lot of stories about the history of our company/organization’.

The questions for measuring **Masculinity/Femininity** were the following: ‘How would you describe the behaviour of a typical member of your organization?’ on a five-point Likert-type scale, 1 means ‘Reserved’, 5 means ‘Initiating’, 1 means ‘Warm’, 5 means ‘Cold’, 1 means ‘Direct’, 5 means ‘Indirect’, 1 means ‘Soft’, 5 means ‘Hard’, 1 means ‘Slow’, 5 means ‘Fast’, 1 means ‘Well-groomed’, 5 means ‘Sloppy’, 1 means ‘Pessimistic’ and 5 means ‘Optimistic’.

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 et al. 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 formula, presented in Appendix 1, were used to calculate Hofstede's cultural dimensions **PDI, UAI, IDV, MAS, LTO, IVR, MON** for Lindab Luxembourg, Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality, Lindab France and Lindab Germany. The mean values and standard deviations were calculated for each question. These study's results were compared with Hofstede's estimates. Pearson Correlations were calculated among all variables.

Results

Table 2 depicts the respondents' scores on the seven cultural dimensions. Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality score 29 in PDI, 95 in UAI, 34 in IDV, 54 in MAS, 65 in LTO, 55 in IVR and 24 in MON. Whereas Lindab Luxembourg scores 36 in PDI, 97 in UAI, 51.5 in IDV, 47 in MAS, 69 in LTO, 53.5 in IVR and 10 in MON. The estimates given by Hofstede for Luxembourg are: 40 in PDI, 70 in UAI, 60 in IDV, 50 in MAS, 64 in LTO, 56 in IVR. Hofstede didn't provide data for MON. See the following table.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Lindab France scores 32.5 in PDI, 28.8 in UAI, 41 in IDV, 43.5 in MAS, 37 in LTO, 80 in IVR, and 31 in MON. Whereas Hofstede's France scores 68 in PDI, 86 in UAI, 71 in IDV, 43 in MAS, 63 in LTO, 48 in IVR, 16.5 in MON. Lindab Germany scores 37 in PDI, 67.5 in UAI, 65.5 in IDV, 64.5 in MAS, 84.5 in LTO, 46 in IVR, and 6.5 in MON. Hofstede's Germany scores 35 in PDI, 65 in UAI, 67 in IDV, 66 in MAS, 83 in LTO, 40 in IVR, and 9.9 in MON. Formulas for the cultural dimensions calculation and an example of the calculation of Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality are shown in Appendix 1.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The correlations between all variables are shown in table 2. 'Happiness' was significantly correlated with 'Indulgence versus Restraint IVR' (.293) and with 'Long-Term-Oriented LTO' (.268).

Discussion and Implications

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. Hofstede did not have empirical scores for Luxembourg in his study of culture (1980). He 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.

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.

Some proven relationships between culture, represented by such dimensions as Long Term Orientation, and 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. 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 70 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 live 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 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, a fact which would allow conducting more sophisticated statistics than mere correlation.

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 studies could focus on two branches of the current research: first, focus on the relationship between language and culture and empirically validate it for other languages. 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 south command Mandarin

while the people of the north 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 organizations and countries have the potential to strengthen the validity of the current research findings by generalizing 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 and 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 greatly diverse, the ability of the use of countries' national boundaries as the fault lines that define culture dimensions, to explain and predict management and other societal behaviors, is very limited. Students of culture should make it their habit to measure social units' cultural dimensions by varying the respondents across languages, and may be even across dialects, rather than across common national boundaries.

References

Aaker, J., and 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.

Bearden, W.O., Money, B.R., and Nevins, J.L. (2006), 'A measure of Long-Term Orientation: Development and Validation', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34, 3, 456-467.

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

Bond, M.H., et al. (2004), 'Culture-level dimensions of social axioms and their correlates across 41 cultures', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 548-570.

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

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

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

Cooper, C.L. (1982), 'Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's consequences,' *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 3, 2, 123.

