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Abstract

This study addresses the question: to what extent serve Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures as a prediction for the success of Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California, and the initial failure of Disneyland Paris in Europe? The notions of Americanization, globalization, themed environments, and hyperreality are analyzed to give a clear picture of the current stance in the discipline. Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures are applied to the United States and France to demonstrate the cultural differences between these countries. It was discovered that France and the United States are juxtaposed on five of the six cultural dimensions. Certain examples of the cultural differences are applied to the Disneyland Park in Anaheim and Disneyland Paris. It is presented that most problems that were caused by these differences could have been avoided or can be solved by looking closely at Geert Hofstede’s model.
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Introduction

The presence and popularity of American products in Europe did not necessarily lead to a change in the European psyche. Europeans appropriated certain elements of the American lifestyle, intertwining them with native attitudes and mores. What emerged was a hybrid culture, part American and part European.

Richard Pells

Disney’s adaptation of *Beauty and the Beast* premiered in London on February 23, 2017. The movie was co-produced by Walt Disney Productions – a segment of the Walt Disney Company – and Mandeville Films – which is located at the Walt Disney Studios. The media and, consequently, a better part of the western world was dominated by this movie. To give an estimate of its success, the movie raised roughly 175 million dollars in its opening weekend in the United States of America only. On May 10, 2017, the movie raised 1.2 billion dollars worldwide (IMDB, 2017). Therefore, it can be said that this movie is definitely a financial success, and has reached large numbers of people. It seems that this has become a trend. Walt Disney Productions has released blockbuster after blockbuster, such as *Frozen* (2013), which yielded only $243,390 opening weekend but in the end raised 1.2 billion dollars worldwide, and the long-awaited sequel to *Finding Nemo* (2003) *Finding Dory* (2016), which raised one billion dollars worldwide (IMDB, 2017). These are merely three examples out of many. Ever since Walt Disney started his company in the entertainment business in the 1920s, he has built his company into a true empire. Nowadays, the Walt Disney Company incorporates several affiliates and subsidiaries. It includes different business segments, such as media networks, studio entertainment, consumer products, interactive media, and parks and resorts (Our Business, 2017). The Walt Disney Company originated in the United States, and as the popularity of the movies might imply, the company has dominated the globe in all the various business segments.

This global success by an American company is associated with the notions ‘globalization’ and ‘Americanization’. The former has increased in its popularity since the 1990s. The development of new media and the Internet have sparked the awareness of globalization even more (Chen, 2012). The world is, in terms of globalization, growing to be more homogenous. There are, however, different forms of globalization, such as political and cultural. This thesis will focus on the latter. It is said that the line between globalization and Americanization is blurring. Scholars often think that there is a growing cultural unity in the
world that is synonymous to American culture. Thus, the American culture is, in their perception, the culture of the world (Pells, 2004). Americanization is often coined as the ‘worldwide invasion of American movies, jazz, rock and roll, mass circulation magazines, best-selling books, advertising, comic strips, theme parks, shopping malls, fast food, television programs, and now the Internet’ (Pells, 2004). This suggests that globalization and Americanization are indeed linked. Moreover, the concepts of themed environments and hyperreality fit perfectly into both notions. Themed environments and the concept of hyperreality have been incorporated into the western culture, and have been incredibly important in the spreading of American culture (Baudrillard, 1988; Gottdiener, 2001). The Walt Disney Company embodies all these notions, and since this company consists of multiple business segments, I will focus on one; parks and resorts.

Americanization, globalization, themed environments, hyperreality, and Disney theme parks have been widely researched. These notions are for a better part associated with culture. When cultures interact or study each other, the differences and similarities surface. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck were the first scientists that researched fundamental problems in human societies, and they presented their findings in the Harvard Values Project in 1961 (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hills, 2002). They argue that there are six value orientations that are the most common among cultures. This research serves as the basis that several other researchers – in different disciplines– have built upon. Social psychologist Geert Hofstede is possibly the most important researcher who has extended Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s research. Hofstede added six, so-called, dimensions to the discussion that explain the basic values that typify national cultures (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hills, 2002). Since I have not come across a study that combines all the stated notions and dimensions, I will attempt to research the correlation between Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures and the successes and/or failures of two Disney theme parks; Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California and Disneyland Paris in Europe. I have chosen these two parks because the former is the original Disney theme park that has become an immense success from the start; it now serves as a worldwide model (Gottdiener, 2001). The latter was, however, a failure at first. The model had to be altered to become successful in Europe. It was one of the first setbacks for the Walt Disney Company in a fairly long time (Lainsbury, 2000). Could the problems have been predicted? Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures might have the answer. Therefore, this thesis will answer the following question: to what extent serve Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures as a prediction for the success of Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California, and the initial failure of Disneyland Paris in Europe?
In this literary review, I will address the main theories and works that I will incorporate in my study. The following chapter – “Cultural Differences, Cultural Imperialism, and Cultural Appropriation” – elaborates on the notions that have been briefly mentioned in two sections. In the first section, I will apply Mark Gottdiener’s beliefs about the act of theming and themed environments, and explain its impact on the world, which he describes in *The Theming of America: American Dreams, Media Fantasies, and Themed Environments* (2001). Next, I will present two researchers’ findings on globalization. Globalization is an immense field of study and therefore I have chosen the works of two researchers; Guo-Ming Chen’s “The Impact of New Media on Intercultural Communication in Global Context” (2012) and George Ritzer’s “Rethinking Globalization: Glocalization/Grobalization and Something/Nothing” (2003). I prefer these studies because, even though they analyze different aspects of globalization, I believe the issues they discuss are particularly relevant to this thesis, and give a clear picture on this phenomenon. Chen argues that there are five aspects of globalization, while Ritzer introduces a new term that is part of globalization. These complementing and contradictory aspects introduce some interesting perspectives for this research. After that, I will present data about the notion of Americanization. Just as globalization, Americanization encompasses a vast discipline. Therefore, I have used six works by four researchers; including three books and three articles. First, professor of history at the University of Texas Richard Pells has written two books and published an article on the matter; *Not Like Us: How Europeans have loved, hated, and transformed American culture since World War II* (1997), *Modernist America: Art, Music, Movies, and the Globalization of American Culture* (2011), and “From Modernism to the Movies: The Globalization of American Culture in the Twentieth Century” (2004). He writes about how American culture has infiltrated Europe since World War II. He argues that Europe has never truly become Americanized. His works are interesting because it allows us to understand his changing view on this matter. Furthermore, Winfried Fluck’s “The Americanization of Modern Culture: A Cultural History of the Popular Media” (1999), Rob Kroes’ *If You’ve Seen One, You’ve Seen The Mall* (1996), and Jaap Kooijman’s *Fabricating the Absolute Fake: America in Contemporary Pop Culture* (2004) all describe how America has affected the world. The distinction between cultural imperialism and cultural appropriation will be debated in this chapter since this division is the question that dominates the discussion of Americanization. Finally, Jean Baudrillard discusses a controversial view of America; “it is neither a dream, nor a reality, it is a hyperreality,” in his work *America* (1988). This particularly interesting phenomenon will be elaborated as it can serve as a reason for the spreading of American
culture. The second section of this chapter will be about Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s Harvard Values Project (1961) and Geert Hofstede’s cultural dimension theory. Geert Hofstede’s *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (2010) will provide the information needed on the six cultural dimensions. Hofstede’s son, Gert Jan, and Michael Minkov co-wrote this book that has become one of the most cited works in this discipline. Eventually, these notions will be combined that will serve as the framework of this thesis.

The second chapter and first case study, ‘Walt Disney’s Dreams and Desires’, discusses Walt Disney’s life and the road towards one of his dreams; building a theme park. Michael Barrier’s *The Animated Man: A Life of Walt Disney* (2007) provides an interesting look into Disney’s life and company. It offers this thesis a glance in Walt Disney’s mind, and thus his dreams and desires. Next, the original Disney theme park will be analyzed by applying Barrier’s and Gottdiener’s work. Both researchers have written extensively on this matter. Finally, Geert Hofstede’s cultural dimension theory will be employed on both Walt Disney and his theme park.

The third chapter and second case study, ‘Dreaming beyond Borders’, elaborates on the development of the Euro Disney theme park, its failures, and alterations. Andrew Lainsbury’s *Once Upon an American Dream: the Story of Euro Disneyland* (2000), Jonathan Matusitz’s “Disneyland Paris: a Case Analysis Demonstrating How Glocalization Works.” (2010), and the works by Richard Pells will provide the information needed. Just as in the first case study, Geert Hofstede’s cultural dimension theory will be applied in order to see if the successes and failures could have been predicted.

