Original scientific paper

UDC:005.591:005.21]:316.72

doi: 10.5937/ekonhor1401003J

THE ROLE OF NATIONAL CULTURE IN CHOOSING A CHANGE STRATEGY IN ORGANIZATIONS

Nebojsa Janicijevic*

Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

In this paper, the causal relationship between certain dimensions of a national culture and certain organizational change strategies are analyzed. The paper uses two of the four dimensions of national culture, identified by G. Hofstede: the power distance and masculinity–femininity ones. On the other hand, the four organizational change strategies have been differentiated: the coercive strategy, the normative-re-educative strategy, the rational-empirical strategy and the creative strategy. The identified dimensions of national culture and the identified organizational change strategies differ from one another with respect to the same criteria: the distribution of power and task orientation *versus* people orientation. Based on this fact, it is possible to establish eight hypotheses about a causal relationship between certain types of national cultures and certain organizational change strategies.

Keywords: organizational change, national culture, organization, strategy

JEL Classification: M14

INTRODUCTION

Through its assumptions and values, national culture, determines the way in which the members of the organizations of that culture interpret the surrounding reality as well as the way they behave in the reality (Hofstede, 2001). For this reason, we may assume that national culture has an impact on the way in which an organization changes, and that the matching of national culture and a change strategy will improve the efficiency of the change process. National culture has a strong impact on an organization and its

management, which emerges from its nature and content. Here, national culture is understood as „...mental programming: the pattern of thoughts, feelings and actions which every individual adopts in childhood and applies throughout the entire lifetime” (Hofstede, 2001, 25). National culture assumptions and values determine the way in which members of all organizations belonging to a particular national culture will understand the organization itself and, thereby, the adequate way to change it. The process of organizational change involves a series of activities, interactions and decisions which are undertaken by the leader and the members of an organization. Changes, however, can be led and implemented in organizations in very different ways, and each method or strategy of change is based on activities, decisions and

* Correspondence to: N. Janicijevic, Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade; Kamenicka 6, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia;
e-mail: jnebojsa@eunet.rs

interactions of a different nature of and between the members of the organization while it is being changed. The organizational change strategy that will be chosen by the leaders and the members of an organization depends on how they understand the world around them, the organization, the relations within it, and the ways considered to be suitable and effective for it to undergo change. For example, in cultures with a high power distance, such power is assumed to be unequally distributed and that the leader and his/her associates at the top of the organization are primarily responsible for the operation of as well as changes in their organization. In such a culture, we can certainly expect a directive kind of changes or changes planned at the top of the organization and implemented top-down. In cultures with a low power distance, an organization's members are expected to have an impact on everything in the organization, including the manner in which it is being changed. So, cultures with a low power distance can be expected to have their organizational changes guided bottom-up instead of top-down. Therefore, it is natural to assume that the assumptions and values embedded in a particular national culture have a significant impact on its organizational change strategies. Already, there are studies showing that people's reactions to change, and suitable strategies to overcome resistance to change, depend on national culture (Alas, Sun & Gao, 2012).

The described impact of national culture on organizational change management strategy is, however, too general in character and calls for operationalization which would consist of generating and testing the hypothesis on the causal relationship between certain dimensions of national culture and certain organizational change strategies. In other words, it is necessary to prove that specific organizational change management strategies are favored or are more frequent and more efficient in specific types of national cultures. Such operationalization of the relationship between national culture and organizational change strategy has not been dealt with in the literature so far. The researchers who have analyzed different organizational change strategies have only listed culture as one of the factors in an adequate change strategy selection (Nickols, 2010). There have been no concrete findings on the relationship between national

culture types and organizational change strategies. The purpose of this paper is to fill this gap.

The goal of the paper is to explore the role of certain dimensions of national culture in choosing an organizational change strategy in organizations in greater depth. The goal will be accomplished through developing hypotheses about the relations between certain dimensions of national culture and certain organizational change strategies.

The scientific method used in this paper is in accordance with the explorative character of the research. The implications of certain dimensions of national culture for managers' and employees' behavior will be compared with the conditions for an efficient implementation of different change strategies in organizations. When we find out compatibility between certain dimension of national culture and the implementation of certain change strategy, we will then assume this dimension of national culture to imply the implementation of this organizational change strategy.

The structure of the paper is as follows: first, the organizational change strategy will be defined, and the classification through which various organizational change strategies are differentiated will be presented. Then, the classification through which national culture types are differentiated will be presented. Finally, in the last segment of the paper, and based on the similarity of the criteria in the described classifications of culture and the strategy, hypotheses stating the implementation of a specific organizational change strategy is conditioned by a certain combination of national culture dimensions will be established.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE STRATEGIES

In the area of organizational change management, the attention of academic researchers and practicing managers has mainly been focused on three principal questions: what it is that changes (the content), why it changes (the causes), and how it changes (the process) (Pettigrew, 1987; Porras & Robertson, 1987). Unlike the issues of the content, the cause and the

process of organizational change, organizational change strategies have been less present in research (Nickols, 2010). An organizational change strategy includes the approach, the method, or the manner in which changes are implemented in an organization. This definition implies that changes are always planned and that, whenever we speak about a change implementation strategy, we actually speak about planned organizational changes. The fact that the very first classification of an organizational change strategy deals with a planned change strategy also contributes to this impression (Chin & Benne, 1969; Benne, 1978). This, however, does not always have to be the case. Changes can also be spontaneous or unplanned, and their consistent approach, method, or manner constitutes a change strategy. They can be an organizational change realization strategy, even though such changes have been unplanned.

When classifying organizational change strategies, almost all authors start with the seminal work by R. Chin and K. Benne (1969), which recognizes the three basic ways to implement change in a social system: rational-empirical, power-coercive, and normative-re-educative. This classification, which has been supplemented many times, will also be the basis for organizational change strategy differentiation in this paper. Therefore, we will first introduce the basic elements of the three strategies.

The rational-empirical strategy is founded on the assumption of the rationality of organizations and the people constituting them. Organizations are observed as a rational means for achieving the mutual goals of their members through a collective action. People are treated as rational beings led by self-interest. Therefore, changes are implemented by showing the members of an organization that they are rational, i.e. justified and useful from the perspective of achieving organizational goals, as well as useful to the self-interest of the members of the organization. The assumption is that the members of the organization in which changes are performed will, as rational beings, behave according to their objectively given interests. Hence, if they are provided with a proof that change is in their interest, they will accept it. Changes are conducted through a rational process of information gathering and the application of knowledge in solving

the problems the organization faces. The problem is solved and changes conducted by applying a theory, regardless of how simple it is, to observations of the problem that must be solved. Practically, changes are conducted through the process of the implementation and testing of specific theories, which seem adequate in a given context.

Organizational changes are conducted in five phases: problem identification, information gathering and analysis, the generation of alternative courses of action, the selection of the optimal course of action, and the implementation of the solution. In the rational strategy, are exactly the information regarding the problem which must be solved and possible problem-solving strategies are the basic driver of change. If such information is convincing and clear, and if it is correctly communicated, the members of an organization will, as rational beings, accept the implementation of changes. The process of communicating the information regarding the problem and the changes that will have the problem solved is unilateral and top-down. No dialogue or discussion in which the members of the organization would be allowed to challenge, question, or redefine the „facts“ or the theoretical models presented to them is included.

It is clear that the top management are the agent of change in this strategy and that the direction of change is top-down. The members of the organization have a passive role and their role is limited to receiving information and acting accordingly. An organization's members' participate at a low degree and acceptance is, at best, the reaction to the strategy, demonstrated by the participants in the changes. As a rule, there is high resistance to change.

The basic rational-empirical strategy change implementation tools are tasks, or work positions, rather than the social structure of an organization and the relations within it. Since an organization is understood as a rational tool for achieving mutual goals, changes in it are primarily realized through changing the formal, planned, 'hard' components: tasks, structures, procedures, policies, strategies, and its relation with the environment. Only the first-order changes can be initialized and conducted through the rational empirical strategy, since the process does not

allow the redefining of the assumptions of reality; these would be part of the second-order changes (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). As a rule, changes do not require very much time, except when the information gathering process is a very complex one.

The power-coercive strategy implies that an organization is observed as a political system, in which those with power also have the right to manage the organization and therefore change it. Man is not a rational but a political being, who submits to the will of the more powerful. Therefore, in the power-coercive strategy, power is the key driver and the tool for change. Those who have power, usually the leader or the top management, plan changes and, by exploiting the power they have, impose these changes on the other members of the organization. The members of the organization are expected to obey and implement the changes unquestioningly. This strategy is based on the assumption that the right to impose a course of collective action in one social community also emerges from power. Thus, the inferior members of a community also expect the superior members to set a course in which changes will be implemented.

Communication is unilateral and directed top-down. It consists of the leader or the management reaching a decision on the solving of a problem, and then communicating to their followers and an organization's members how, when, where, and who will implement the changes which will solve the problem. The only agent of change is the leader or the management of the organization, who have power to implement changes. The participation of the members of an organization in the process of change is very low, and their role is passive and comes down to mere obedience. In this strategy, information has a top-down flow, because the agent of change only informs the organization's members about what they are expected to do, without receiving feedback. For the same reason, change-related activities are unilateral.

The power-coercive strategy can only produce the first-order change, since it does not include changing the assumptions, values, or attitudes of the members of an organization. Of all the strategies, the power-coercive strategy leads to the fastest results, which is its main advantage and the reason why it is relatively often

used. However, its disadvantages are rather numerous; for example, the destruction of motivation and loyalty, very strong resistance to changes, and a lack of understanding of changes leading to their inefficient implementation. This change strategy is focused on relations and the social structure, rather than the work structure and tasks. Since relations of dependence are what this strategy is founded on, it naturally depends on relations between the powerful agent of changes and the inferior members of the organization. Thus, the power-coercive strategy relies on relations and the social, informal, „soft“ component of the organization as a tool for change.

The normative-re-educative strategy is based on the assumption that an organization is a social system in which the behavior of its members is determined by shared assumptions, values, norms, and attitudes. People are, above all, social beings, who – in the process of social interaction – construct an image of reality and set the rules of behavior in the reality. The social construction of reality is the basic mechanism for determining an individual and collective action in each social system, such as an organization. This is why organizational changes are conducted through the construction of a different image of reality, which then implies changes in the assumptions, beliefs, and values of the organization's members, which in turn implies changes in their behavior. Therefore, people are not rational beings who always determine their behavior based on objective information, but rather social beings who derive their behavior from their own beliefs and values. Thus, it is possible to achieve changes in individual and collective actions by changing their values and beliefs rather than by a rational persuasion. Such changes are normative because changing values standardizes a new behavior, and they are re-educative because this process of change is conducted through a form of learning. Values are therefore the basic driver of change in this strategy.

Changes are conducted by changing the assumptions, values, norms, and attitudes shared by the organization's members in the first place, and then by changing their actions and interactions or relations as well. Therefore, it is precisely these relations and social components of the organization that are the basic tools for change in the normative-re-educative

strategy, rather than its „hard“ components, i.e. tasks. In this strategy, changes happen at the level of relations between the organization's members. The normative-re-educative strategy includes the process of reframing, or changing, the socially-constructed image of reality, from which changes of both collective assumptions and values emerge.