Carr, A. (2004), *Positive psychology. The science of happiness and human strengths*, Carr, Hove: Brunner-Routledge.

De Mooij, M. (2011), *Global Marketing and Advertising: Understanding the Cultural Paradox* (3rd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

- Diener, E. (2000) 'Subjective Well-Being', *American Psychologist*, 55, 1, 34-43.
- Diener, E., and 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.
- Diener, E., and Lucas, R.E. (2000), 'Explaining differences in societal levels of happiness: relative standards, need fulfilment, culture, and evaluation theory', *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1, 41-78.
- Earley, P.C. (1997), *Face, Harmony, and Social Structure: An Analysis of Organizational Behavior Across Cultures*, New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Elms, H., Brammer, S., Harris, J.D., and Phillips, R.A. (2010), 'New directions in strategic management and business ethics', *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 3, 401-425.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1981), 'The four dimensions'. Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's consequences', *New Society*, 16 April.
- Fang, T. (2003), 'A Critique of Hofstede's Fifth Dimension', *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 3, 3, 347-368.
- Frey, B.S., and Stutzer, A. (2000), 'Happiness prospers in democracy', *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1, 79-102.
- Haag, E. (2011), *Une réussite originale. Le Luxembourg au fil des siècles*, Luxembourg: Editions Guy Binsfeld.
- Hagerty, M.R, and Veenhoven, R. (2003), 'Wealth and Happiness Revisited: Growing National Income Does Go With Greater Happiness', *Social Indicators Research*, 64, 1, 1-27.
- Hall, E. (1976), *Beyond culture*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Hermans, H.J.M., and Kempen H.J.G. (1998), 'Moving Cultures. The perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society', *American Psychologist*, 53, 10, 1111-1120.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B.B. (1959), *The Motivation to Work*, New York,

NY, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

Hofstede, G. (ed.) (1998), *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures*, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd ed.)*, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

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, 285-305.

Hofstede, G. (2002), 'Dimensions do not exist: a reply to Brendan McSweeney', *Human Relations*, 55, 1355-61.

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

Hofstede at www.geerthofstede.nl

Hofstede, G.J., Pederson, P.B and Hofstede, G. (2002), *Exploring Culture: Exercises, Stories and Synthetic Cultures*. Boston, MA, USA: Intercultural Press.

Hong, Y.-Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C.-Y., and Benet-Martínez, V. (2000), 'Multicultural Minds. A Dynamic Constructivist Approach to Culture and Cognition,' *American Psychologist*, 55, 7, 709-720.

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

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

- Inglehart, R. (2011) *Values change the world. World Values Survey*. Brochure, from
www.worldvaluessurvey.org
- Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., and Welzel, C. (2008), 'Development, Freedom, and Rising Happiness. A Global Perspective (1981-2007)', *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 4, 264-285.
- IPSE – Identités, Politiques, Sociétés, Espaces (Eds.). (2010), *Doing identity in Luxembourg. Subjektive Aneignungen – institutionelle Zuschreibungen – sozio-kulturelle Milieus, Kultur und soziale Praxis*, Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., Schwarz, N., (1999), *Well-Being: the Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*, New York, NY, USA: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kanayama, T., and Cooper-Chen, A. (2005), 'Hofstede's Masculinity/Femininity Dimension and the Pregnancy of Princess Masako: An Analysis of Japanese and International Newspaper Coverage', *Keio Communication Review*, 27, 23-42.
- Kashima, E.S., and 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.
- Kuhn T.S. (1970), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL, USA: Chicago University Press.
- Maslow, A.H. (1970), *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed.), New York, NY, USA: Harper % Row.
- McClelland, D. (1961), *The Archiving Society*, Princeton, NJ, USA: Van Nostrand.
- McSweeney, B. (2002), 'Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and the consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis', *Human Relations*, 55, 89-118.