In this thesis, I will apply two methods; discourse analysis and case studies. I have chosen to do a discourse analysis, because it is a perfect way to conceptualize and analyze said notions (Wertz et al., 2011). It is also great in combining various approaches, such as a case study. This means that I can apply the ideas by, for instance, Pells, Gottdiener, and Hofstede, to an analysis of Disneyland. This will give us different perspectives that, then, will be part of a larger understanding. This type of analysis is also great for analyzing national identities and cross and intercultural communication (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2011). I will conduct two case studies, because it offers a clear view or clarification of the theoretical notions and definitions from the first chapter. A case study is also appropriate when the questions arises on how people see the world and their surroundings (Swanborn, 2003). This means that both methods are qualified to analyze and answer the main question: to what extent serve Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures as a prediction for the success
of Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California, and the initial failure of Disneyland Paris in Europe?
1. Cultural Imperialism, Cultural Appropriation, and Cultural Differences

The world is not being Americanized. Rather, the world constantly Americanizes itself.

- Winfried Fluck, 1999

In recent years, researchers have argued that the view on Americanization is old-fashioned. The world is no longer subject to America’s cultural imperialism and the establishment of the globalization of the American culture. It did leave a mark on the western society, but native cultures remain existing. Thus, it is argued that Americanization should be described differently; as cultural appropriation. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section focuses on this division between cultural appropriation and cultural imperialism. The subchapter is arranged into three larger pieces that describe this division from separate angles. First, the act of theming will be addressed, following by the description of globalization. Finally, Americanization will be dealt with. This section contains a separate fragment on hyperreality. Hyperreality should be part of the discussion on Americanization, but it should also be standing on its own. The second section of this chapter is about Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s Harvard Values Project and Geert Hofstede’s cultural dimensions theory.

1.1 Themed Environments, Globalization, Americanization, and Hyperreality

1.1.1 Themed Environments

Since the 1950s, local and national western cultures have been captured by the use of themes and signs. These themes and signs characterize not only recreational activities, such as professional – sports, but also other activities, such as family vacations. The trend of theming is noticeable in, for instance, shopping malls, airports, museums, and restaurants. These themed places are created to sell merchandise and to attract customers. It creates a competition among various places for the “tourist dollars” (Gottdiener, 2001). The themed environments are crawling with motifs that have symbolic meanings which define the built spaces or products (Gottdiener, 2001). The questions arise: what does it mean that something is seen as a theme or a sign, and why do themed environments exist?

In order to understand the act of theming, it is important to know what specifies something as a theme or a sign. A sign is a unity of the signifier and the signified, in which
the signifier is the word or the image and the signified is the meaning of that word or image. Thus, a sign stands for something which is part of a particular cultural concept. Signs are sometimes purposely constructed to communicate meaning, for instance in themed environments. Objects that represent a particular meaning are called sign functions. In other words, we denote meaning. A signifier can also connote multiple associations. These are usually defined by social contexts and have meanings with specific cultural contexts. For instance, when we see a building that is a bank, at the denotative level we know its sign function. At the connotative level, the bank building connotes different associations, such as wealth, success, savings, and so on. This means that objects should not only be seen as signs. Signs can also be used as objects. For instance, the former can be the act of theming, while the latter can be used by the producers to gain profits. Signs are, therefore, twofold. Moreover, every culture has different ways of communicating. A sign given by one culture can have a different meaning in the other. Several meanings can be organized in a single, unified sense. This is called a code or ideology. Codes are subcultural phenomena that are shared within a culture, but they can differ across cultures. This means that a theme or a sign can be interpreted a certain way by one culture, while its connotation can be extremely different by the other. Nonetheless, each culture gives meaning to certain signs and that is extremely important in themed environments (Gottdiener, 2001).

According to Mark Gottdiener, themed environments are the product of two social processes. Firstly, these socially constructed environments are built and designed to operate as “containers for commodified human interaction” (2001). Secondly, cultural processes inflict symbolic meaning to themed motifs and it triggers the meaning that users and inhabitants give to symbolic motifs (2001). Furthermore, Gottdiener makes the distinction between production and consumption. Production is the social process of creation where individuals or groups of people are brought together within an organized institutional context. How these individuals or groups of people interpret these spaces is called consumption. They apply meaning or meanings to this space. Thus, this means that the consumption of the themed environment is the interpretation of symbolic content in the experience of the constructed space and the theming milieu (Gottdiener, 2001). This also suggest that these environments have the power to guide the consumer’s behavior, whether the sign is obvious or hardly noticed. Signs or motifs are, however, not symbolic on their own. The consumers need to prescribe symbolism to the motifs. The people seek for activities and images to fulfill their own needs and desires (Gottdiener, 2001). In other words, themed environments can alter the consumers’ behavior,
but in return, the consumers need to be persuaded to want to fulfill their desires and needs. Therefore, it is a reciprocal process.

In short, signs are words or images that contain or convey meaning. In themed environments, objects are not only signs; signs can be the objects as well. The socially constructed environments are purposely supplied with signs and themes in order to convey symbolic meaning. The producers are able to make a profit of the consumers who are attracted to these environments because they award these themes and signs with symbolic meaning.

1.1.2 Globalization

Marshall McLuhan coined the term ‘the global village’ in 1961, by which he meant that technological developments have changed the world into a smaller village with blurring boundaries. The ‘six degrees of separation’-experiment by Stanley Milgrim in 1967 researched the connectedness of two people who were randomly selected, and it turned out that there are only five or six steps, or people, between those two randomly selected people. Facebook built upon this experiment and discovered that “if you pick only two Facebook users, it’s been calculated there’s an average of 3.57 ‘degrees of separation’ between them” (Reinierse, personal communication, January 31st, 2017). These examples are three of many. Even though these examples are about communication, globalization encompasses all aspects of human society. Globalization has increasingly become a trend for topic of research since the 1990s. Govindarajan and Gupta defined globalization as “the expansion, stretching, intensification, and acceleration of social activities in both objective/material and subjective/human consciousness levels, or different levels of human society, and an individual” (as cited in Chen, 2012). Chen describes that social and cultural globalization changed the concept of a community and it redefined the meaning of cultural identity (2012). This suggests that globalization has had a powerful impact on the globe. Chen argues that globalization embraces five aspects. First, it is a dynamic process. It is a constant movement back and forth between cultural identity and cultural diversity, and between localization and universalization. Second, globalization is pervasive. It influences every aspect of our daily lives, such as the way we think and behave. Third, it is interconnected. It has created an interconnected web of networks in various fields. Fourth, globalization hybridizes culture.
Boundaries blur and disappear; different cultural aspects correlate. Fifth, individual power increases. One’s voice is becoming more important (2012).

George Ritzer argues that globalization is too broad a topic and needs to be divided into glocalization and grobalization – a term coined by Ritzer. These two terms give some perspective to globalization. Glocalization is the combination of the global and the local. This results in unique outcomes in local areas. A local aspect is incorporated in a global policy in order to appeal to the local culture of market. For instance, in the Netherlands, the McKroket is a glocal product by McDonald’s. People who believe in glocalization support global heterogeneity and consider the growing cultural homogeneity of the world as a negative manifestation. Ritzer believes that glocalization is important, but he argues for another term that, in his opinion, exists in the world: grobalization. Grobalization focuses on the imperialistic ideas of organizations and corporations to gain power and influence in several geographic areas. They want their profits to ‘grow’, and therefore, the term grobalization is created (Ritzer, 2003). Multinationals have taken over the consumer market with products that are alike and use similar approaches in similar surroundings, resulting in a global cultural homogeneity (Kooijman, 2008). The difference between globalization and grobalization is that the former encompasses several disciplines, whereas the latter is about the corporate world only. Ritzer stresses the fact that grobalization is penetrating the local. This means that, in time, the local will no longer be free of grobal and global influences. Most things we consider local are already glocal. This in effect means that it gets increasingly difficult to find anything in the world that is untouched by globalization.