This process, however, implies a multilateral action, since the change of a socially-constructed reality evolves through an interaction of all or most of the members of an organization. Of course, the leader of the organization, whose competences allow him/her to impose a certain image of reality on the other members of the organization, often plays a leading role in this process. However, this does not mean the reframing process is unilateral, or that activities related to change are directed top-down. It often happens that the shared assumptions and values of an organization's members change beyond the will and plan of the leader of the organization. Even when they do change due to actions undertaken by the organization's leader, it is necessary for the organization's members to engage in numerous mutual interactions in order for these changes to lead to a new system of collective assumptions and values and thereby to real changes in their organization.

Thus, changes in this strategy are directed both top-down and bottom-up, and the information flow is multilateral. In the normative-re-educative strategy, the agents of change in an organization are both the management and the employees. The organization's members are active participants in change at a high level: hence, resistance to change is relatively low. Changes conducted by the normative-re-educative strategy imply the organization's members' commitment to a new image of reality and a new organization, and is of a higher quality than the previous two strategies which demand an organization's members' acceptance and obedience. The normative-re-educative strategy may initiate and lead to the second-order change, since it implies changing the way in which members of an organization understand the world around them (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). The implementation of this strategy, however, takes longer since changing assumptions, values, norms and attitudes is not a quick process.

Since the classification of the strategies described here emerged, a great number of authors have used it in their analyses of specific organizational changes (Quinn & Sonenshein, 2008). However, a significant number of authors have evaluated R. Chin and K. Benne's classification as an incomplete one. Many authors needed a fourth strategy, which would supplement the previous classification. Thus, F. Nickols (2010) added the environmental-adaptive strategy based on the human ability to adapt to changes in the environment. This strategy consists of abandoning the existing organization, defining a completely new organization through a vision and then through a transfer of people from the existing organization to the new one. M. Miles, A. Thangaraj, W. Dawei and M. Huiqin (2002) have developed the fourth strategy through their research in China, which they added to R. Chin and K. Benne's classification, naming it the relational strategy. This change strategy is based on using people's personal relations in order to force them to implement changes. R. Quinn and S. Sonenshein (2008) also added the fourth strategy and called it the transforming strategy. It consists of transforming some people, who, by setting a personal example, lead then others into a process of change. In his book "Paths of Change", M. McWhinney (1997) differentiated four basic modes of change: analytic, imperative, participant, and emergent. The analytic mode of change is very similar to the change strategy which R. Chin and K. Benne named the rational-empirical strategy; the imperative mode of change is compliant with the power-coercive strategy; and the participant mode of change matches R. Chin and K. Benne's normative-re-educative strategy. The emergent change strategy is new, and implies that changes are „achieved through creating and accepting a new idea“. This strategy is realized by having the members of an organization or society articulate their feelings and ideas, thus making it possible for them to perceive the problem in a new way and find a new solution to the problem.

The fourth strategy we will supplement and balance R. Chin and K. Benne's classification with is similar to M. McWhinney's emergent mode of change. Here, we will call it the creative strategy since it is based on the individual creativity of an organization's members.

The creative strategy is based on the assumption that people are creative beings, and that an organization is a form of improvisation in which all processes, including the process of change, take place as a consequence of the free will, actions, and ideas of its members. Hence, changes are conducted through the process of the articulation of new ideas by a member of the organization, and through the acceptance of these ideas by the rest of the members. The creative strategy is a typical example of what is called an innovative process in a company. Changes occur through an act of individual creativity, through which the problem the organization is being faced with is demonstrated in an entirely new way and creative solutions are found. This is why the process of change is a process of creative improvisation, with ideas and a vision being the basic drivers of change. The members of an organization themselves, as the source and generator of ideas, are the agents of change.

However, the process of communicating these solutions to the other members of an organization is equally important to the individual articulation of new solutions to the problem. Changes will not occur if the process of communication is inefficient and if the other members of the organization reject the innovation. This is why this strategy implies a multilateral action of the agents of change, and the information flow is directed bottom-up. The role of the management in this strategy is merely to create an ambience in which the members of the organization will be free to improvise and articulate new ideas. When this happens, ideas flow bottom-up towards the management who realize these ideas. The creative strategy implies an active role and the highest possible level of participation on the part of the organization's members who creatively react to changes in the change process. This is why resistance to changes is the lowest in this strategy.

Since changes are realized through the articulation of creative solutions to problems, it is clear that this change strategy leads to the second-order changes as well as that performing these changes will be relatively time-consuming. The creative strategy is realized through the articulation of new ideas in order to solve some of the existing problems in the company's functioning and task performance. This is why tasks,

or the organizational work structure, are the primary change tool in this strategy is.

From the description of the four change strategies, it is obvious that, apart from their basic assumptions and drivers of change, they differ from each other according to the two basic criteria: the direction of changes and the basic means (tools) of change. There are two different strategies for the direction which changes are made in: the directive and the participative ones.

The directive strategies are characterized by a unilateral change action and a top-down information flow. This means changes are planned at the top of the organization and then the other members of the organization implement them in the way the top management have planned. The leader or the top management has the key role in directive changes, sometimes helped by external consultants. The members of the organization have a passive role as executives, with little or no participation at all in the process of change. Their reaction to changes is also passive and reflects in their obedience or acceptance. Resistance to change by an organization's members is relatively strong because they do not know the causes and the direction of changes; hence, they face uncertainty regarding the impact of these changes on themselves. Directive changes are relatively fast and efficient, except when prolonged due to such resistance. Nevertheless, these strategies only lead to the first-order changes. The directive strategies of organizational change include the rational-empirical and power-coercive strategies.

The participative change strategies imply that there is a top-down direction of change inclusive of multilateral information flows. Through the application of the participative strategies, changes are realized at multiple points in an organization and flow in multiple directions. Not only managers, but employees themselves, too, are the agents of change. This is why an organization's members' degree of participation in change is high and their role active. Consequently, resistance to change in applying these strategies is relatively low. On the other hand, however, the implementation of the participative change strategies consumes much more time. These strategies lead to

the second-order changes. The normative-re-educative strategy and the creative strategy belong to the set of the participative change strategies.

The second criterion for the organizational change strategy differentiation is the means (tools) of their implementation. Under this criterion, a distinction is made between the strategies in which changes are implemented through the structure and tasks, on the one hand, and those in which changes are implemented through interpersonal relations, on the other. Each organization comprises of both its work or the formal „hard“ component, consisting of the systems and processes, and its social or informal „soft“ component, consisting of the people, their relations and an influence on others. Organizational change strategies differ from each other in the organizational component they use as the primary lever of change: work or the social component. The rational-analytical and the creative strategies differ in the direction of the changes they imply; however, they have in common the fact that changes are conducted through changing the way tasks are performed in in the structure of the organization. In these two strategies, changes in the the way tasks are performed in in the structure of the organization. In these two strategies, changes in the functioning and improvement of the organizational performance are based on redefining the way in which individual tasks and work processes are performed within the organization. On the other hand, the power-coercive and the normative-re-educative strategies, which differ in the direction of changes, have in common that they both use people and their interpersonal relations in order to perform changes. In these two strategies, changes are realized through having an influence on an organization's members rather than on their tasks or work processes. The only difference between these two strategies is he who executes this influence. In the power-coercive strategy, the leader of the organization is the one to unilaterally influence all the members of the organization, thus realizing changes. In the normative-re-educative strategy, all members of an organization, both individuals and groups, multilaterally influence all other individuals and groups within the organization.

When the two described criteria for the differentiation of the organizational change management strategies intertwine, the following matrix can be constructed (Table 1).

Table 1 The differentiation of the organizational change strategies

Change direction	Change tool	
	Work structure, tasks	Social structure, relations
Directive changes	Rational-analytical Strategy	Power-coercive Strategy
Participative changes	Creative Strategy	Normative-re-educative Strategy

Source: Author

THE DIMENSIONS OF NATIONAL CULTURES

In order to deal with national cultures' influence on the organizational change strategies, the substantial components of national cultures that distinguish one from another must be identified. Those components are the dimensions of national cultures, usually subject to research by the authors in the field of cross-cultural management. The dimensions of a national culture form the basic assumptions and values constituting a culture's substance, define its specific nature and distinguish it from other cultures. The framework for studying and understanding the dimensions of national cultures as well as their first classification is provided by F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtbeck (1961). As they noted, the basic assumptions and values comprising the dimensions of national cultures are, de facto, answers to fundamental questions every society faces. There are, in fact, a limited number of basic issues every community has to resolve if it strives to endure and function as a social group. For example, every

social group must resolve the issues of power and status in terms of their distribution within the group in a certain way. Moreover, every social group must solve the issue of the individual-collective relation. Those are the fundamental issues relevant for every social group in any given period, without whose resolving the group can survive as a community. In other words, all societies in the world are, at one time or another, faced with a limited set of similar or identical questions and issues to resolve. On the other hand, the number of the existing solutions to the said issues is also limited. The problem of the distribution of power can, for example, be solved through one of the two basic modes: the hierarchical and the egalitarian ones. While the former model implies an uneven distribution of power within a society, the latter implies a balanced one. The question of an individual-collective relation is also answered through one of the two fundamental modes: individualism and collectivism. The former implies the predominance of individual interests over the collective ones, whereas the latter implies the opposite. All the alternative solutions to fundamental problems are always present in every society. However, all societies prefer some alternatives over others during certain periods; i.e. advantage is sometimes given to some alternatives over others. The preferred variants of solving the fundamental questions societies face develop into the dimensions of their national cultures. These dimensions create their national cultures and figure as a *differentia specifica* in relation to other societies.

Several authors have identified the fundamental dimensions of national cultures (Hall & Hall, 1990; Schwartz, 1992; Trompenaars, 1994; Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque & House, 2006). The most prominent among them were defined in G. Hofstede's famous research: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity (Hofstede, 1980; 2001). These are the ones usually used when the effects of national culture on management are researched, possibly because G. Hofstede had them quantified. From their description, it can clearly be seen that their essence lies in solving the fundamental questions of the society. G. Hofstede identified and described four fundamental dimensions, according to which national cultures worldwide can be differentiated.

These dimensions are bipolar; therefore, every national culture can be positioned within a continuum between the two extremes of a dimension. Owing to this methodology, G. Hofstede was able to quantify the position of every national culture within each dimension. Every national culture is given an index regarding its position within each cultural dimension.

The dimensions of national culture constitute the basic values and assumptions shared by the members of a national community about the vital problems every society faces. A society resolves the questions of authority and social inequality by accepting a premise about power distance. The question of the individual-community relation is resolved in locating a national culture at a specific position on a continuum between the two extremes: individualism-collectivism. The social implications of *male* and *female* find its reflection in the dimension of national culture called masculinity-femininity. Hence, in this dimension, every national culture assumes a position as a culture of either masculine- or feminine-predominant values. Finally, the manner in which a society reacts to uncertainties, changes, differences and conflicts is formulated as the level of its uncertainty avoidance, as a dimension of national culture.