- Merriam-Webster (2009): Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 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.
- Mogilner, C., Aaker, J., and Kamvar, S.D. (2012), 'How Happiness Impacts Choice', *Social Science Research Network*.
- Myers, D.G., and Diener, E. (1995), 'Who is happy?', *American Psychological Society*, 6, 1, 10-19.
- 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*. New York, NY, USA: Palgrave MacMillan, 3-15.
- Oswald, A.J. (1997), 'Happiness and economic performance', *The Economic Journal*, 107, 1815-1831.
- Peterson, C, Park, N, and Seligman, M.E.P. (2005), 'Orientations to Happiness and Life Satisfaction: The Full Life versus the Empty Life', *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6, 25-41.
- Roberts, K.H., and 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*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 423-75.
- Robertson, C. (2008), 'An analysis of 10 years of business ethics research in Strategic Management Journal: 1996-2005', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80, 745-753.
- Rockeach, 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 Eudaimonic Well-Being', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.

- 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.
- Schein E.H. (2009), *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide*. San Francisco, CA, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Scholz, C., and 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.
- Sherzer, J. (1987), 'Discourse-Centered Approach to Language and Culture', *American Anthropologist*, 89, 2, 295-309.
- Smith, P.B. (2006), 'When elephants fight, the grass gets trampled: the GLOBE and Hofstede projects', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 915-921.
- Smith, P. (2002), 'Culture's consequences: Something old and something new', *Human Relations*, 1, 119-35.
- Søndergaard, M. (1994), 'Hofstede's consequences: A study of reviews, citations and replications', *Organization Studies*, 15, 447-56.
- Sorge, A. (1983), 'Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's Consequences', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 625-9.
- Spizzo, D. (1995), *La Nation Luxembourgeoise. Genèse et structure d'une identité*, Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Statec Luxembourg (2011). *Luxembourg in figures*. Luxembourg: Editions Saint Paul. Or at www.statec.public.lu
- Taylor, D.M., Bassilia, J.N., Abouda, F.E. (1973), 'Dimensions of Ethnic Identity: An Example

- from Quebec', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 89, 2, 1973.
- Triandis, H.C. (1982), 'Review of Geert Hofstede: Culture's consequences', *Human Organization*, 41, 86-90.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995), *Individualism & Collectivism*, New York, USA: Simon & Schuster.
- Triandis, H.C., and Gelfand, M.J. (1998), 'Converging Measurement of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism,' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1, 118-128.
- Trompenaars, F., and Hampden-Turner, C. (1997), *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business* (2nd ed.), London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Venaik, S., and Brewer, P. (2010), 'Avoiding uncertainty in Hofstede and GLOBE', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 1294.
- Venaik, S., and Brewer, P. (2011), 'Individualism-Collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42, 3, 436-445.
- Veenhoven, R. (2012), World Database of Happiness (<http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl> .)
- Veenhoven, R., and Hagerty, M. (2006), 'Rising happiness in nations 1946-2004: a reply to Easterlin', *Social Indicators Research*, 79, 3, 421-436.

Appendix 1

Formulas for the cultural dimensions calculation and example of the calculation of Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality

The formulas for the cultural dimensions calculation are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PDI} &= 35(\text{mQVAL7} - \text{mQVAL2}) + 25(\text{mQVAL23} - \text{mQVAL26}) + \text{C (pd)} \\ \text{UAI} &= 40(\text{mQVAL20} - \text{mQVAL16}) + 25(\text{mQVAL24} - \text{mQVAL27}) + \text{C (ua)} \\ \text{IDV} &= 35(\text{mQVAL4} - \text{mQVAL1}) + 35(\text{mQVAL9} - \text{mQVAL6}) + \text{C (ic)} \\ \text{MAS} &= 35(\text{mQVAL5} - \text{mQVAL3}) + 35(\text{mQVAL08} - \text{mQVAL10}) + \text{C (mf)} \\ \text{LTO} &= 40(\text{mQVAL18} - \text{mQVAL15}) + 25(\text{mQVAL28} - \text{mQVAL25}) + \text{C (ls)} \\ \text{IVR} &= 35(\text{mQVAL12} - \text{mQVAL11}) + 40(\text{mQVAL19} - \text{mQVAL17}) + \text{C (ir)} \\ \text{MON} &= 35(\text{mQVAL14} - \text{mQVAL13}) + 25(\text{mQVAL22} - \text{mQVAL21}) + \text{C (mo)} \end{aligned}$$