Chen’s five aspects of globalization and Ritzer’s theory on glocalization and grobalization share some common ground; certain points either are similar to or complement each other. First, Chen argues that globalization is a dynamic process. There is a constant push and pull attraction between the local and the universal. This means that these two are connected; the one serves as fuel for the other (2012). Ritzer makes a similar point. He says that the local and the universal – in his words; grobal – are connected. He goes even beyond that; he says that there is almost no local anymore as it is penetrated by the grobal. In other words, the world is growing more culturally homogeneous. However, if the local and the grobal keep interacting – pushing and pulling – then a “unique phenomenon” is produced. If the grobal creates the glocal then, in the end, the glocal abates the local. Then the glocal serves as the local (Ritzer, 2003). This means that the world grows more culturally heterogeneous again. Then, the process starts all over again. Thus, the grobal and the local reinforce each other. Second, Ritzer’s idea of the local already being the glocal coincides with
Chen’s second point; globalization is pervasive. Globalization moves like air, encompassing all aspects of life (Chen, 2012). This means that much of the local is infiltrated by the global, making the globe culturally homogeneous. Lastly, Ritzer believes that the world is getting more and more homogeneous with the disappearing of the local (2003). Chen believes that globalization hybridizes culture, and that human boundaries are dissolving (2012). Thus, these two arguments align and are interrelated as well, and these two researchers include certain important aspects of globalization that also align with the American culture. The following will build upon that.

### 1.1.3 Americanization

It is often believed that Americanization originated at the ending of World War II. This is a misconception since the term was introduced in Britain in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Back then, Americanization referred to machine-driven innovations and technological resourcefulness. The following century, the word obtained a new meaning. The United States extended its influence globally, especially in its industrial and military power. This and the emerging horrible circumstances in Europe resulted in an increase of awareness of the United States by Europeans (Pells, 1997). In the 1920s and 1930s, thousands of people fled Europe and migrated to the United States. By the 1940s, the U.S. had extended its dominance economically and culturally. The term Americanization inflicted a sense of danger. It was felt that the United States would be superior and that the country would enforce its supremacy on the world (Pells, 1997). America and Americanization have been extensively researched. The question that has lead this research in recent decades is whether the United States uses its cultural dominance and imperializes the world, or whether the relationship could be seen as cultural appropriation.

Cultural imperialism is defined as the infliction of American (popular) culture on the world by using powerful marketing strategies endorsed by American organizations or multinationals in order to increase the global popularity of both the product and the company (Fluck, 1999). The consumers of American popular culture are, in this case, inferior and are, in some sense, victims of the globally executed strategies, which threatens the local cultures. This cultural imperialism causes the globe to become culturally homogenous (Kooijman, 2008). This suggests that cultures that are not American mindlessly digest the American culture and that they are not aware of this cultural infiltration (Pells, 2004). However, this view is dated.
It is apparent that the American culture is unmistakably dominant in the world, but there must be other reasons why the American products, music, art, sports, multinationals, corporations, and so on, are this popular (Fluck, 1999).

There are three overarching themes that represent the process of cultural appropriation instead of cultural imperialism of American culture. The first factor that proves to be an extremely important contributor is a simple, but effective one; the English language. It has spread throughout the world ever since the colonial times. Nowadays, non-native speakers outnumber native speakers in the world. The language is, also, one of or the official language in several countries around the globe – the United States is, funnily enough, not included in this list (Svartvik & Leech, 2006). Nonetheless, the U.S. has an advantageous position. The nation is able to propagate its – cultural – influence throughout the globe. Especially with the rise of mass communications and mass culture, American organizations are able to grow at great lengths (Pells, 1997). It is, however, important to note that the English language is not understood the same everywhere. A particular word by a native speaker could have a different connotation with a non-native speaker (Pells, 2004). Thus at times, the language does not impose a certain explanation; there is room for interpretation.

Secondly, American products and the American culture do not feel that foreign. There are two main explanations for this sensation. First, with the influx of immigrants in the beginning of the twentieth century, the U.S. could use their expertise and knowledge on their native cultures to its benefit. Therefore, the American culture was and is built on the backs of immigrants. The culture incorporates a blend of different folklores, fairytales, and fantasies from all over the world. These cultural codes allow us to understand and appreciate these products without any difficulties. This also creates an immense audience that is interested in this culture (Kroes, 1996; Pells, 2004). Second, the U.S. adopts and transforms ideas – from for instance Europe – cleverly and sends these ideas back to where it came from. That means that the product is now “in forms that are more mesmerizing for the masses” (Pells, 2011). When we go to the United States, it is possible that one recognizes certain products, because they belong to their cultures. This suggests that the American culture is actually heterogeneous. It has always been “more cosmopolitan than imperialistic” (Pells, 1997) (Fluck, 1999; Pells, 2004).

Lastly, American culture is not mindlessly accepted by other cultures; homogeneity is to some extend rejected. The American ideas are taken into careful consideration and other cultures reinterpret them into their own circumstances. They domesticate these ideas and products (Pells, 1997). In other words, the process of hybridization occurs. Elements of the
American culture are interwoven with features of the native culture. Moreover, in this process, factors such as genes, childhoods, families, experiences at work or school, must be taken into considerations as well. These factors enhance the hybridization process; products and ideas are adapted to their own tastes and preferences.

In the end, the American culture is not imprinting on other cultures. The relationship between the American culture and the world has always been reciprocal. The United States consumes as much of the cultures around the globe. Still, the American culture is unmistakably present and it is often “the cultural elephant in everyone’s living room” (Pells, 1997, 2004). The American culture is, however, not Americanizing the world. It is present in everyone’s living room by choice, and therefore “the world constantly Americanizes itself,” and that is why American culture is this popular (Fluck, 1999).

1.1.3.1 Hyperreality

The following notion is important in the discussion of Americanization, cultural appropriation, and cultural imperialism. Jean Baudrillard argues in America that America should be seen as an entity beyond that; America is a hyperreality. He says:

America is neither dream nor reality. It is a hyperreality. It is a hyperreality because it is a utopia which has behaved from the beginning as though it were already achieved. Everything here is real and pragmatic, and yet it is all the stuff of dreams too.

(Baudrillard, 1988)

America is thus a “utopia achieved”. He argues that America is an enormous “hologram that is a three-dimensional dream”. This dream can be entered as one pleases. Thus, America is fiction, and “this fictive basis dominates the world” (Baudrillard, 1988). Baudrillard then argues that only Europeans can truly see the truth of America. Even though America continues to uphold the dream world, Europeans are never true outcasts (Kroes, 1996). Europeans are aware of this manifestation; the Americans are not. Baudrillard continues his argument:

It may be that the truth of America can only be seen by a European, since he alone will discover here the perfect simulacrum – that of the immanence and the material
transcription of all values. The Americans, for their part, have no sense of simulation. They are themselves simulation in its most developed state, but they have no language in which to describe it, since they themselves are the model. (Baudrillard, 1988)

America has taken products and ideas from abroad and created a form of hyperreality. Then, these “cultural artifacts are perceived as an improved copy, more ‘real’ than its original” (Kooijman, 2008). Thus, America has molded its culture into a style. This has become the international style, and therefore it has become the model. This model serves as the basis for the rest of the world; it has become “a universal one” (Baudrillard, 1988).

1.1.4 Combining notions

So far, the act of theming, globalization, Americanization, and the concept of hyperreality have been discussed separately. Even though these notions can stand on their own, they are incredibly interconnected; the one complements the other, or causes the other to exist. The purpose of the act of theming is, for instance, to attract consumption and to be profitable for the producers. This means that a theme is used to grow a business, which coincides with Ritzer’s concept of globalization. This describes the imperialistic trend of large corporations and multinationals to grow; physically and profitably (2003). Theming connects also with Baudrillard’s hyperreality theory. Themed environments have the power to alter consumers’ behavior. It can liberate and alienate people from the past, present, and future. In other words, these environments allow people to escape their realities and in turn enter a dreamlike place; a hyperreality (Baudrillard, 1988; Gottdiener, 2001). The themed environments become a model, and they are usually American. This results in a worldwide, American model (Baudrillard, 1988).

Another example of the connection between notions is the fact that the line between Americanization and globalization is blurring. The United States has unmistakably been influential in several fields in the world. The world is coated with American products, ideals, themes, and so on. The English language has had an immense contribution to the spread of American culture and thus, argued by some, cultural globalization. The language has become the language of cultural globalization with the coming of the Internet and mass communications. The United States was able to become a pioneer and innovator in these fields, and together with the English language, the country was able to maintain an advantage
and globalize the world. It is important to note, however, that cultures assign different codes to words and images. Thus, certain words can be interpreted differently than initially intended. This means that even though the American culture is present in everyone’s lives, the different applied codes can cause segmentation in the global inflicted approach, resulting in cultural appropriation (Pells, 1997; Kooijman, 2008).