Power distance indicates the level at which a society accepts the fact that power found in institutions and organizations is unequally distributed (Hofstede, 2001). In other words, power distance outlines the level at which the members of a society consider the uneven distribution of power as a common and expected fact; so, in that society, it is consequently possible for very powerful groups and individuals to coexist with individuals who have no power whatsoever. Power distance reveals the manner in which a society has solved the problem of the distribution of power and prestige, varying between egalitarianism (small power distance) and high level of authoritarianism (large power distance). Power distance reveals not only the position of those in power but also the one of those forced to obedience. High power distance indicates that the unequal distribution of power in a society and its organizations is considered to be normal and natural, as something that should not or could not be changed, in both groups. The unequal distribution

of power in a society is considered to be the only possible and natural state of affairs and a prerequisite for a functional society and its organizations. The authoritarian mindset prevails in high power distance societies, so their level of authoritarianism is notably high.

Uncertainty avoidance indicates the level of the endangerment felt by the members of a society in uncertain, unclear and variable conditions. Uncertainty avoidance signifies the manner in which a society deals with the fundamental issues of changes, uncertainty and the unknown. Two extreme answers can be given. Some societies treat changes, uncertainty and the unknown as a threat, and avoid these conditions whenever possible. Other societies embrace changes, uncertainties and the unknown as an opportunity.

Individualism–collectivism answers the fundamental question every society must deal with: the individual–collective relation. The crucial difference between individualism and collectivism concerns the placing of responsibility for one's own destiny. Individualism considers every individual to be responsible for themselves and their families. Conversely, collectivism – in a family, an organization and a society in general alike – considers the collective responsible for its every single individual. In collectivism, individuals believe they have the right to expect the collective to take care of them. In return, they owe complete loyalty to the collective and its leader. In individualism, an individual assumes him- or herself responsible for his/her own destiny, and does not see the collective as obliged to him.

The masculinity–femininity dimension of national culture reveals a society's attitude towards doing and being. Cultures with the prevailing masculinity value action, the accomplishment of tasks, results, determination and aggressiveness. Since these values are often perceived as „masculine“, the cultures in which they dominate are called masculine national cultures. These are the „doing cultures“ in which someone's value is measured by his/her ability to earn money and his/her material prosperity. Caring for others is not this culture's priority. Feminine national

cultures are those comprised of prevailing values such as relationships, the quality of life, balance and harmony. Since these values are often perceived as „feminine“, cultures which they dominate in are called feminine national cultures. These cultures prefer harmonious relations and connections with the natural and social environment.

Two of the four dimensions of national culture identified by G. Hofstede are particularly important for an analysis of the impact of national culture on the choice of a strategy of organizational change. These are the power distance and the masculinity–femininity dimensions. Because these two dimensions of national culture have two extremes, four types of national cultures are possible to identify. These types of national cultures differ in terms of their assumptions regarding power distribution and a suitable frame of collective actions. The power distance dimension of national culture divides national cultures according to the notion of the useful, efficient or desirable distribution of power in a community and organizations within it. High power distance implies an assumption that the unequal or hierarchical distribution of power in a community and organizations within it is good, efficient and useful. Low power distance implies an assumption that the equal or egalitarian distribution of power in a community and organizations within it is desirable.

On the other hand, the masculinity–femininity dimensions of national cultures divide national cultures according to the notion of suitable or efficient frame of collective action in a community and organizations within it. Masculine cultures contain an assumption that collective actions in a social community and organizations within it will be the most efficient if they are undertaken within the frame of the work structure or tasks. Femininity cultures contain the assumption that the social structure and human relations are the most efficient frame of undertaking collective actions in a community and organizations within it. The differentiation of the four types of national cultures that have an impact on the choice of an organizational change strategy can be seen in the following matrix (Table 2).

Table 2 The differentiation of the national culture types

Assumptions about power distribution	Assumptions about the frame of collective actions	
	Work structure, tasks	Social structure, relations
Hierarchical distribution of power	High power distance Masculinity	High power distance Femininity
Egalitarian distribution of power	Low power distance Masculinity	Low power distance Femininity

Source: Author

CAUSAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE DIMENSIONS OF NATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE STRATEGIES

The presented classification of national cultures and organizational change strategies shows a high degree of correspondence between the criteria used to differentiate them. The assumptions regarding a suitable distribution of power in a social community, by which national cultures are differentiated, are obviously connected with the direction of changes which differentiate change strategies. Also, the assumptions regarding a suitable frame of collective actions in an organization, by which organizational cultures are differentiated, are obviously connected with the means of change which differentiate change strategies. This enables us to establish hypotheses about the causal relationships between certain national culture types and certain change strategies.

In authoritarian or hierarchical cultures, with high power distance, in which the assumption about an unequal distribution of power prevails, the preferred and efficient strategies of organizational changes are directive strategies or strategies directed top-down. These strategies are exactly the rational-empirical and power-coercive change strategies. Since all the members of an organization consider an unequal distribution of power to be a natural order, their views on a suitable way of managing change will assume a

different role for the management and employees in the change process. In such cultures, the leader and his/her associates will always be expected to articulate and plan changes, which others in the organization will merely implement. Therefore, the only agent of change is the leader; change activities are unilateral top-down; and the members of the organization have a passive role in the change process. Thus, the following hypothesis can be established:

H1 : National cultures with high power distance favor the implementation of the rational-empirical and power-coercive change strategies.

By contrast, in low power distance cultures, or egalitarian cultures, which assume a need for a more equal distribution of power, the desirable and efficient change strategies are the participative ones, i.e. change strategies directed bottom-up. These are precisely the normative-re-educative and the creative change strategies. In these cultures, an organization's members expect to play an active role in both everyday functioning and changes. The leader and the management are expected to provide resources for changes and space for the participation and active role of all the members of the organization. In such cultures, the agents of change are not just at the top of but throughout the organization as well, and change activities are multilateral. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be established:

H2 : National cultures with low power distance favor the implementation of the normative-re-educative and the creative change strategies.

In cultures that primarily accomplish their problem solving and achievement of goals through the work structure or tasks, the desirable and efficient change management strategies will be based on the work structure and tasks as the fundamental change tools. Since these cultures assume the work structure and tasks are where the fundamental managerial tool for organizational functioning is, it is only natural to expect that work tasks are the fundamental tool for leading change as well. Change strategies based on the work structure and tasks as the primary change tool are the rational-empirical and the creative change

strategies. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be established:

H3 : National cultures with masculine values favor the implementation of the rational-empirical and the creative change strategies.

In contrast, in cultures where problem solving and the achievement of organizational goals is primarily accomplished through the social structure and relations, the desirable and efficient change strategies are those in which the primary tool for change is precisely this social structure and these relations. Since these cultures assume that social structures and interpersonal relations are the fundamental managerial tool of an organization's management, it is only natural to expect that the social structure and relations are the primary tools for change management. Change strategies based on the social structure and relations as the primary change tool are the normative-re-educative and the power-coercive change strategies. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be established:

H4 : National cultures with feminine values favor the implementation of the normative-re-educative and the power-coercive change strategies.

Based on the compliance of the basic criteria for the differentiation of national cultures and change management strategies, the following matrix, from which the hypotheses about direct causal relations between certain types of national cultures emerge and about suitable change management strategies in these cultures can be constructed (Table 3).

The national cultures combining high power distance with masculine values favor an organizational change strategy including directive, top-down changes primarily within the work or task structure of the organization. This is why the following hypothesis can be established:

H5 : National cultures with high power distance and masculinity favor the implementation of the rational-empirical strategy for organizational change.

The national cultures combining high power distance with feminine values favor an organizational change

Table 3 Matching organizational change strategies and national culture types

Assumptions about power distribution / direction of change	Assumptions about the form of collective action / a change tool	
	Masculine values Work structure, tasks	Feminine values Social structure, relations
High power distance	High power distance, masculine values	High power distance, feminine values
Directive changes	Rational-empirical Change Strategy	Power-coercive Change Strategy
Low power distance	Low power distance, masculine values	Low power distance, feminine values
Participative changes	Creative Change Strategy	Normative-re-educative Change Strategy

Source: Author

strategy including directive, top-down changes primarily within the social or relation structure of the organization. This is why the following hypothesis can be established:

H6 : National cultures with high power distance and femininity favor the implementation of the power-coercive strategy for organizational change.

The national cultures combining low power distance with masculine values favor the organizational change strategy including participative, bottom-up changes, primarily within the work or task structure of the organization. This is why the following hypothesis can be established:

H7 : National cultures with low power distance and masculinity favor the implementation of the creative strategy for organizational change.

The national cultures combining low power distance with feminine values favor an organizational change strategy including participative, bottom-up changes, primarily within the social or relation structure of the

organization. This is why the following hypothesis can be established:

H8 : National cultures with low power distance and femininity favor the implementation of the normative-re-educative strategy for organizational change.

CONCLUSION

National culture, through its assumptions and values, determines the way in which the members of the organizations of that culture interpret the reality surrounding them as well as the way they behave in that reality. For this reason, we assume that national culture has an impact on the way in which an organization changes, and that the matching of national culture and a change strategy will improve the efficiency of the change process. The four types of national culture have been identified on the basis of two cultural dimensions: power distance and masculinity–femininity. On the other hand, the four organizational change strategies have also been identified: coercive, normative-re-educative, rational-empirical and creative strategy. The identified dimensions of national culture and the identified organizational change strategies differ from one another according to the same criteria: the distribution of power and the frame of collective action. Based on this fact, we have been able to establish the eight hypotheses about the causal relationship between certain types of national cultures and certain organizational change strategies.

This paper has several significant theoretical implications. The most important theoretical implication is the usefulness of further research into relations between national culture and organizational change strategies. The paper has shown that there is a theoretical basis for the assumption that national culture is one of the factors in the selection of organizational change management strategies. It is now necessary to empirically test this assumption by testing the hypotheses generated in this paper. This paper also implies the need to expand research into the impact of national culture on the other aspects of organizational change. It is necessary to explore

whether national culture has an impact on the character of the change process or not, and if so – to what extent; i.e. whether changes will be continuous or discontinuous, partial or comprehensive, evolutionary or revolutionary, developmental or adaptive. It is also necessary to explore if and how culture has an impact on the efficiency of the change process and its success.