Example of the calculation of Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish Nationality

$$\text{PDI} = 35(\text{mQVAL7} - \text{mQVAL2}) + 25(\text{mQVAL23} - \text{mQVAL26}) + \text{C (pd)}$$

$$\text{PDI} = 35 \times (1.9 - 2.0) + 25 \times (3.5 - 1.8) - 10 \quad (\text{C} = -10)$$

$$\text{PDI} = -3.5 + 22.5 - 10$$

$$\text{PDI} = 39 - 10$$

$$\text{PDI} = 29$$

$$\text{UAI} = 40(\text{mQVAL20} - \text{mQVAL16}) + 25(\text{mQVAL24} - \text{mQVAL27}) + \text{C (ua)}$$

$$\text{UAI} = 40 \times (2.0 - 3.0) + 25 \times (3.3 - 2.3) + 100 \quad (\text{C} = +110)$$

$$\text{UAI} = -40 + 25 + 110$$

$$\text{UAI} = -15 + 110$$

$$\text{UAI} = 95$$

$$\text{IDV} = 35(\text{mQVAL4} - \text{mQVAL1}) + 35(\text{mQVAL9} - \text{mQVAL6}) + \text{C (ic)}$$

$$\text{IDV} = 35 \times (1.6 - 2.2) + 35 \times (2.8 - 1.8) + 20 \quad (\text{C} = +20)$$

$$\text{IDV} = -21 + 35 + 20$$

$$\text{IDV} = 14 + 20$$

$$\text{IDV} = 34$$

$$\text{MAS} = 35(\text{mQVAL5} - \text{mQVAL3}) + 35(\text{mQVAL08} - \text{mQVAL10}) + \text{C (mf)}$$

$$\text{MAS} = 35 \times (1.9 - 1.7) + 35 \times (2.4 - 2.2) + 40 \quad (\text{C} = +40)$$

$$\text{MAS} = 7 + 7 + 40$$

$$\text{MAS} = 014 + 40$$

$$\text{MAS} = 54$$

$$\text{LTO} = 40(\text{mQVAL18} - \text{mQVAL15}) + 25(\text{mQVAL28} - \text{mQVAL25}) + \text{C (ls)}$$

$$\text{LTO} = 40 \times (2.3 - 1.8) + 25 \times (2.6 - 2.0) + 30 \quad (\text{C} = +30)$$

$$\text{LTO} = 20 + 15 + 30$$

$$\text{LTO} = 35 + 30$$

$$\text{LTO} = 65$$

$$\text{IVR} = 35(\text{mQVAL12} - \text{mQVAL11}) + 40(\text{mQVAL19} - \text{mQVAL17}) + \text{C (ir)}$$

$$\text{IVR} = 35 \times (2.7 - 2.1) + 40 \times (3.2 - 2.1) - 10 \quad (\text{C} = -10)$$

$$\text{IVR} = 21 + 44 - 10$$

$$\text{IVR} = 65 - 10$$

$$\text{IVR} = 55$$

$$\text{MON} = 35(\text{mQVAL14} - \text{mQVAL13}) + 25(\text{mQVAL22} - \text{mQVAL21}) + \text{C (mo)}$$

$$\text{MON} = 35 \times (2.1 - 2.2) + 25 \times (3.7 - 3.4) + 20 \quad (\text{C} = +20)$$

$$\text{MON} = -3.5 + 7.5 + 20$$

$$\text{MON} = 4 + 20$$

$$\text{MON} = 24$$

Table 1**Comparison of the seven cultural dimensions on various databases**

	Lindab Luxembourg (n=106)	Lindab Luxembourg with Luxembourgish nationality (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

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