After all, several of said notions characterize more or less the same phenomena. Americanization can be divided into cultural imperialism and cultural appropriation, and globalization in glocalization and globalization. In the end, cultural appropriation, (g)localization, cultural heterogeneity, and hybridization describe the embracement of, in this case, the American culture, with careful consideration and active appropriation to one’s own needs and desires, whereas universalization, cultural imperialism, cultural homogeneity, grobalization, and globalization describe the fashion of the growing cultural homogeneity of the world. It is often believed that these latter terms address a sense of danger; it is dangerous that cultural differences disappear and one super-culture arises (Chen, 2012; Kooijman, 2008; Pells, 2004).

It is apparent that these notions are intertwined, but that a division is noticeable. This thesis will build upon the notion that Americanization is as much a subject to globalization as any other culture. This means that the United States and the world deal with cultural appropriation and that there is still a sense of cultural differences. These cultural differences will be explored more deeply in the second half of this framework.

1.2 Cultural Dimensions Theory

The American army made a huge leap in the research for cross-cultural and intercultural communication during World War II. Cross-cultural research is about the differences and similarities between cultures, while intercultural research is about what happens when these cultures interact. It is important to be aware of cultural differences since cultures can apply different meanings to certain signs. In other words, there are divergent cultural codes. The Americans were conscious of these differences and after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1942, they started to research the Japanese culture and how to approach it. They discovered that the Japanese emperor should not be humiliated and the people should not be oppressed when they surrendered. This research proved to be beneficial and it sparked the development of an important project by Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck that
would change the course of this field of study; the Harvard Values Project of 1961 (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017).

This subchapter is about this project that serves as the basis of several other conducted studies. One of them is the study by Geert Hofstede. He built upon Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck’s research and introduced six cultural dimensions. The second half of this subchapter will discuss these cultural dimensions.

1.2.1 Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck’s Harvard Values Project (1961)

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck were one of the first who researched the fundamental concepts in predicting behavior among human beings. They were interested in the basic human values and, as a result, published the Harvard Values Project in 1961. Clyde Kluckhohn, Florence’s husband, describes a value as “a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action” (as cited in Hills, 2002). This means people can share certain beliefs that function as the basis of the development of a culture. It is often believed that people think that their culture is the ‘right’ one, the standard, or that it is superior to other cultures. Thus, it is highly likely that these conceptions pose problems. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck researched these principles and established three assumptions:

There is a limited number of common human problems for which all peoples must at all times find some solution. While there is variability in solutions of all the problems, it is neither limitless nor random, but is definitely variable within a range of possible solutions. All alternatives of all solutions are present in all societies at all times but are differently preferred. (as cited in Hills, 2002)

These assumptions resulted in six basic types of problems that need to be solved by every (individual in a) culture. The problems are formulated in six questions. (1) What is the nature of human beings? (2) What is the relationship between human beings? (3) What drives humans’ actions? (4) What conceptions do human beings have about space? (5) What is the relationships between human beings and time? (6) What is the relationship between human beings and nature, and the spiritual (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hills, 2002)? These questions
are answered with a possible solution. For instance, the first question can be answered with ‘good,’ ‘evil,’ or ‘a mixture of both’. These aspects form the orientation that describe the value; thus, making a value orientation. (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hills, 2002). Value orientations are also called dimensions. Different researchers have since studied the basic human dimensions, I will address those of Geert Hofstede.

1.2.2 Geert Hofstede’s National Culture Dimensions

Social psychologist Geert Hofstede is a pioneer in the world of culture, and he was fascinated by organizational behavior. He landed a position in the research department of IBM international and led a team of psychologists who researched the preferred values in the working conditions of the personnel in the sixties. He and his team analyzed data from over 116,000 IBM employees from over 50 countries that were obtained from surveys. This resulted in the publication of his book Culture’s Consequences in 1980 (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017).

Geert Hofstede developed a model that initially included four dimensions; Power Distance (PDI); Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV); Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS); and Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). The fifth dimension was added in 1991, after researcher Michael Bond studied cultures in China and re-analyzed Hofstede’s findings. The fifth dimension is to be known as Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Orientation (LTO). Finally, the sixth and last dimension was added in 2010 with the publication of Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. This dimension is called Indulgence versus Restraint (IVR) (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). It is important to note that these dimensions are part of a continuum and they are relative and not absolute positions of the countries. It is expected that an overall view can be applied to one culture, but it is not necessarily applicable to each individual in that country (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). In what follows is a brief description of the six dimensions to get a basic understanding. They will be extensively treated in the case studies.

**Power Distance Index**

The PDI describes how a culture grapples with (in)equality in different institutions, such as schools, families, communities, and in organizations, such as the workplace. This index is based on those who are less powerful. How do they perceive the distance between
them and people with more power, such as bosses, teachers, and family members (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010)? A low score on the PDI labels those cultures who believe in equality, and when there is a sense of inequality, it should be justified. A high score means that inequality is relatively normal. It is expected that there is a strong hierarchy in their society. In these cultures, people are more dependent on those with power (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017).

**Individualism versus Collectivism**

Individualism pertains those cultures in which it is expected to look after themselves and after immediate family members. The ‘I’ is important, but equality among all is too. These cultures belong to a group, they feel individually independent, but are also willing to help other groups of people as well. While in Collectivism, the ‘We’ is important. This only applies, however, to their own group; the in-group. They do not feel responsible for other groups of people. It is expected to take care of those in their group in return for unconditional loyalty. There is a strong, cohesive sensation for their group, while in Individualism, identity is derived from the self (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

**Masculinity versus Femininity**

The MAS index does not necessarily concern the distinction between men and women, but how cultures identify gender roles. In a Masculine society, there is a clear difference between men and women. It entails a more traditional view; for instance, women cry and men do not. Men are seen as though and they work hard in order to obtain (material) success, while women are fragile, gentle and are more “concerned with the quality of life” (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). In a Feminine culture, there is not a distinct difference between gender roles. Everyone is concerned with the quality of life. Men and women work to achieve a happy life. In these cultures, everyone is equal and it is important for all to take care of those in need.

**Uncertainty Avoidance Index**

UAI answers the question how a culture copes with the Uncertain. Do they seize these situations or do they avoid them? In other words, is there “a need for written and unwritten rules” (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010)? Cultures with low scores on the UAI do not feel the necessary need for multiple laws and rules. Details and precision are not that important. The unsure is unavoidable. Societies with a high Uncertainty avoidance index
desire to enclose as many laws and rules as possible to diminish the threat that is known as the Uncertain (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

**Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Orientation**

The LTO-index describes the way cultures detect the past, the present, and the future. Cultures that are labeled as Long Term Orientation societies believe that the primary goal in life is to live virtuously so that the world becomes a better place. Thrift and perseverance are the most important aspects for the preparation of the future. Traditions should be adapted to the modern society. Short Term Orientation cultures are, on the other hand, those who are fixated on the past and the present. Traditions are important, and spending and profits in a short amount of time are highly appreciated (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

**Indulgence versus Restraint**

Indulgence is about the allowance to enjoy life, to be impulsive, and to be happy. There is room for pleasure; life should be ‘fun’. Restraint is the other side of this continuum. There is a need to suppress the happiness of life. Cultures that are more Restraint appreciate strict regulations of social norms. Having friends are not as important as work is (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

Hofstede’s six dimensions fit into three of the six basic problems formulated by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck. The Power Distance Index and Individualism versus Collectivism describe the relationship between human beings. Masculinity versus Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance Index, and Indulgence versus Restraint correspond with the third problem; what initiates human beings’ actions? Lastly, Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Normative Orientation is the only dimension that matches the relationship between human beings and time (Gerritsen & Claes, 2017). This shows that even though both the studies by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck and by Hofstede define six dimensions or questions, this does not mean that each dimension corresponds with each question. This thesis will primarily research the six dimensions given by Hofstede, and consequently, with three of the basic value orientations by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck. An extended description of each dimension will be given in the following chapters as they will be applied to certain countries.
2. Walt Disney’s Dreams and Desires

To all that come to this happy place: welcome. Disneyland is your land. Here age relives fond memories of the past, and here youth may savor the challenge and promise of the future. Disneyland is dedicated to the ideals, the dreams, and the hard facts that have created America… with hope that it will be a source of joy and inspiration to all the world.