This paper has significant limitations as well. The first and foremost limitation lies in the very nature of this paper, which is explorative and theoretical. The paper has resulted in the hypotheses regarding the relations between national culture and the strategy which are yet to be empirically proven. Without being empirically tested, the findings of this paper are not entirely valid. The paper is also limited to investigating national culture's impact on just one aspect of organizational change management – a change management strategy. It does not examine the impact of culture on the other aspects of organizational change that would complete the picture. Finally, the limitation of this paper is exclusive reliance on just one classification of organizational change strategies and the two dimensions of national culture derived from the only one classification of national culture's dimensions. Given the abundance of the classifications of both organizational change and national culture's dimensions, it is possible that different results would have been obtained had those other classifications been used.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is a part of the research Project (No. 179062), which is funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

REFERENCES

- Alas, R., Sun, W., & Gao, J. (2012). The implementation of organizational changes during the transition in China and Estonia. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 7(1), 86-102. doi: 10.1108/17465261211195847
- Bartunek, J. M., & Moch, M. (1987). First Order, Second

- Order and Third Order Change and Organizational Development Interventions: A Cognitive Approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 23(4), 483-500. doi: 10.1177/002188638702300404
- Benne, K. (1978). Societal Changing and Organizational Development. *Southern Review of Public Administration*, 1(4), 416-432.
- Chin, R., & Benne, K. (1969). General Strategies for Effecting Change in Human Systems. In: W. Bennis, K. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), *The Planning of Change* (pp. 32-59). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., de Luque, M. S., & House, R. J. (2006). In the Eye of the Beholder: Cross Cultural Lessons in Leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1), 67-90. doi:10.5465/AMP.2006.19873410
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- McWhinney, M. (1997). *Paths of Change*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M., Thangaraj, A., Dawei, W., & Huiqin, M. (2002). Classic Theories – Contemporary Applications: A comparative study of the implementation of innovation in Canadian and Chinese Public Sector Environments. *The Innovation Journal*, 12(12). Accessed January 16, 2013 (<http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style-articles.htm>)
- Nickols, F. (2010). Four Change Management Strategies. *Distance Consulting*. Accessed January 18, 2013 (<http://www.nickols.us/>)
- Pettigrew, A. (1987). Introduction: Researching Strategic Change. In: A. Pettigrew (Ed.), *The Management of Strategic Change* (pp. 1-7). London, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Porras, J., & Robertson, P. (1987). Organization Development Theory: A Typology and Evaluation. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1, 1-57.
- Quinn, R., & Sonenshein, S. (2008). Four General Strategies for Changing Human Systems. In T. G. Cummings (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Development* (pp. 69-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna, (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 1-65). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding Waves of Culture*. New York, NY: Irwin..

Received on 13th January 2014,
after revision,
accepted for publication on 17th April 2014

Nebojsa Janicijevic is a professor at the Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade, where he teaches courses in the field of organization, human resources management and change management to students at undergraduate, graduate and doctoral studies. So far, as an author and coauthor he published several books, the recent one is *Organizaciona kultura i menadzment*. He published a number of articles in foreign and domestic academic journals, and participated in many international scientific conferences. He was three times at study stays at U.S. universities as a receiver of fellowship of Fulbright Program.

Izvorni naučni članak

UDK: 005.591:005.21]:316.72
doi: 10.5937/ekonhor1401003J

ULOGA NACIONALNE KULTURE U IZBORU STRATEGIJE PROMENA U ORGANIZACIJAMA

Nebojša Janićijević*

Ekonomski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu

U radu se analiziraju uzročno-posledične veze između određenih dimenzija nacionalne kulture i određenih strategija organizacionih promena. Koriste se dve od četiri dimenzije nacionalne kulture koje je identifikovao G. Hofstede: distanca moći i „muške“ *versus* „ženske“ vrednosti. Na drugoj strani, izdiferencirane su četiri strategije organizacionih promena: strategija moći, normativno-reedukativna strategija, racionalno-empirička strategija i kreativna strategija. Identifikovane dimenzije nacionalne kulture i identifikovane strategije organizacionih promena međusobno se razlikuju po istim kriterijumima: distribuciji moći i orijentaciji na ljude *versus* orijentacije na zadatke. Na toj osnovi je moguće postaviti osam hipoteza o uzročno-posledičnim vezama između određenih tipova nacionalnih kultura i određenih strategija organizacionih promena.

Ključne reči: organizacione promene, nacionalna kultura, organizacija, strategija

JEL Classification: M14

UVOD

Nacionalna kultura, svojim pretpostavkama i vrednostima, determiniše način na koji članovi organizacije interpretiraju realnost oko sebe, kao i način na koji se u toj realnosti ponašaju (Hofstede, 2001). Iz tog razloga možemo pretpostaviti da nacionalna kultura ima uticaj na način na koji se organizacije menjaju, kao i da će slaganje nacionalne kulture i strategije organizacionih promena voditi ka većoj efikasnosti procesa promena. Nacionalna kultura ima snažan uticaj na organizaciju i menadžment

preduzeća koji proističe iz njene prirode i sadržaja. Nacionalna kultura se ovde razume kao: „mentalno programiranje: obrazac mišljenja, osećanja i delovanja koje svaka osoba stekne u detinjstvu i zatim primeњуje kroz čitav život“ (Hofstede, 2001, 25). Nacionalna kultura svojim pretpostavkama i vrednostima determiniše način na koji članovi organizacija koje pripadaju nacionalnoj kulturi razumeju samu organizaciju, kao i pogodan način njenih promena. Proces organizacionih promena podrazumeva seriju aktivnosti, interakcija i odluka koje donosi lider i članovi organizacije. Promene se, međutim, mogu voditi i implementirati u organizacijama na vrlo različite načine i svaki je metod ili strategija promena bazirana na različitim aktivnostima, interakcijama i odlukama članova organizacije tokom promena.

* Korespondencija: N. Janićijević, Ekonomski fakultet
Univerziteta u Beogradu, Kamenička 6, 11 000 Beograd,
Srbija; e-mail: jnebojsa@eunet.rs

Koju će strategiju organizacionih promena izabrati lider i članovi organizacije, zavisi od načina na koji oni razumeju svet oko sebe, organizaciju, odnose u njoj, kao i pogodne načine da se oni promene. Na primer, u kulturama sa visokom distancom moći, ljudi pretpostavljaju da je moć distribuirana nejednako i da lider i njegovi saradnici na vrhu organizacije imaju primarnu odgovornost za funkcionisanje, kao i za promene organizacije. U takvoj kulturi, mi sigurno možemo očekivati direktivne promene ili promene planirane na vrhu organizacije i sprovedene odozgo na dole. U kulturama sa niskom distancom moći, očekuje se da članovi organizacije imaju uticaj na sve što se dešava u organizaciji, pa i na način kako se ona menja. Zato, u kulturama sa niskom distancom moći, možemo očekivati da se organizacione promene sprovedu odozdo na gore umesto odozgo na dole. Dakle, prirodno je pretpostaviti da pretpostavke i vrednosti nacionalne kulture imaju značajan uticaj na strategije organizacionih promena. Već postoje studije koje pokazuju da su reakcije ljudi na promene, kao i pogodne strategije prevazilaženja otpora promenama, zavisni od nacionalne kulture (Alas, Sun & Gao, 2012).

Opisani uticaj organizacione kulture na strategiju vođenja organizacionih promena je, međutim, suviše opšteg karaktera i zahteva operacionalizaciju koja bi se sastojala u generisanju i testiranju hipoteze o kauzalnim relacijama između određenih dimenzija nacionalne kulture i određenih strategija organizacionih promena. Drugim rečima, potrebno je pokazati da se u određenim vrstama nacionalnih kultura primenjuju, ili da su efikasnije, određene strategije vođenja organizacionih promena. Takvih operacionalizacija odnosa nacionalne kulture i strategije organizacionih promena do sada nije bilo u literaturi. Istraživači, koji su analizirali različite strategije organizacionih promena, samo su navodili kulturu kao jedan od faktora prilikom izbora adekvatne strategije promena (Nickols, 2010). No, konkretnih saznanja o relacijama tipova organizacionih kultura i strategije organizacionih promena do sada nije bilo. Ovaj rad ima za cilj da popuni tu prazninu.

Cilj ovog rada jeste da dublje istraži ulogu određenih dimenzija nacionalne kulture u izboru strategije organizacionih promena. Taj cilj će biti ostvaren kroz razvoj hipoteza o relacijama određenih

dimenzija nacionalne kulture i određenih strategija organizacionih promena.

Naučni metod korišćen u ovom radu je u skladu sa eksplorativnim karakterom samog istraživanja. Implikacije određenih dimenzija nacionalne kulture na ponašanje menadžera i zaposlenih će biti upoređene sa uslovima za efikasnu primenu određenih strategija organizacionih promena. Kada pronađemo kompatibilnost određene dimenzije nacionalne kulture i određene strategije organizacionih promena, pretpostavićemo da ta dimenzija nacionalne kulture implicira primenu te strategije organizacionih promena.

Struktura rada je sledeća. Prvo ćemo definisati strategiju organizacionih promena i predstaviti klasifikaciju pomoću koje diferenciramo različite strategije organizacionih promena. Zatim ćemo predstaviti klasifikaciju pomoću koje diferenciramo tipove nacionalnih kultura. Zatim ćemo, u poslednjem delu rada, na osnovu sličnosti kriterijuma u opisanim klasifikacijama kultura i strategija, generisati hipoteze o uslovljenosti primene strategije organizacionih promena određenim dimenzijama nacionalne kulture.

STRATEGIJE ORGANIZACIONIH PROMENA

U oblasti upravljanja organizacionim promenama, pažnja akademskih istraživača i menadžera iz prakse se, uglavnom, fokusirala na tri osnovna pitanja: zašto, šta i kako se menja (Pettigrew, 1987; Porras & Robertson, 1987). Za razliku od pitanja uzroka, sadržaja, procesa i vođstva organizacionih promena, strategije organizacionih promena su bile manje zastupljene u istraživanjima (Nickols, 2010). Pod strategijom organizacionih promena podrazumevamo pristup, metod ili način na koji se sprovedu promene u organizaciji. Tako definisana strategija organizacionih promena, na prvi pogled, podrazumeva da su one uvek planirane i da, kad god govorimo o strategiji izvođenja promena, uvek govorimo o planiranim organizacionim promenama. Tom utisku doprinosi i činjenica, da se već u prvoj klasifikaciji strategija organizacionih promena, govori o strategiji planiranih promena (Chin & Benne, 1969; Benne, 1978). No, to ne

mora biti uvek slučaj. Promene mogu biti i spontane, neplanirane, a da se u njima prepozna konzistentan pristup, metod ili način kako se one realizuju, što je samo drugo ime za strategiju promena. U tom slučaju opet možemo govoriti o strategiji realizacije organizacionih promena, iako su one neplanirane.

Kada je reč o klasifikaciji strategija organizacionih promena, gotovo svi autori polaze od prelomnog rada R. Chin-a i K. Benne-a (Chin & Benne, 1969), u kome se prepoznaju tri osnovna načina da se promene uvedu u neki socijalni sistem: racionalno-empirički, sistem moći i normativno-reedukativni. Ova klasifikacija, koja je kasnije više puta dopunjavana, će biti i osnova za diferenciranje strategija organizacionih promena u ovom radu. Stoga ćemo se prvo upoznati sa osnovnim elementima tri navedene strategije.