Walt Disney

Walter Elias Disney, born on December 5, 1901, in Chicago, Illinois, was a man of great desires and dreams. He dreamed of owning a company together with his best friend; his brother Roy. “I wanted Roy and I to be partners, that was all. I mean, we just wanted to be partners – I wanted it” (as cited in The Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). His dreams came true with the founding of the Disney Brothers Cartoon Studio in 1923, in which Walt took care of the artistic and creative side of the business, and Roy managed the business and financial aspects. They remained business partners until Walt’s death in 1966 (The Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). Walt Disney, his parents, and his siblings moved to Marceline, Missouri where he spent the rest of his childhood. He developed an interest in drawing and doodling from an early age. Moreover, they lived close to the Santa Fe Railroad tracks and Walt became fascinated by them. Walt often recaptured his love for nature, trains, family, and community that he obtained in his childhood. He moved to California to set up his company and he eventually married one of his first employees in 1925. They raised two daughters; Diane Marie and Sharon Mae. Even though he acquired celebrity status in the 1930s, he would rather eat dinner with his family at home than socialize with Hollywood’s elite. He said: “The most important thing is the family” (as cited in The Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). Nonetheless, he worked extremely hard to fulfill his dreams. One of those dreams was to build an amusement park with the purpose to not only entertain children, but to entertain the entire family.

This chapter will analyze Walt’s dream of building that park. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first half is on the development of the original Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California. Then, the structure of the park will be discussed and analyzed. Following, a close analysis will be constructed on Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures. The national culture that will be shed light on is the United States of America.
2.1 Dreams become Reality: Disneyland Park in Anaheim

The idea of building an amusement park had been on Walt Disney’s mind for quite some time. He talked about this idea publicly since the 1930s, but he seriously began exploring the options mid-1940s. Disney had a clear vision for the park; “Disneyland will be something of a fair, an exhibition, a playground, a community center, a museum of living acts and a showplace of beauty and magic” (as cited in Barrier, 2007). This dream was, however, extremely expensive. Walt had to go on a quest to find the amount of money required to fulfill his dream. There was one large problem that set Disney back several times. Investors did not want to support Disney because, by the 1950s, amusement parks had acquired an awful reputation. They were often extremely dirty and dangerous. Nonetheless, Disney remained persistent. He said: “Almost everyone warned us that Disneyland would be a Hollywood spectacular – a spectacular failure. But they were thinking about an amusement park, and we believed in our idea; a family park where parents and children could have fun – together” (as cited in the Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). Eventually, Disney struck a deal with the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) in 1953 (Barrier, 2007).

For both parties, this deal would prove to be beneficial. ABC Networks was struggling in the beginning of the 1950s. Actually, ABC was happy enough to get any program on the air. It was even better that a Disney TV show would bring a big audience, since Walt Disney was a high-profile figure. In addition, the audience would consist of the eldest children among the baby boom generation – the targeted age for Disney merchandize. Moreover, the young parents who grew up with the cartoons and films by Disney would recognize the earlier themes (Barrier, 2007). ABC was also willing to film the program in advance, something that was not done before. Disney would get a show that would not be interfered with, and thus, the show would keep the attention of the audience (Barrier, 2007). Disney obtained the control over the program and he decided to call it *Disneyland*. The first show depicted a studio tour. This behind-the-scenes tour was very innovative since this would normally remain secret. Disney allowed the audience to see the park’s construction, and therefore he shared the dream or magic of this environment. Disney said at one point during the show: “This year, we want you to see and share with us the experience of building this dream into a reality” (as cited in Barrier, 2007). This demonstrates the impact Disney had on the entertainment industry.

Firstly, Disney created a hybridized environment by combining the entertainment aspect of the show with the promotional aspect of its merchandize. He is one of the first in history to execute this kind of mixed-marketing strategy (Barrier, 2007). Secondly, Disney already
created a form of hyperreality. He allows the audience to enter the dreamlike and magical place through the screen of a television. Thus, Disney established a hyperreal, hybrid environment.

On July 17, 1955, Disneyland opened its doors while the park was far from finished. Only a dozen rides and Main Street USA (one of the distinct features of the park) were open and ready for public. During the first seven weeks, the park attracted over one million visitors, fifty percent more than expected (Barrier, 2007). This resulted in a profit that Disney used to invest in his park, which was unfortunate for ABC who thought it would be easy money. Disney believed in his dream, so he kept investing. He also invested his own savings into the development of the park. He said: “The park means a lot to me, in that it’s something that will never be finished, something that I can keep developing, keep plussing and adding to” (as cited in Barrier, 2007). In total, the expenses of the park were over 17 million dollars, pushing Disney into debt. This did not stop Walt Disney. Eventually, his company would be highly profitable and conquer the world (Barrier, 2007).

Walt Disney formed a team that had to inspect amusement parks in the United States and all over the world. Two aspects were evident in these inspections. First, Disney noticed that many parks were uninteresting for the parents and that they were merely walking around, aimlessly. Disney wanted them to experience the excitement of an amusement park, and had certain ideas about achieving that wish. The park should be “clean and respectable for all” (as cited in Barrier, 2007). The team of inspectors had to inspect not only the construction of the park but also how they were treated by the employees. This resulted in the ‘smile’-policy. Disney trained his employees to be extremely customer-friendly. He believed that this would enhance one’s experience of the park. Furthermore, the parks should be spick-and-span. It was common to see a number of sweepers in the park (Barrier, 2007; Matusitz, 2010).

Second, the amusement park Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen, Denmark, served as a great inspiration for the original Disney theme park. These parks are incredibly similar. This means that Walt Disney was inspired by a European product, molded this into an American style, and sold it to the rest of the world. In the end, the structure of the park has become a model that is used “from Disneyland to Disneyland” (Gottdiener, 2001).

This park is structured according a particular model (Appendix A). Visitors start at the grand entrance of the park. This is a simulation of Main Street America; a representation of a Midwestern town, such as Marceline, Missouri where Walt Disney grew up in. This street functions as the gateway to the entire park. One of the most recognizable features of the parks, the Sleeping Beauty Castle, is located at the end of this road. Moreover, the end of this
road leads the way to four separate ‘lands’ that each contains a theme that represents the Walt Disney Company one way or another. On the right side of Main Street is Tomorrowland; a land with representations of the future. At the end of Main Street is Fantasyland. Not only is this the location of the well-known Matterhorn Mountain and Sleeping Beauty’s Castle, it is also home to the Disney cartoons and animated films from the past decades. On the left side of Main Street is the location of both Frontierland – the land that contains all the old Disney successes, and a representation of America’s first settlements – and Adventureland – the land where a series of fantasies are portrayed. Next to the four lands, there are three ‘mock’-towns that serve either food or entertainment (Gottdiener, 2001).

These four lands can be analyzed in two different ways; an analysis of the park as mass consumer culture and an analysis of the park in a more personal way. Visitors actively choose to visit the park. They choose to become consumers of the themed environment, consequently, the park becomes the producer. This themed environment connotes certain signs where to the visitors feel a sense of recognition since they grew up with Disney’s cartoons and animated films. This represents the mass consumer culture. In this point of view, an analysis of the four lands can be realized. “Frontierland can be interpreted as a reference to the stage of predatory capitalism; Adventureland, as a representation of colonialism/imperialism; Tomorrowland, as a state-financed capitalism, or the military-industrial complex; and lastly, Main Street as the period of family and mercantile capitalism” (Gottdiener, 2001). The themes in these areas are a popularized form of American history, such as folklores about the frontier days. In this analysis, these themed environments serve as signs for capitalism and consumer culture. But Disneyland is more a form of hyperreality. A dreamlike venture that serves as a simulation for one’s past, present and future.

Therefore, a ‘personal’ analysis is also appropriate. That would mean that Adventureland is a representation of the realm of children’s games such as ‘Cowboys and Indians’, that are often played in one’s backyard. Brothers and sisters, and friends play with each other in their own imaginary worlds. Frontierland is a portrayal of the summer camps, the boy scouts, national parks and/or folk heroes. It is a place where one can learn about nature and how to conquer it. In Tomorrowland, the world of science and industry is represented. It is a place where science fiction and science projects come alive. Lastly, in Fantasyland dreams and imaginary tales come alive. People can go back to their youth with childhood, bed-time stories and fables (Gottdiener, 2001). This means that each separate land serves as a hyperreal environment, it is neither a dream, nor a reality.
Thus, Walt Disney dreamed of opening his own theme park where he would not just offer attractions and rides, but display a fantasy too. He created four lands that each would portray a different theme, and these themes are conducted as such that different connotations can be applied. They then function as hyperreal places in order to become the universal model.