Racionalno empirička strategija počiva na pretpostavci racionalnosti organizacija i ljudi koji ih čine. Organizacije se vide kao racionalna sredstva za ostvarivanje zajedničkih ciljeva njenih članova kroz kolektivnu akciju. Ljudi se tretiraju kao racionalna bića koja su vođena, pre svega, sopstvenim interesima. Stoga, promene se sprovode tako što se članovima organizacije jasno pokaže da su one racionalne, odnosno, opravdane i korisne sa stanovišta ostvarenja organizacionih ciljeva, kao i da odgovaraju interesima njenih članova. Pretpostavka je da su članovi organizacije u kojoj se izvode promene racionalna bića koja će se ponašati u skladu sa svojim, objektivno datim, interesima. Zato, ukoliko im se dokaže da je promena u njihovom interesu, oni će je prihvatiti. Promene se izvode kroz racionalan proces prikupljanja informacija i primene znanja u rešavanju problema sa kojima se organizacija suočava. Problem se rešava i promene se izvode tako što se neka teorija, bez obzira koliko jednostavna ona bila, primeni na opservacije o problemu koji treba rešiti. Praktično, promene se izvode kroz proces primene i testiranja određenih teorija koje se u datom kontekstu učine adekvatnim.

Organizacione promene se izvode kroz pet faza: identifikacija problema, prikupljanje i analiza informacija, generisanje alternativnih pravaca akcije, izbor optimalnog pravca akcije i sprovođenje rešenja. U racionalnoj strategiji, osnovni pokretač promena jesu upravo informacije o problemu koji treba rešiti i

moogućim strategijama rešavanja problema. Ukoliko su informacije ubedljive i jasne, i ukoliko se komuniciraju na ispravan način, članovi organizacije, kao racionalna bića, prihvatiće sprovođenje promena. Proces komunikacije informacija o problemu i promenama koje će taj problem rešiti u osnovi je unilateralan i ide odozgo na dole. Ovde nije predviđen dijalog, ili diskusija, u kojoj bi članovima organizacije bilo dozvoljeno da izazivaju, dovode u pitanje ili redefinišu „fakte“ ili teorijske modele koji su im prezentirani. Jasno je da je agent promena u ovoj strategiji top menadžment, a da je sam pravac promena odozgo na dole. Uloga članova organizacije je pasivna, i svodi se na primanje informacija i postupanje po njima. Stoga je stepen participacije članova organizacije u promenama nizak. Reakcija učesnika promena na ovu strategiju može biti u najboljem slučaju prihvatanje. Otpor promenama je, po pravilu, visok.

Osnovno oruđe kojim se izvode promene u racionalno-empiričkoj strategiji su zadaci, odnosno, radna, a ne socijalna struktura organizacije i relacije u njoj. Budući da se organizacija razume kao racionalno oruđe u ostvarivanju zajedničkih ciljeva, promene u njoj se mogu realizovati, prevashodno, kroz izmene formalne, planske, *hard* komponente organizacije: zadaci, strukture, procedure, politike, strategije, relacije sa okruženjem. Racionalno empiričkom strategijom je moguće inicirati i sprovesti samo promene prvog reda, budući da proces ne dozvoljava redefinisane pretpostavke o realnosti, što bi moralo da bude deo promena drugog reda (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). Promene po pravilu ne traže previše vremena osim kada je proces prikupljanja informacija veoma složen.

Strategija moći i prinude podrazumeva da se organizacija vidi kao politički sistem u kome oni koji imaju moć imaju i pravo da vode organizaciju, pa i njene promene. Čovek nije racionalno, već političko biće koje se pokorava volji onih koji su moćniji od njega. Stoga je u strategiji moći i prinude moć ključni pokretač i oruđe promena. Promene se sastoje u tome da oni koji imaju moć, obično je to lider ili top menadžment, planiraju promene i, eksploatišući moć koju imaju, nameću te promene ostalim članovima organizacije. Od članova organizacije se očekuje da te promene, bez pogovora, prihvate i sprovedu. Važna pretpostavka na kojoj se bazira ova strategija promena

jeste da iz moći proizilazi i pravo da se nameće pravac kolektivne akcije u jednoj socijalnoj zajednici. Tako i inferiorni članovi zajednice očekuju od superiornih članova da određuju pravac u kome će se promene sprovesti.

Komunikacija je unilateralna i odozgo na dole. Ona se sastoji u tome da lider ili menadžment donosi odluku o tome kako će se neki problem rešiti, i zatim, saopšti sledbenicima i članovima organizacije kako, kada, gde i ko će sprovesti promene kojima se rešava taj problem. Jedini agent promena je lider ili menadžment organizacije koji ima moć da promene sprovedi. Participacija članova organizacije u promenama je veoma niska, a njihova uloga u procesu promena je pasivna i svodi se na puku poslušnost. U ovoj strategiji informacioni tok je odozgo na dole, jer agent promena samo saopštava članovima organizacije šta se od njih očekuje, i ne prima povratne informacije. Iz istog razloga, aktivnosti promena su unilateralne.

Strategija prinude i moći može da proizvede samo promene prvog reda, budući da ona ne uključuje promene pretpostavki, vrednosti ili stavova članova organizacije. Strategija moći i prinude od svih strategija vodi najbržim rezultatima, i to je njena glavna prednost i razlog zašto se relativno često koristi. Njeni nedostaci su, na drugoj strani, veoma brojni: razaranje poverenja i lojalnosti, veoma snažan otpor promenama, nerazumevanje promena koje vodi u njihovo neefikasno sprovođenje. Ova strategija promena je fokusirana na relacije i socijalnu strukturu, pre nego na radnu strukturu i zadatke. Budući da su odnosi zavisnosti u osnovi ove strategije, ona je prirodno zavisna od relacija između moćnog agenta promena i inferiornih članova organizacije. Stoga se strategija moći i prinude oslanja na relacije i socijalnu, neformalnu, *soft* komponentu organizacije kao oruđe promena.

Normativno reedukativna strategija zasniva se na pretpostavci da je organizacija socijalni sistem u kome je ponašanje njenih članova determinisano zajedničkim pretpostavkama, vrednostima, normama i stavovima. Ljudi su, pre svega, socijalna bića koja, u procesu socijalne interakcije, konstruišu sliku realnosti i postavljaju pravila ponašanja u toj realnosti. Socijalna konstrukcija realnosti je osnovni mehanizam

determinisanja pojedinačnih i kolektivnih akcija u svakom socijalnom sistemu, kakva je organizacija. Zato se promene organizacija sprovode kroz konstrukciju drugačije slike realnosti, što onda implicira promene pretpostavki, verovanja i vrednosti njihovih članova, a to znači i njihovog ponašanja. Ljudi, dakle, nisu racionalna bića koja svoje ponašanje uvek određuju na osnovu objektivnih informacija, već socijalna bića koja svoje ponašanje izvode iz sopstvenih verovanja i vrednosti. Stoga je promene u individualnim i kolektivnim akcijama ljudi moguće ostvariti pre promenama njihovih vrednosti i verovanja, nego racionalnim ubeđivanjem. Takve promene su normativne, jer se promenama vrednosti normira novo ponašanje, a reedukativne, jer se taj proces promena vrši kroz neku vrstu učenja. Osnovni pokretač promena u ovoj strategiji su upravo zato vrednosti.

Promene se sprovode tako što se prvo promene pretpostavke, vrednosti, norme i stavovi, koje dele članovi organizacije, a zatim, menjaju se i njihove akcije i interakcije, odnosno, relacije. Jasno je, dakle, da su osnovno oruđe promena u normativno-reedukativnoj strategiji, upravo, relacije i socijalna komponenta organizacije, a ne njena *hard* komponenta, odnosno, zadaci. U ovoj strategiji se doslovno promene odvijaju u ravni relacija između članova organizacije. Normativno-reedukativna strategija uključuje promene socijalno konstruisane slike realnosti, iz čega proizilaze i promene kolektivnih pretpostavki i vrednosti.

Ovaj proces, međutim, podrazumeva multilateralnu akciju, jer se promena socijalno konstruisane realnosti odvija kroz ravnopravnu interakciju svih ili većine članova organizacije. Naravno da u tom procesu glavnu ulogu često igra lider organizacije koji svojim liderskim kompetencijama može da nametne određenu sliku realnosti ostalim članovima organizacije. No, to još uvek ne znači da je proces redefinisavanja unilatralan, niti da su aktivnosti promena odozgo na dole. Naime, vrlo često se promene zajedničkih pretpostavki i vrednosti članova organizacije menjaju i van volje i plana lidera organizacije. No, čak i kada se one menjaju usled akcije lidera organizacije neophodno je da članovi organizacije stupaju u brojne međusobne interakcije, da bi te promene dovele do novog sistema

kolektivnih pretpostavki i vrednosti, a time i do realnih promena u organizaciji.

Stoga su aktivnosti promena u ovoj strategiji odozgo na dole, kao i odozdo na gore, a tok informacija je multilateralan. U normativno-reedukativnoj strategiji, agent promena su kako menadžment, tako i zaposleni u organizaciji. Članovi organizacije su u ovoj strategiji aktivni učesnici promena i ispoljavaju visok nivo participacije, te je stoga i otpor promenama relativno nizak. Promene sprovedene po normativno-reedukativnoj strategiji impliciraju posvećenost članova organizacije novoj slici realnosti i novoj organizaciji, što je viši kvalitet u odnosu na prethodne dve strategije koje vode ka prihvatanju ili poslušnosti članova organizacije. Normativno-reedukativna strategija može da inicira i vodi ka promenama drugog reda, jer podrazumeva promenu načina na koji članovi organizacije razumeju svet oko sebe (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). Ova strategija, međutim, traži više vremena za sprovođenje, jer promene pretpostavki, vrednosti, normi i stavova ljudi ne mogu biti brz proces.

Nakon pojave opisane klasifikacije strategija organizacionih promena, veliki broj autora ju je koristio u analizi konkretnih organizacionih promena. Međutim, značajan broj autora je ocenio klasifikaciju R. Chin-a i K. Benne-a kao nepotpunu. Mnogim autorima je naime, nedostajala i četvrta strategija koja bi na neki način dopunila prethodnu klasifikaciju. Tako je F. Nickols (2010) dodao adaptivnu strategiju koja se bazira na ljudskoj sposobnosti da se adaptira promenama u okruženju. Ova strategija se sastoji u napuštanju postojeće organizacije, definisanju sasvim nove organizacije kroz viziju i, zatim, transfer ljudi iz postojeće u novu organizaciju. M. Miles, A. Thangaraj, W. Dawei i M. Huiqin (2002) su, kroz empirijsko istraživanje koje su obavili u Kini, došli do četvrte strategije, koju su dodali klasifikaciji R. Chin-a i K. Benne-a, koju su nazvali relaciona. Ova strategija promena se zasniva na tome da se lične relacije ljudi upotrebljavaju da bi se oni privoleli na sprovođenje promena. Dakle, nisu informacije ili moć ono što privoli ljude da prihvate promenu pravca akcije, već lični odnosi među ljudima. R. Quinn i S. Sonenshein (2008) su, takođe, dodali četvrtu strategiju i nazvali je transformaciona. Ona se sastoji u ličnoj transformaciji

nekih ljudi koji, onda, svojim primerom uvedu ostale u proces promena. M. McWhinney (1997) je izdiferencirao četiri osnovna načina promena: analitički, imperativni, participativni i spontani. Interesantno i značajno jeste da su, od četiri osnovna načina promena, tri veoma slična strategijama R. Chin-a i K. Benne-a, dok je četvrta strategija sasvim nova. Analitički način promena je veoma sličan strategiji promena, koju su R. Chin i K. Benne nazvali racionalno-empiričkom, imperativni način promena odgovara strategiji moći, dok se participativni način promena poklapa sa normativno-reedukativnom strategijom. Spontani način promena je nova strategija promena i ona podrazumeva da su promene „ostvarene kroz kreiranje i prihvatanje nove ideje“. Ova strategija se realizuje tako što članovi organizacije, ili društva, artikulišu osećanja i ideje čineći da se na novi način vidi neki problem i da se pronađe nova solucija za taj problem.