2.2 From Dreams to Reality: Hofstede’s Dimensions in the U.S.

In order to find out if Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures could be used as a prediction for the success of Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California, the dimensions of the United States have to be researched. Table 2.1 shows the six dimensions, the scores that correlate with these dimensions, and the rank the U.S. occupies. 76 countries are included in the Power-Distance-Index, the Individualism versus Collectivism index, the Masculinity versus Femininity index, and the Uncertainty-Avoidance index, 93 countries in the other two dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>IVR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>59-61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69-71</td>
<td>15-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The United States scores relatively low on the Power-Distance-Index. This means that, for instance, parents teach their children that it is important to be equal. There is not a strong hierarchy in family structures. If there is any form of hierarchy in the family, then, this will be spun around in the theme park. Moreover, parents encourage their children to actively experiment. This means that in the theme park, children are encouraged to ride the attractions and explore the scenery. Children, therefore, decide what to do, what to eat, and where to go (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

PDI and IDV are usually negatively correlated. That is the case for the U.S., as well. It scores extremely high on the IDV-index; it is ranked the highest. This means that the U.S. is less dependent on in-groups; the individual is as important as the group. Children teach their children from a young age to take care of and think about themselves. They are taught to discover what their unique quality is and how they can exploit this in life. Walt Disney
realized that he was a talented cartoonist and was full of dreams and imagination (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010; The Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). Walt Disney was thus an Individualist. He believed that the park’s visitors should be treated equally and he taught his employees to be customer-friendly at any time. It could be taught that Walt Disney showed some Collectivist characteristics. Walt Disney was a family man and he thought family was the most important thing in life. His family would thus be his in-group. However, it can be said that his cartoons and his work were also his family. And thus, becoming the in-group. It is an Individualist manner to have meetings at one’s home. The phrase “My home is my castle” literally applied to Walt Disney, since he would invite people into the park with Sleeping Beauty’s Castle in the backyard (Walt lived in the theme park for several years). This means that he invited people into his in-group, which is the Individualist way and the Collectivist way (Barrier, 2007; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

The U.S. is a relatively Masculine country with a score of 62. Only 18 of the 70 countries are more Masculine than the U.S. This means that in some sense, the U.S. values traditional gender roles where men are supposed to deal with facts and women with feelings, and the father is the sole provider, while the mother manages the household (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). It is difficult to apply this cultural dimension to Disneyland. It can be said, though, that Walt Disney is more Masculine than Feminine. Masculine cultures live in order to work. Disney worked all his life and he stressed that his work will never be finished if there is imagination in the world. Also, Masculine cultures prefer larger organizations. Disney aspired his company to be as big as possible to fill the world with his imagination and dreams.

The stress on imagination coincides with the UAI. The U.S. scores relatively low, 46, making the country weak on the index. This means that the U.S. is curious about the unknown. Those things that are different spark a sense of curiosity. As Walt Disney said: “When you’re curious you find lots of things to do” (as cited in The Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). This means that people in Uncertainty-Accepting cultures can have a strong sense of imagination, such as Walt Disney had (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). This also means that people accept Disney’s imagination more easily. Thus, there is an active consumption of this hyperreal environment. Cultures that are Uncertainty-Avoiding believe that time is expensive; “time is money” (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). Others think that you should make use of the time and enjoy that time to the fullest. For instance, Walt Disney usually did walkthroughs in his park. One of the trainers of the employees, Van Arsdale France, recalls:
A “trip time” of seven minutes had been established for the Jungle Cruise ride. … When there were hundreds of people lined up on a hot day, the operators tended to speed up the trip, and Walt was a passenger on one of these abbreviated trips. Dick [Nunis, the manager of Adventureland] was standing on the dock when Walt steamed up with his eyebrows raised. “Dick, what is the trip time for this attraction?” “Well, sir, it is seven minutes,” Dick responded. Mad as hell, Walt came back with, “Well, I just had a four-minute ride and went through the hippo pool so fast I couldn’t tell if they were rhinos or hippos. … If the trip is seven minutes, and you cut out three minutes, it’s like going to a movie and having some important reels left out. (as cited in Barrier, 2007)

This shows that Walt Disney appreciated the experience more than the number of people attending this ride in the fewest amount of time. Walt Disney was also a little Uncertainty-avoiding. He preferred structure in his park. He planned the lands in such a way, that they could not collide. The themes should be and stay separate. This is a typical trait that is found in Uncertainty-Avoiding cultures (Barrier, 2007; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). It is a typical feature of Uncertainty-Accepting cultures to accept new ideas, innovative products, and to be willing to try these new products; which fits perfectly into the realization imaginations and dreams of Disney.

The U.S. scores extremely low on the LTO-index; 26. This means that, as a Short-Term Orientation culture, traditions are respected and that old-age is seen as an unhappy time. Moreover, leisure time is important and there is a tendency to spend money. This is seen in Disneyland as it has strong ties with the past. Moreover, Walt Disney loved his childhood and has recreated his imagination into this theme park. The United States are also relatively Indulgent. The country scores 68 on the scale. Indulgent cultures are those who have a higher percentage of very happy people, and there is a positive attitude among them (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). Disneyland enhances this feeling; “My business is making people, especially children, happy” (as cited in The Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017). It is important to have enough leisure time. “Work hard, play hard” (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010) gets a literal meaning.
2.3 Conclusion

In all, Walt Disney’s vision of building a theme park turned out to be a great success. Walt Disney aspired to build a park that was a form of entertainment for the entire family. Parents and children should have fun together. There should not be a hierarchy, and if there was any in the family, the child should be on top, which coincides with a weak score in the PDI-index. In Anaheim, the children and parents felt a sense of recognition of the cartoons and themes that were portrayed in the separate lands, since they both grew up with them. The TV show that Walt Disney used for funding the park and promoting the park also complemented the feeling of recognition. He was able to create a hyperreal, hybridized environment, both in the park and on the television. He facilitated for families to experience fun and a place to spend their money and leisure time. Furthermore, he created a place of imagination and forged it into a hyperreal, simulation. This especially works in Uncertainty-Accepting and Short-Term Oriented cultures, such as the American culture. The visitors were particularly satisfied with the customer service in the park. They were expected to be treated as if they were always right, a typical Individualist way of thinking. These traits helped in the success of the park, which was surprising since amusement parks had had an awful reputation at that point. Walt Disney was able to turn the table and making the park “a showplace of beauty and magic.” This themed environment spread happiness throughout the people’s hearts (coinciding with a high score on the IVR-index). These lands, however, can be analyzed in several ways. This implies that the themes are signs that connote different meanings. This also implies that every human being can interpret the themes in their own way, molding them into their own dreams and desires. Disneyland Park in Anaheim, thus, proved to be highly successful and it therefore became a model for the globe.
3. Dreaming beyond Borders

The changes we’re making today stem from a natural evolution as we shift from running a construction project to actually welcoming our guests. … Euro Disney is forging its own identity, a unique blend of Disney tradition reflecting European expectations. One of our highest priorities will be to continue our effort to adapt to our European environment.

Philippe Bourguignon and Stephen Burke

Almost forty years after the opening of Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California, and almost twenty years after Walt Disney’s death, Disneyland Paris – formerly known as Euro Disney – opened its doors on April 12, 1992. Walt Disney had dreamed of opening his theme park in the continent that had served as the inspiration for his creations, that would honor in ancestral roots, and that would praise his memories of his time in France during World War I. “What better gift for the land that had nourished his imagination than a pleasure garden there of his own design? (Lainsbury, 2000). This dream was sparked by the success of the original theme park even more. At first, Disney’s officials were hesitant to pursue Walt’s dream, but after the immense success of Disneyland Tokyo – that opened its doors in 1983 – they were happily looking at the options to go to Europe. At this point, the Walt Disney Company had not endured many financial setbacks, but this would soon change (Lainsbury, 2000).

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first subchapter builds upon the development of Euro Disney and the critique it had to undergo, the alterations the Walt Disney Imagineers – the team that is the creative power behind the Disney theme parks – had to do in advance for Europe to accept the theme park, and the adjustments the Walt Disney Company had to undergo to become profitable. The second subchapter contains a case analysis of Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures in Western Europe.