Četvrta strategija, kojom ćemo dopuniti i izbalansirati kalsifikaciju R. Chin-a i K. Benne-a, je u značajnoj meri na tragu upravo spontane strategije promena M. McWhinney-a. Mi ćemo je ovde nazivati kreativna strategija, jer se zasniva na individualnoj kreativnosti članova organizacije. Kreativna strategija se zasniva na pretpostavci da su ljudi kreativna bića, a da je sama organizacija jedan vid improvizacije u kojoj se svi procesi, pa i proces promena, dešavaju kao posledica slobodne volje, akcije i ideja njenih članova. Otuda se promene vrše kroz proces artikulacije novih ideja nekog od članova organizacije i prihvatanja tih ideja od strane ostalih članova. Kreativna strategija je tipičan primer onoga što se naziva inovativnim procesom u preduzeću. Do promena dolazi kroz čin individualne kreativnosti, kojom se na sasvim novi način predstavlja problem sa kojim se suočava organizacija i pronalaze kreativna rešenja. Proces promena je, zato, u osnovi proces kreativne improvizacije, a osnovni pokretač promena su ideje i vizije. Agent promena su sami članovi organizacije, kao izvor i generator ideja.

Međutim, isto toliko koliko je važna individualna artikulacija novih rešenja problema, važan je i proces komuniciranja, kojim se ta rešenja komuniciraju ka ostalim članovima organizacije. Promena neće biti ukoliko proces komuniciranja nije efikasan, i ukoliko ostali članovi organizacije ne prihvate inovaciju. Zato ova strategija podrazumeva multilateralnu akciju

agenata promena, a tok informacija je odozdo na gore. Uloga menadžmenta u ovoj strategiji jeste samo da kreira ambijent u kome su članovi organizacije slobodni da improvizuju i artikulišu nove ideje. Kada se to desi, onda te ideje idu odozdo na gore menadžmentu, koji ih realizuje.

Jasno je da kreativna strategija implicira aktivnu ulogu i najviši mogući nivo participacije članova organizacije u procesu promena, koji u ovoj strategiji, na promene reaguju kroz kreativnost. Stoga je i otpor promenama u ovoj strategiji najniži. Budući da se promene realizuju kroz artikulaciju kreativnih rešenja problema jasno je da ova strategija promena vodi ka promenama drugog reda, kao i da će za izvođenje tih promena biti potrebno relativno dosta vremena. Kreativna strategija se realizuje kroz artikulaciju novih ideja kako da se reše neki od postojećih problema u funkcionisanju i ostvarivanju zadataka organizacije. Stoga su osnovni instrument promena u ovoj strategiji zadaci, odnosno, radna struktura organizacije.

Iz opisa četiri strategije vođenja promena vidljivo je da se one, osim po osnovnim pretpostavkama i pokretaču promena, razlikuju po dva osnovna kriterijuma: prema pravcu aktivnosti promena i tokova informacija, kao i prema osnovnom sredstvu promena. Prema kriterijumu pravca u kome se promene vrše i u kome teku informacije, strategije možemo podeliti na: direktivne i participativne.

Direktivne strategije su one koje podrazumevaju unilateralnu akciju promena i tok informacija odozgo na dole. To znači da su promene planirane na vrhu organizacije, a da ih, zatim, ostali članovi organizacije sprovode onako kako je to top menadžment planirao. U direktivnim promenama, ključnu ulogu ima lider ili top menadžment organizacije, nekada uz pomoć spoljnih konsultanata. Članovi organizacije imaju pasivnu ulogu izvršilaca sa nimalo ili veoma malo participacije u procesu promena. Njihova reakcija na promene je, takođe, pasivna: poslušnost ili prihvatanje. Otpori promenama od strane članova organizacije su relativno snažni, jer oni nisu upoznati sa uzrokom i pravcem promena te se suočavaju sa velikom dozom neizvesnosti oko uticaja tih promena na njih same. Direktivne promene su relativno brze i efikasne, osim kada se zbog otpora neplanirano ne produže. No, ove

strategije, uglavnom, vode samo ka promenama prvog reda. U direktivne strategije organizacionih promena spadaju racionalno-empirička i strategija moći.

Participativne strategije promena podrazumevaju da pravac promena bude odozdo na gore, kao i da tokovi informacija budu multilateralni. Primenom participativnih strategija, promene se realizuju na više tačaka u organizaciji i u više pravaca. Agenti promena nisu samo menadžeri već i sami zaposleni. Stoga je stepen participacije članova organizacije u promenama visok, a njihova uloga aktivna. Sledstveno tome, otpor promenama, pri primeni ovih strategija, je relativno nizak. No, s druge strane, primena participativnih strategija promena traži značajno duže vreme. Ove strategije vode ka promenama drugog reda. U participativne strategije promena ubrajamo normativno-reedukativnu i kreativnu strategiju.

Drugi kriterijum za diferenciranje strategija organizacionih promena jeste sredstvo za njihovo sprovođenje. Po ovom kriterijumu razlikujemo strategije u kojima se za izvršenje promena koristi struktura i zadaci, i strategije u kojima se za izvršenje promena koriste međuljudski odnosi. Svaku organizaciju čini njena radna ili formalna, *tvrd*a komponenta u koju spadaju struktura, sistemi i radni procesi, s jedne strane, i socijalna ili neformalna, *meka* komponenta, u koju spadaju ljudi, njihovi odnosi i uticaj na ljude. Strategije organizacionih promena se međusobno razlikuju po tome koju komponentu organizacije koriste kao primarnu polugu za promene: radnu ili socijalnu. Racionalno-empirička i kreativna strategija se razlikuju po pravcu promena koje impliciraju, ali im je zajedničko da se promene izvode kroz promenu načina na koji se obavljaju zadaci u strukturi organizacije. Promena funkcionisanja i unapređenje performansi organizacije se, u ove dve strategije, baziraju na redefinisaju načina na koji se obavljaju pojedinačni zadaci i radni procesi unutar organizacije. Na drugoj strani, strategija moći i normativno reedukativna strategija, koje se razlikuju po pravcu promena, imaju zajedničko to što obe koriste ljude i njihove međusobne odnose da bi se promene izvele. U ove dve strategije, promene se realizuju kroz ostvarivanje uticaja na članove organizacije, a ne na njihove zadatke ili radne procese. Razlika između ove dve strategije je samo u tome ko taj uticaj provodi. U

strategiji moći to je lider organizacije koji unilateralno vrši uticaj na sve članove organizacije i tako realizuje promene. U normativno-reedukativnoj strategiji, uticaj vrše svi članovi organizacije, kao pojedinci i grupe, multilateralno na sve ostale pojedince i grupe u organizaciji.

Kada se ukrste dva opisana kriterijuma za diferenciranje strategija vođenja organizacionih promena možemo konstruisati sledeću matricu (Tabela 1).

Tabela 1 Diferencijacija strategija organizacionih promena

Pravac promena	Sredstvo promena	
	Radna struktura, zadaci	Socijalna struktura, odnosi
Direktivne promene	Racionalno-empirička strategija	Strategija moći i prinude
Participativne promene	Kreativna strategija	Normativno-reedukativna strategija

Izvor: Autor

DIMENZIJE NACIONALNIH KULTURA

Da bismo istražili uticaj nacionalne kulture na strategiju organizacionih promena moramo identifikovati ključne komponente nacionalnih kultura, koje ih diferenciraju jednu od druge. Te komponente su dimenzije nacionalnih kultura koje se uobičajeno istražuju u oblasti inter kulturnog menadžmenta.

Dimenzije nacionalnih kultura su, zapravo, osnovne pretpostavke i vrednosti koje čine njen sadržaj, koje određuju specifičan karakter nacionalne kulture, i koji razlikuju jednu od ostalih nacionalnih kultura. Okvir za istraživanje razumevanje dimenzija nacionalnih kultura, kao i njihovu prvu klasifikaciju, dali su F. Kluckhohn i F. Strodtbeck (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck,

1961). Prema njihovom mišljenju, osnovne pretpostavke i vrednosti koje predstavljaju dimenzije nacionalnih kultura su, zapravo, odgovori na fundamentalna pitanja sa kojima se svaka društvena zajednica suočava. Postoji, naime, ograničen broj osnovnih pitanja koja svaka društvena zajednica, ako želi da opstane i funkcioniše kao socijalna grupa, mora da reši. Recimo, svaka društvena grupa na neki način mora da reši pitanje moći i uticaja, odnosno, njihove raspodele u grupi. Takođe, svaka društvena grupa mora da reši pitanje odnosa pojedinca i grupe. To su fundamentalna pitanja relevantna za sve društvene grupe u svakom vremenskom periodu, bez čijeg rešavanja grupa ne može da opstane kao zajednica. Drugim rečima, sve socijalne zajednice u svetu se u svakom vremenu suočavaju sa ograničenim setom sličnih ili istih pitanja i problema, koje moraju rešiti. Na drugoj strani, postoji ograničen broj alternativa rešavanja tih problema. Tako se, na primer, pitanje raspodele moći može rešiti na dva osnovna načina: hijerarhijski i egalitarno. Prvi način podrazumeva nejednakost, a drugi uravnoteženu raspodelu moći u društvu. Pitanje odnosa pojedinca i kolektiva kome pripada rešava se na dva fundamentalna načina: individualizmom ili kolektivizmom. Prvi način podrazumeva prevlast interesa pojedinca nad kolektivnim interesom, a drugi je obratan. Svi alternativni načini rešavanja osnovnih problema sa kojima se društva suočavaju su konstantno prisutni u svim društvima. Međutim, u svakom društvu se u određenom vremenu neke alternative preferiraju u odnosu na druge, odnosno, nekim alternativama se daje prednost u odnosu na druge. Preferirane alternative u pogledu načina rešavanja osnovnih pitanja sa kojima se društvene zajednice suočavaju postaju dimenzije nacionalnih kultura tih zajednica. One kreiraju osnovu nacionalne kulture jednog društva i čine *diferentia specifica* u odnosu na kulture drugih društava.

Više autora je identifikovalo osnovne dimenzije nacionalnih kultura (Hall & Hall, 1990; Schwartz, 1992; Trompenaars, 1994; Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque & House, 2006). Među njima, najpoznatije dimenzije nacionalnih kultura identifikovao je G. Hofstede (Hofstede, 1980; 2001). Te dimenzije su i najviše korišćene za istraživanje uticaja nacionalne kulture na menadžment, moguće i zbog toga što ih je G.

Hofstede kvantifikovao. Iz opisa tih dimenzija najbolje se vidi da je njihova suština – rešavanje osnovnih pitanja društva. G. Hofstede je identifikovao i opisao četiri osnovne dimenzije, na osnovu kojih je moguće razlikovati nacionalne kulture u svetu. Ove dimenzije su po karakteru dvopolne, tako da se svaka nacionalna kultura po svakoj dimenziji može pozicionirati na kontinuumu između dva ekstrema te dimenzije. G. Hofstede je, zahvaljujući svojoj metodologiji, uspeo da kvantifikuje poziciju svake nacionalne kulture po svakoj od dimenzija. On je svakoj nacionalnoj kulturi odredio indeks koji joj određuje poziciju na svakoj od kulturnih dimenzija.

Dimenzije nacionalne kulture predstavljaju osnovne vrednosti i pretpostavke koje dele članovi jedne nacionalne zajednice o ključnim pitanjima sa kojima je svako društvo suočeno.

Problem socijalne nejednakosti i odnosa prema autoritetu, društvo rešava usvajanjem pretpostavki o distanci moći. Pitanje odnosa pojedinca i kolektiva rešava se lociranjem nacionalne kulture na određenu poziciju na kontinuumu između dva ekstrema: individualizam - kolektivism. Socijalne implikacije muškog i ženskog pola nalaze svoj odraz u dimenziji nacionalne kulture nazvanoj „muške“ vrednosti – „ženske“ vrednosti (*masculinity-femininity*). Dakle, svaka nacionalna kultura se pozicionira po ovoj dimenziji kao kultura sa pretežno „muškim“ ili „ženskim“ vrednostima. Najzad, način reagovanja na neizvesnost, promene, razlike i konflikte u društvu je određen stepenom izbegavanja neizvesnosti kao dimenzijom nacionalne kulture.

Distanca moći pokazuje stepen u kojem društvo prihvata činjenicu da je moć u institucijama i organizacijama raspoređena nejednako (Hofstede, 2001, 42). Drugim rečima, distanca moći pokazuje stepen u kojem pripadnici jedne nacionalne kulture smatraju da je normalno i očekivano da moć bude neravnomerno raspoređena, tako da u društvu postoje vrlo moćni pojedinci i grupe, kao i oni koji uopšte nemaju moć. Distanca moći je odgovor društva na fundamentalni problem koji svaka socijalna zajednica mora da reši, a koji se odnosi na princip raspodele moći i uticaja u njoj. Ova dimenzija nacionalne kulture pokazuje kako je društvo rešilo taj problem, a

odgovori se mogu kretati između egalitarnosti i visoke autoritarnosti. Distanca moći pokazuje stavove ne samo onih moćnih, već i onih koji je nemaju i koji su prinuđeni na poslušnost. Visoka distanca moći indicira da i jedni i drugi smatraju da je nejednaka distribucija moći u društvu, kao i u organizacijama, sasvim normalno i prirodno stanje koje niti bi trebalo, niti se može menjati. U društvima sa visokom distancom moći prevladava autoritarna svest, pa je i stepen autoritarizma vrlo visok.

Izbegavanje neizvesnosti indicira stepen ugroženosti koji osećaju članovi društva u neizvesnim, nejasnim ili promenljivim okolnostima. Izbegavanje neizvesnosti jeste način na koji je društvo rešilo fundamentalni problem odnosa prema promenama, nepoznatom i neizvesnosti. Dva su moguća ekstremna odgovora. U nekim društvima se promene, neizvesnost i nepoznato tretiraju kao pretnja, oni se izbegavaju kad god je to moguće. U drugim društvima se ide u susret promenama, neizvesnosti i nepoznatom, i oni se koriste kao šansa.

Individualizam - kolektivism daje odgovor na fundamentalan problem koji svako društvo mora da reši: odnos pojedinca i kolektiva. Osnovna razlika između individualizma i kolektivism sastoji se u lociranju odgovornosti za sopstvenu sudbinu. Individualizam podrazumeva da je svaki pojedinac odgovoran za sebe i svoju najbližu porodicu. Kolektivism, nasuprot tome, podrazumeva da je za sudbinu svakog pojedinca odgovoran kolektiv kojem pripada, bilo da je taj kolektiv porodica, preduzeće ili društvo u celini. U kolektivismu, pojedinci veruju da imaju pravo da očekuju da se kolektiv brine za njih. Zauzvrat, oni kolektivu i njegovom lideru duguju potpunu lojalnost. U individualizmu, pojedinac veruje da je samo on odgovoran za sopstvenu sudbinu i da kolektiv nema obavezu prema njemu.

„Muške – ženske“ vrednosti dimenzija nacionalne kulture pokazuje odnos društva prema činjenju i postojanju.

U kulturama u kojima prevladavaju vrednosti, kao što su: akcija, činjenje, postignuće, rezultati, odlučnost i agresivnost, koje se, uglavnom, percipiraju kao „muške“, reč je o „muškim“ nacionalnim kulturama.

To su „činiti“ kulture, u kojima se nečija vrednost dokazuje rezultatom i činjenjem. Najčešće se nečija vrednost ocenjuje na osnovu sposobnosti zarađivanja novca i materijalnog blagostanja. Briga za druge ljude nije u centru pažnje pripadnika ove kulture.

„Ženske“ nacionalne kulture su one u kojima dominiraju vrednosti kao što su: međuljudski odnosi, kvalitet života, balans i harmonija. Kako se ove vrednosti uglavnom pripisuju ženama, to su nacionalne kulture u kojima dominiraju ove vrednosti – „ženske“ nacionalne kulture. To su „biti“ kulture u kojima se vrednost ljudi dokazuje samim postojanjem i ulogom u socijalnoj mreži. U ovim kulturama preferira se uspostavljanje dobrih veza i odnosa sa prirodnim i socijalnim okruženjem.

Od četiri dimenzije nacionalne kulture koje je identifikovao G. Hofstede, dve su od posebnog značaja za analizu uticaja nacionalne kulture na izbor strategije organizacionih promena. To su distanca moći i „muške“, odnosno, „ženske“ vrednosti. Budući da te dve dimenzije nacionalnih kultura imaju po dve ekstremne vrednosti, moguće je identifikovati četiri tipa nacionalnih kultura. Ti tipovi nacionalnih kultura se međusobno razlikuju u pogledu distribucije moći i pogodnog oblika kolektivne akcije. Distanca moći, kao dimenzija nacionalne kulture, deli ih prema korisnoj, efikasnoj ili poželjnoj distribuciji moći u društvu, kao i u njenim organizacijama. Visoka distanca moći implicira pretpostavku da je nejednaka, hijerarhijska distribucija moći u društvu i organizacijama dobra, efikasna i korisna. Niska distanca moći implicira pretpostavku da je jednaka ili egalitarna distribucija moći u društvu i organizacijama poželjna. Na drugoj strani, „muške“ *versus* „ženske“ vrednosti, dimenzija nacionalne kulture deli nacionalne kulture prema tome šta se smatra pogodnim ili efikasnim okvirom kolektivne akcije u društvu i u organizacijama koje mu pripadaju. „Muške“ kulture sadrže pretpostavku da će kolektivna akcija u društvu i u organizacijama u njegovim okvirima biti najefikasnija ako je preduzeta u okvirima radne strukture i zadataka. „Ženske“ kulture sadrže pretpostavku da su socijalna struktura i međuljudski odnosi efikasan kontekst za preduzimanje kolektivne akcije u društvu i u pripadajućim organizacijama. Diferenciranje četiri tipa nacionalnih kultura koje imaju uticaj na izbor

strategije organizacionih promena može se videti iz sledeće matrice (Tabela 2).

Tabela 2 Diferenciranje tipova nacionalnih kultura

Pretpostavke o distribuciji moći	Pretpostavke o okviru kolektivne akcije	
	Radna struktura, zadaci	Socijalna struktura, odnosi
Hijerarhijska distribucija moći	Visoka distanca moći „Muške“ vrednosti	Visoka distanca moći „Ženske“ vrednosti
Egalitarna distribucija moći	Niska distanca moći „Muške“ vrednosti	Niska distanca moći „Ženske“ vrednosti

Izvor: Autor

UZROČNO-POSLEDNIČNI ODNOSI DIMENZIJA NACIONALNE KULTURE I STRATEGIJA ORGANIZACIONIH PROMENA

Predstavljene klasifikacije nacionalnih kultura i strategija organizacionih promena pokazuju visok stepen slaganja između kriterijuma koji su korišćeni za diferenciranje tipova organizacionih kultura i strategija promena. Pretpostavke o pogodnoj distribuciji moći u društvu, na osnovu kojih se diferenciraju nacionalne kulture, očigledno su povezane sa pravcem promena na osnovu koga se diferenciraju strategije promena. S druge strane, pretpostavke o pogodnom obliku kolektivne akcije u društvu, na osnovu kojih se diferenciraju nacionalne kulture, očigledno su povezane sa sredstvom promena, na osnovu koga se diferenciraju strategije promena. To nam omogućuje da postavimo hipoteze o kauzalnim relacijama određenih tipova nacionalnih kultura i određenih strategija promena.

U autoritarnim ili hijerarhijskim kulturama u kojima vlada pretpostavka o nejednakoj distribuciji moći u

organizaciji, moguće, verovatne i efikasne su direktivne ili strategije vođenja promena odozgo na dole. To su upravo racionalno empiričke i strategije moći i prinude. Budući da svi članovi društva prihvataju činjenicu da je moć nejednako distribuirana u društvu i da to treba da bude tako, onda je razumno pretpostaviti da će slično posmatrati i pogodan način vođenja promena. U tim kulturama se od rukovodstva organizacije očekuje da vodi kako svakodnevno funkcionisanje, tako i promene društva. Stoga će se uvek od lidera i njegovih saradnika očekivati da artikulišu i planiraju promene koje će ostali u društvu samo sprovesti. Zato možemo postaviti hipotezu:

H1 : Nacionalne kulture sa visokom distancom moći favorizuju primenu racionalno-empiričke i strategije moći i prinude u organizacionim promenama.

Nasuprot tome, u egalitarnim kulturama u kojima vlada pretpostavka o potrebi ravnomernije distribucije moći u organizaciji, moguće, verovatne i efikasne su participativne ili strategije vođenja promena odozdo na gore. To su upravo normativno-reedukativna i kreativna strategija promena. Članovi organizacije u ovim kulturama očekuju da imaju aktivnu ulogu, kako u svakodnevnom funkcionisanju, tako i u promenama. Od lidera i rukovodstva organizacije se očekuje da obezbede resurse za promene, da ih usmeravaju, ali i da obezbede prostor za participaciju i aktivnu ulogu svih članova organizacije. U takvim kulturama, agenti promena nisu samo na vrhu, već u čitavoj organizaciji, a aktivnosti promena su multilateralne. Zato možemo postaviti sledeću hipotezu:

H2 : Nacionalne kulture sa niskom distancom moći favorizuju primenu normativno-reedukativne i kreativne strategije u organizacionim promenama.