3.1 Dream becomes a Disaster: Euro Disney/Disneyland Paris

After announcing that a Disney theme park was going to be built in Europe, many countries fought for the site. Especially Spain and France were among those who were up for the deal. Spain offered a site close to Barcelona, but eventually Disney chose a site next to Paris at approximately 20 miles from the city. The French government offered a cheap deal
for the site and it would connect the park with a set of newly laid transportation routes. The foundational agreement between the French government and the Walt Disney Company was signed in 1987, stating that a Disney theme park was going to be located in a new French town, Marne-La-Vallée (Matusitz, 2010). The Walt Disney Company chose this location because of the cheap deal and the central location in Western Europe, preferring these factors over a more advantageous climate in Barcelona. The French were eager to win this contest, because it would provide numerous jobs, it would create a better position in the Western market, and it would serve as part of a reconstruction during the ongoing recession (Lainsbury, 2000; Matusitz, 2010; Pells, 1997). While Michael Eisner, Disney CEO, mistakably assumed that Euro Disney could be a replica of the other Disney parks, the foundational agreement stressed the need of the French officials for the Walt Disney Company to alter the park in such a way that it would celebrate and incorporate European cultures. In other words, it would be cultural appropriated (Lainsbury, 2000; Pells, 1997).

This meant that the Disney Imagineers had the rare opportunity of altering the structure of the theme park that had been used as a universal model. The four separate “lands” remained existing, two lands, however, switched positions (Appendix B). The entrance of Frontierland was now at the far left of Main Street USA – which remained fairly the same – and Adventureland moved to the end of this road. The Imagineers discovered that Europeans recognized and connected with the Wild West. This means that Europeans and Americans have a different connotation on the sign ‘the frontier’. The Imagineers altered Frontierland in a way that it became more of a representation of the Wild West. Thus, a large part of the park would be themed as such (Frontierland became the biggest land of this park). Main Street USA and Frontierland therefore coexist, which is a major difference from the structured themes in Disneyland Park in Anaheim. In the end, Frontierland would incorporate the Wild West theme and Native American cultures, making this park a representation of both the Old and the New world (Lainsbury, 2000). Adventureland, on the other hand, was squeezed into the far left of the park. The Imagineers were uncertain what to do with this land. Eventually, they themed this park with Arabic and Creole features. This ‘exotic’ theme offered a quest-like journey (Lainsbury, 2000).

Fantasyland remained the heart of the park, and the castle is still at the end of Main Street USA. The Walt Disney Company was aware of the origin of most themes; namely European. The Imagineers, therefore, took the change to celebrate Europe’s own heritage. As Robert Fitzpatrick, president of Euro Disney, said: “Europe isn’t North America. It seemed appropriate and politically astute to understand that Pinocchio was an Italian boy, Peter Pan
used to fly out of London, and Cinderella was a French girl. We’ve tried to emphasize the European roots of these stories” (as cited in Lainsbury, 2000). The Imagineers had the difficult task of reinterpreting these stories and make them into respected themes. For instance, the inspiration of Sleeping Beauty’s Castle originated from numerous European castles. To Europeans, castles are not an exotic feature. “Why would Europeans chose in imitation of the Matterhorn or a German castle when they could go see the original just down the road?” (Pells, 1997). Thus, the Imagineers had the incredibly difficult task of designing the castle. Eventually, they applied several features from different European castles and molded this into one. In addition, this castle would have the original French name of Sleeping Beauty’s castle; Le Château de la Belle au Bois Dormant.

The last land, Tomorrowland, went through the biggest change of them all. First, the name changed from Tomorrowland to Discoveryland. Walt Disney once said: “The only problem with anything of tomorrow is that at the pace we’re going right now, tomorrow could catch up with us before we got it built” (as cited in Lainsbury, 2000). Imagineers had to come up with an idea that still incorporated Walt Disney’s point of view, but also solve this problem. In the end, they designed a themed environment that combined the ‘yesterday’ and the ‘tomorrow’. They were able to present the past and the future. The depictions of the past would represent the vision of the future at that time. Thus, the themes of Star Wars were complemented with themes that consisted of people from the past, such as Leonardo da Vinci and Jules Verne (Lainsbury, 2000).

These changes did not stop the criticism during the development of the park. Headlines such as “A terrifying giant step toward world homogenization”, “A horror made of cardboard, plastic and appalling colors”, “A cultural Chernobyl”, “the new beachhead of American imperialism”, and “cultural wasteland” dominated French newspapers (as cited in Matusitz, 2010; Pells, 1997). It was felt that the theme park would inflict the American culture upon the European culture; in other words, this was a sign of American cultural imperialism. This could have been a prediction for the horrible results of the opening year. In the first three years, the company suffered an immense loss of $1.5 billion and it would be in the red until 1995 (Pells, 1997). This was a shock for the Walt Disney Company as they were not used to this phenomenon. Eisner said: “We had a generation of executives who had never been around failure. We had this momentum that never seemed to end. We were climbing this ladder that seemed to have no top. Even I got kind of used to it and comfortable with it” (as cited in Lainsbury, 2000). This did not stop the Walt Disney Company. In Walt’s vision, you
need a good failure to strive again, the Walt Disney Company made more alterations to this park (the Walt Disney Family Museum, 2017).

First of all, the name changed from Euro Disney to Disneyland Paris. It was initially believed that the word Euro would be exciting (Lainsbury, 2000). However, Europeans had a different, negative connotation. Eventually, Disneyland Paris was introduced because this implied a precise location on the map of Europe and this negativity would disappear (Matusitz, 2010). Second, movement patterns were different among Europeans than Americans. As Europe went through a recession, admission fees had to be cut. As it turned out, the prices were even higher than the admission fees in Disneyland Park in Anaheim and Disney World in Orlando, Florida. Disneyland Paris cut admission prices in the off-season and later also throughout the year (Matusitz, 2010; Pells, 1997). Moreover, the company did not anticipate on Europeans’ vacation patterns. In general, Europeans wanted to take a few weeks off and go to a place to relax during the summer. During the winter, Europeans wanted to go to a warm place. Disneyland Paris was not seen as a relaxing place, and it could be freezing during the winter. While people would go for several days in a row to Disneyland Park in Anaheim and Disney World in Orlando, the visitors in Paris would usually go for one of two days (Matusitz, 2010; Pells, 1997). Moreover, Europeans like to come in at 9:30 a.m., get lunch around 12:30 p.m., and leave at 5:30 p.m. This meant that there were long lines in the morning at the entrance gate and long ques in the afternoon at food stands. This caused discouragement among visitors. They wanted to sit down and eat a meal with their families with the comfort of a glass of wine or beer. Only to find out that the park does not serve alcohol. This could even feel as an insult to some Europeans (Matusitz, 2010). Imagineers had installed several European food stands and restaurants. However, typical American food was just as popular. The difference was that while eating a hamburger, Europeans like to sit and eat is as a meal, while Americans could eat that burger at any time of the day at any place, even when walking (Lainsbury, 2000).

Third, even though the park was adjusted to European styles, it did not celebrate European festivities. Europeans did not care that much about Halloween, but more about Bastille Day or Oktoberfest. It was thus felt that Euro Disney was still too American (Matusitz, 2010). Lastly, employees had a difficult time adjusting to the desires of the Walt Disney Company on how to be customer-friendly, and what the first language should be. French employees thought it was difficult to use the ‘smile’ policy. They thought it was too difficult to smile as much as the Disney standard and they felt this was emotional labor, which they considered a bad working condition. The first language that employees had to speak was
English initially. Even when a meeting was among French employees, they were required to speak in English. This resulted in the fact that over 3000 employees left the company in the first few months. The Walt Disney Company had to change this policy. Employees were allowed to speak a different first language, as long as they could speak English fluently. Moreover, sign in the park were translated into several languages (Matusitz, 2010).

In all, these problems were solved to some extent. Next to the alteration in the parks and the themes of the lands, the Walt Disney Company had to change its policy towards admission fees, working shifts, queues, types of food and the lack of places to sit, the celebration of European traditions, and their policies towards personnel. But even though the park gained its first profit three years after the opening, this park has never been the most profitable of the Disney theme parks (Lainsbury, 2000). In what follows is an analysis of Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures that could show the cultural differences and explain why some of the features do not work in Disneyland Paris.