U kulturama u kojima se rešavanje problema i ostvarivanje ciljeva organizacije ostvaruje primarno preko radne ili formalne strukture, moguće, verovatne i efikasne će biti strategije vođenja promena koje se, takođe, baziraju na radnoj strukturi i zadacima, kao osnovnom oruđu promena. Budući da u ovim kulturama vlada pretpostavka da su zadaci u radnoj strukturi osnovni upravljački mehanizam za vođenje

organizacije, prirodno je da se očekuje da su radni zadaci osnovni mehanizam i za vođenje promena. Strategije promena koje se baziraju na radnoj strukturi i zadacima su racionalno empirička i kreativna strategija. Zato možemo postaviti hipotezu:

H3 : Nacionalne kulture sa „muškim“ vrednostima favorizuju primenu racionalno-empiričke i kreativne strategije u organizacionim promenama.

Nasuprot tome, u kulturama u kojima se rešavanje problema i ostvarivanje ciljeva organizacije ostvaruje primarno kroz socijalnu strukturu i relacije, moguće, verovatne i efikasne će biti strategije promena u kojima je osnovno sredstvo promena upravo ta socijalna struktura i relacije. Budući da u ovim kulturama vlada pretpostavka da su socijalne strukture i relacije između ljudi osnovni upravljački mehanizam za vođenje organizacije, prirodno je da se očekuje da su socijalna struktura i relacije osnovno sredstvo vođenja promena. Strategije promena koje primarno koriste socijalnu komponentu i međuljudske odnose su strategija moći i normativno reedukativna strategija. Shodno tome možemo postaviti hipotezu:

H4 : Nacionalne kulture sa „ženskim“ vrednostima favorizuju primenu normativno-reedukativne i strategije moći u organizacionim promenama.

Na osnovu slaganja osnovnih kriterijuma za diferenciranje nacionalnih kultura i strategija za vođenje promena, možemo da konstruišemo sledeću matricu (Tabela 3), iz koje proizilaze hipoteze o direktnim kauzalnim relacijama određenih tipova nacionalnih kultura i pogodnih strategija za vođenje promena u tim kulturama.

Nacionalne kulture koje kombinuju visoku distancu moći sa „muškim“ vrednostima favorizuju strategiju direktivnih, promena odozgo na dole, i to primarno unutar radne strukture ili strukture zadataka organizacije. Dakle, možemo postaviti hipotezu:

H5 : Nacionalne kulture sa visokom distancom moći i „muškim“ vrednostima favorizuju primenu racionalno-empiričke strategije organizacionih promena.

Nacionalne kulture koje kombinuju visoku distancu moći sa „ženskim“ vrednostima favorizuju strategiju direktivnih, promena odozgo na dole, i to primarno unutar socijalne strukture ili međuljudskih odnosa u organizaciji. Dakle, možemo postaviti hipotezu:

H6 : Nacionalne kulture sa visokom distancom moći i „ženskim“ vrednostima favorizuju primenu strategije moći i prinude u organizacionim promenama.

H7 : Nacionalne kulture sa niskom distancom moći i „muškim“ vrednostima favorizuju primenu kreativne strategije organizacionih promena.

Nacionalne kulture koje kombinuju nisku distancu moći sa „ženskim“ vrednostima favorizuju strategiju participativnih, promena odozdo na gore i to primarno unutar socijalne strukture ili strukture odnosa u organizaciji. Dakle, možemo postaviti hipotezu:

H8 : Nacionalne kulture sa niskom distancom moći i „ženskim“ vrednostima favorizuju primenu normativno-reedukativne strategije organizacionih promena.

Tabela 3 Slaganje strategija organizacionih promena i nacionalnih kultura

Pretpostavke o distribuciji moći / pravcu promena	Pretpostavke o formi kolektivne akcije / oruđu promena	
	„Muške“ vrednosti Radna struktura, zadaci	„Ženske“ vrednosti Socijalna struktura, odnosi
Visoka distanca moći	Visoka distanca moći, „muške“ vrednosti	Visoka distanca moći, „ženske“ vrednosti
Direktivne promene	Racionalno-empirička strategija	Strategija moći i prinude
Niska distanca moći	Niska distanca moći, „muške“ vrednosti	Niska distanca moći, „ženske“ vrednosti
Participativne promene	Kreativna strategija	Normativno-reedukativna strategija

Izvor: Autor

Nacionalne kulture koje kombinuju nisku distancu moći sa „muškim“ vrednostima favorizuju strategiju participativnih, promena odozdo na gore, i to primarno unutar radne strukture ili strukture zadataka organizacije. Dakle, možemo postaviti hipotezu:

ZAKLJUČAK

Nacionalna kultura, kroz svoje pretpostavke i vrednosti, determiniše način na koji članovi organizacija koji pripadaju toj kulturi interpretiraju realnost koja ih okružuje, kao i način na koji se u toj realnosti ponašaju. Stoga pretpostavljamo da nacionalna kultura utiče na način na koji se organizacija menja, i da slaganje nacionalne kulture i strategije promena unapređuje efikasnost procesa promena. Četiri tipa nacionalnih kultura su identifikovana na osnovu dve kulturne dimenzije: distance moći i „muške“ *versus* „ženske“ vrednosti. Na drugoj strani, identifikovane su četiri strategije organizacionih promena: racionalno-empirička strategija, strategija prinude, normativno-reedukativna i kreativna strategija. Identifikovane dimenzije nacionalne kulture i strategije organizacionih promena se međusobno razlikuju po istim kriterijumima: distribucija moći i okvir kolektivne akcije. Na toj osnovi, postavili smo osam hipoteza o uzročno-posledničnim odnosima određenih tipova nacionalne kulture i određenih strategija organizacionih promena.

Rad ima nekoliko značajnih teorijskih implikacija. Najvažnija teorijska implikacija jeste korisnost daljih istraživanja relacije nacionalne kulture i strategije organizacionih promena. Rad je pokazao da ima teorijske osnove za pretpostavku da je nacionalna kultura jedan od faktora izbora strategije upravljanja organizacionim promenama. Sada je potrebno empirijski proveriti tu pretpostavku testiranjem

hipoteza generisanih u ovom radu. Ovaj rad, takođe, implicira da je potrebno proširiti istraživanje uticaja nacionalne kulture i na druge aspekte organizacionih promena. Neophodno je istražiti da li nacionalna kultura utiče na karakter procesa promena i do kog stepena, odnosno, da li će promene biti kontinualne ili diskontinualne, parcijalne ili sveobuhvatne, evolutivne ili revolucionarne, razvojne ili adaptivne. Neophodno je, takođe, istražiti da li i kako kultura utiče na efikasnost procesa promena i njihov uspeh.

Rad ima i značajnih ograničenja. Prvo i najvažnije ograničenje jeste sama priroda rada, koji je eksplorativni i teoretski. Rad rezultira u hipotezama o odnosu nacionalne kulture i strategije organizacionih promena koje tek treba empirijski proveriti. Bez empirijskog testiranja zaključci ovog rada nisu potpuno validni. Takođe, rad se ograničio na ispitivanje uticaja nacionalne kulture na samo jedan aspekt upravljanja organizacionim promenama – strategiju promena. On ne ispituje uticaj kulture na druge aspekte organizacionih promena, što bi upotpunilo sliku. Najzad, ograničenje rada jeste i isključivo oslanjanje na jednu klasifikaciju strategija organizacionih promena i na dve dimenzije nacionalne kulture preuzetih, iz samo jedne klasifikacije dimenzija nacionalne kulture. Imajući u vidu brojnost klasifikacija, kako strategija organizacionih promena, tako i dimenzija nacionalnih kultura, moguće je da bi se drugačiji rezultati dobili da je korišćena neka druga klasifikacija.

ZAHVALNICA

Ovaj rad je deo Projekta osnovnih istraživanja (br. 179062), koji finansira Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja Republike Srbije.

REFERENCE

- Alas, R., Sun, W., & Gao, J. (2012). The implementation of organizational changes during the transition in China and Estonia. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 7(1), 86-102. doi: 10.1108/17465261211195847
- Bartunek, J. M., & Moch, M. (1987). First Order, Second Order and Third Order Change and Organizational Development Interventions: A Cognitive Approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 23(4), 483-500. doi: 10.1177/002188638702300404
- Benne, K. (1978). Societal Changing and Organizational Development. *Southern Review of Public Administration*, 1(4), 416-432.
- Chin, R., & Benne, K. (1969). General Strategies for Effecting Change in Human Systems. In: W. Bennis, K. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), *The Planning of Change* (pp. 32-59). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., de Luque, M. S., & House, R. J. (2006). In the Eye of the Beholder: Cross Cultural Lessons in Leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1), 67-90. doi:10.5465/AMP.2006.19873410
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- McWhinney, M. (1997). *Paths of Change*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M., Thangaraj, A., Dawei, W., & Huiqin, M. (2002). Classic Theories – Contemporary Applications: A comparative study of the implementation of innovation in Canadian and Chinese Public Sector Environments. *The Innovation Journal*, 12(12). Accessed January 16, 2013 (<http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style-articles.htm>)
- Nickols, F. (2010). Four Change Management Strategies. *Distance Consulting*. Accessed January 18, 2013 (<http://www.nickols.us/>)
- Pettigrew, A. (1987). Introduction: Researching Strategic Change. In: A. Pettigrew (Ed.), *The Management of Strategic Change* (pp. 1-7). London, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Porras, J., & Robertson, P. (1987). Organization Development Theory: A Typology and Evaluation. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1, 1-57.
- Quinn, R., & Sonenshein, S. (2008). Four General Strategies for Changing Human Systems. In T. G. Cummings (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Development* (pp. 69-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna, (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 1-65). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding Waves of Culture*. New York, NY: Irwin.

Primljeno 13. januara 2014,
nakon revizije,
prihvaćeno za publikovanje 17. aprila 2014.

Nebojša Janićijević je redovni profesor na Ekonomskom fakultetu Univerziteta u Beogradu, u oblasti organizacije, upravljanja ljudskim resursima, upravljanja promenama, na osnovnim, diplomskim i doktorskim akademskim studijama. Kao autor i koautor, publikovao je nekoliko knjiga; najnovija je *Organizaciona kultura i menadžment*. Objavio je brojne članke u inostranim i domaćim naučnim časopisima, i učestvovao na mnogim međunarodnim naučnim konferencijama. U okviru Fulbright programa, bio je tri puta na studijskim boravcima u SAD.

THE ROLE OF NATIONAL CULTURE IN CHOOSING A CHANGE STRATEGY IN ORGANIZATIONS

Nebojsa Janicijevic

Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

In this paper, the causal relationship between certain dimensions of a national culture and certain organizational change strategies are analyzed. The paper uses two of the four dimensions of national culture, identified by G. Hofstede: the power distance and masculinity–femininity ones. On the other hand, the four organizational change strategies have been differentiated: the coercive strategy, the normative-re-educative strategy, the rational-empirical strategy and the creative strategy. The identified dimensions of national culture and the identified organizational change strategies differ from one another with respect to the same criteria: the distribution of power and task orientation *versus* people orientation. Based on this fact, it is possible to establish eight hypotheses about a causal relationship between certain types of national cultures and certain organizational change strategies.

Keywords: organizational change, national culture, organization, strategy

JEL Classification: M14