3.2 From Dreams to Disaster: Hofstede’s Dimensions in France

To find out if Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures could be used as a prediction for the initial failure of Disneyland Paris, the dimensions of Western European cultures have to be researched. 1996 is the first year that Euro Disney S.C.A. published the nationalities of the visitors in their annual report. Around 60 percent of the total visitors were foreign as Table 3.1 shows (Euro Disney S.C.A. Annual Report 1996, 1997). The company did not reveal a geographic breakdown from 2006, but they did after the 15-year anniversary in 2007 (Euro Disney S.C.A. Annual Report 2007, 2008). The company included a geographical breakdown of 2016, a year prior to the twenty-fifth anniversary and a year after the introduction of the “Experience Enhancement Program” – a program to attract visitors by enhancing all the themes and attractions (Euro Disney S.C.A. 2016 Reference Report, 2017). The table shows that there has been a reduction in numbers of visitors. Around 50 percent of the visitors is French and since most employees are French, I will apply the national cultures dimensions on France. This is shown in Table 3.2.
Table 3.1: Geographic Breakdown of Visitors in Disneyland Paris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Benelux</th>
<th>Spain/Italy</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11% (Spain)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6% (Belgium) / 5% (Netherlands)</td>
<td>9% (Spain) / 2% (Italy)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Dimensions of France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>IVR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>47-50</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

France scores relatively high on the PDI, 68. This means that French people tend to be accustomed to inequalities between people. They expect that there are more supervisory personnel and that there is a strict hierarchy in organizations. The staff anticipates to be told what to do. They are also used to centralized organizations. “The often strongly emotional character of hierarchical relationships in France is intriguing. There is an extreme diversity of feelings towards superiors: they may be either adored or despised with equal intensity. This situation is not universal” (as cited in Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). The staff in Disneyland Paris despised their supervisors because the CEO and the personnel had different ideas on the organization. French people see themselves as the best in their trade. They like to advise customers, for instance, on the best choice for dinner or the best wine. But in the park, the customer is always right. The French feel disrespected when the customers do not follow their advice (Matusitz, 2010; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

PDI and Individualism versus Collectivism are, as mentioned, negatively correlated. There is an exception to this rule. France and Belgium both score in the 60s on the PDI, and score in the 70s on the Individualism versus Collectivism index. This means that a rank in, for instance, an organization is quite normal, but it is more important to owe this rank to themselves instead of others. The group does not define the rank. This is called a stratified
form of individualism (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). Thus, everyone looks after themselves. This is shown in the 3000 employees who left the company in the first few months after the opening of Disneyland Paris. They did not see them belonging to this group as an acceptance of unconditional loyalty to the company. Their might have been loyal to their jobs, or ranks, but they felt that they were treated wrongly, and so they left. The French believe that they are “economic persons who will pursue the employer’s interest if it coincides with their self-interest” (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). The Walt Disney Company wanted their personnel to always smile at the customers and be customer-friendly at any cost. To the French, this could be explained as ‘emotional labor’. This is when an emotional regulation such as smiling is enforced as a part of the job description. The French employees thought this was one of the bad working conditions, and thus their views did not coincide with those of the Walt Disney Company (Matusitz, 2010).

France is a relatively Feminine country. It scores 43 on the MAS-index. France is the only country where the upper class is Feminine, while the working class is Masculine. In general, though, French people think quality of life is important and people work in order to live. France is also an Uncertainty-Avoiding culture with a score of 86. It is believed that what is different is dangerous, this is called xenophobia. There is a need for rules and regulations. Moreover, ‘time is money’ is a common phrase in Uncertainty-Avoiding cultures. This is shown in, for instance, meetings. The French do not like surprises and they like to have all the information beforehand (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). In this research, it is difficult to apply these dimensions on Disneyland Paris.

France scores relatively high, 63 on the LTO-index. They value honesty, adaptiveness, accountability, and self-discipline in the workplace. They also believe that the truth depends on situation, context, and time. Moreover, there is a tendency to save money instead of spending it (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). It was discovered that the French thought that the price of souvenirs was too high. “I refuse to pay 49 francs (roughly $9) for a little Mickey Mouse statue” (as cited in Lainsbury, 2000). Therefore, Disneyland had perceived more revenue on the souvenir stands, but that did not happen.

France scores relatively low on the Indulgent versus Restraint index, 48. Even though France is a Feminine culture, the combination with of being a Restraint and Uncertainty-Avoiding culture suggests that the French are less relaxed and do not enjoy life as much as could be expected (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). This could also coincide with the resistance of buying souvenirs. It can also be seen as a waste of time and money. Souvenirs are usually fun, but they might not perceive fun in that matter. People in Indulgent cultures
often exhibit a willingness to recognize their impulses, imagination, and desires. This is not the case in France. And that might be why they do not enjoy life as much as would be expected.

### 3.3 Conclusion

In all, Walt Disney’s dream of going beyond borders with his theme park was a success in Tokyo, but failed in Europe. Disneyland Park in Anaheim had served as a model for all the other Disney parks, and therefore, Michael Eisner mistakably assumed that the park could be an exact replica of the other ones. The French official intervened and demanded that the themes in the park should be altered so that European culture would be celebrated accordingly. Even with the Imagineers’ alterations, criticism dominated headlines. It was felt that their culture was invaded by the American culture and the multinationals. It can be said that Walt Disney’s assumption of bringing this ‘gift’ to Europe is a form of cultural imperialism. The Disney Imagineers tried their hardest to modify the themes. In the end, these themes were European originals. Moreover, themes and signs convey different connotations. Thus, in that sense, the arrival of Disneyland Paris should be seen as more a form of cultural appropriation. It was also seen that there were cultural differences between France and the Disney officials. Even though the French expect to be told what to do by their superiors, they only do this when they feel a sense of understanding. If the tasks or the ideas coincide with their own self-interest, the French will pursue them. This is shown in the scores in the PDI and the IDV-index. Moreover, France is an Uncertainty-Avoiding, Long-Term Oriented, and Restraint culture. This means that French people do not enjoy life as much as one would expect. This already suggests the differences between cultures. The French had a difficult time adjusting to the Disney official’s desires. This is shown in the resignation of 3000 employees in just a few months.
Conclusion

In all, this thesis has attempted to answer the question: to what extent serve Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures as a prediction for the success of Disneyland Park in Anaheim, California, and the initial failure of Disneyland Paris in Europe? This research has shown that globalization, Americanization, hyperreality, and themed environments are intertwined. It is almost impossible to study these notions separately. It is shown that globalization and Americanization are often perceived as two counterparts. This has led to the distinction between global cultural imperialism and cultural appropriation. Nowadays, there is a trend towards cultural appropriation. It is argued that cultures appropriate the American culture to their own needs and desires. This means that globalization becomes glocalization. However, if everything becomes glocalized, then there is no space left for the local. This would enhance the feeling of cultural imperialism. In the end though, the glocal serves as the local again. It is also seen that cultural appropriation is simpler since America takes products or ideas, molds them into an American product, and mesmerizes it for the masses. Thus, American products are not that ‘American’ after all; a sense of recognition is felt among the ‘other’ cultures since it originated from their native cultures. This is the case with Walt Disney’s Disneyland. Even though people rejected Euro Disney/Disneyland Paris, it conveyed themes that were known decades before. In the end, Disneyland is a hyperreal, familiar, themed environment that has been culturally appropriated, and therefore, it serves as the universal model.

It is also shown that Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of national cultures can easily be applied to the U.S. and France. It can serve as an explanation for certain accomplishments and certain failures in both Disneyland parks. When we consider both discourses, then we can clearly see the juxtaposition in France and the U.S. This is portrayed in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>IVR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Dimensions of the United States of America and France

We can immediately see that France and the U.S. differ in every dimension, expect for one; Individualism versus Collectivism. The Disney officials attempted to adapt the Disney park to the European culture, however, they did not, for instance, change its personnel policy or
carefully look at movement patterns. A significant number of problems could have been avoided if the Disney officials had examined the cultural differences more closely. Geert Hofstede’s model could have been a great help. Thus, the cultural dimension theory can attack the problems that cultural differences can carry in advance, or even solve these problems when they occur. This means that Disneyland Park in Anaheim was successful because it was adjusted to American ideals, standards and need, and according to the model, Walt Disney was a true American man. It also means that the French people differed too much from the American standard that it was almost inevitable that Disneyland Paris would fail.

This research touches upon the tip of the iceberg. There are several studies that can be conducted that will complement or amplify these results. For instance, there has been a reduction in the nationalities of the visitors in Disneyland Paris. The dimensions could be applied to that particular country and see what differences can be bridged. Moreover, it could be interesting to look at Japan and see if there is any correlation between Hofstede’s dimensions and the success of Disney Resort Tokyo. It is also interesting to study, in a quantitative research, if there is a special ‘Disney’ culture among the Disney parks that does not entail any national culture. In the end, this research was too large because it encompasses such vast theories. Therefore, in future research only one dimension of even one ‘land’ could be researched, or maybe even one feature. Lastly, Disney theme parks will always be a topic for research since, in the Walt Disney’s words, “it will continue to grow as long as there is imagination left in the world” (as cited in Barrier, 2007).
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