

# **Performance Improvement in International Environments: Designing Individual Performance Interventions to fit National Cultures \***

Carol M. Sánchez  
Department of Management  
Grand Valley State University  
401 West Fulton St. Suite 445C  
Grand Rapids, MI 49504  
[sanchezc@gvsu.edu](mailto:sanchezc@gvsu.edu)

As seen in *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, published by the Learning Systems Institute, Florida State University in cooperation with the International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI).

# **Performance Improvement in International Environments: Designing Individual Performance Interventions to fit National Cultures**

## **ABSTRACT**

This article examines how internationalization might affect the design of individual performance improvement approaches in organizations. It begins by examining knowledge that has been learned principally from the North American context of what improves an individual's performance. Then, we discuss motivators, attitudes, and behaviors of workers and how they may vary among workers in different national cultural contexts. In short, we examine individual performance improvement for its cross-border effectiveness, using various models of national cultural differences. By doing this, we hope to provide an understanding of how performance improvement systems might require modification to fit with non-North American work environments.

## **Performance Improvement in International Environments: Designing Individual Performance Interventions to fit National Cultures**

The field of performance improvement, also known as the field of performance technology (Stolovitch & Keeps, 1999), concerns itself with the models, methods, and measures for solving problems and realizing opportunities to improve the performance of organizations and their members. Performance technology may be applied to the performance of individuals, small groups, or entire organizations. It typically involves using systematic approaches that were developed from applied experimentation and research conducted mostly in the United States and that have been evaluated using measurable standards (Stolovitch & Keeps, 1999). Approaches include the assessment, analysis, design, development, delivery, and evaluation of performance interventions. Interventions include aligning work environment with the strategy, structure, and systems of the organization; improving the systems and processes that deal with expectations and feedback; resource allocation; electronic performance support systems that supply information directly to the workstation; pay and non-pay incentives; instructional training that has immediate application on the job; and thoughtful personnel selection (Dean & Ripley, 1997, 1998b).

### **The Internationalization of Organizations**

As a domestic organization conducts more of its business across national borders, the internationalization process will cause it to make explicit and implicit changes in its strategy, structure, design, and performance (Hoecklin, 1995). Many of these changes involve modifying the tasks of the organization as it conducts international operations, such as changes in operations to lower costs and increase efficiency, adding locations to expand markets, and adopting technology to improve cross-border information flows (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996). Other changes require modifications in organizational processes and systems, such as motivating, leading, evaluating, and controlling and may involve a reflection on the organization's core values and culture (Schneider & Barsoux, 1997). As a company strives to implement a global strategy, its tasks and processes must be modified to fit that global strategy.

Adjusting human performance policies and practices to international situations is among the most challenging tasks facing organizations (Laurent, 1986). As organizations attempt to apply performance improvement systems in their international operations, they would be wise to examine the assumptions of the systems before they do so. We suggest that the delivery of performance improvement systems and methods might require changes if companies expect them to work across national borders, because national cultural differences may affect the effectiveness of performance improvement interventions. More importantly, we propose that if managers examine these assumptions through the lens of national culture, and if they modify the interventions accordingly, performance improvement approaches will be as successful in international environments as they are in the North American context.

### **The Human Performance System**

The human performance system approach is based on the premise that human performance can be understood as a system comprised of critical factors in the individual's immediate work environment that influence the individual's behavior and the subsequent accomplishment, or lack thereof (Dean, 1999). Performance, therefore, is the behavior plus the accomplishment. Table 1 outlines the six subsystems or factors that comprise the human performance system.

**Table 1**  
**The Six Subsystems of the Human Performance System**

	<b>Factor</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	Performance Specifications	Expectations of the outputs and standards that comprise job goals and feedback about the outcome
2	Task Support	Inputs and logical procedures that help the performer do her job
3	Incentives	How a performer is told to either continue or change performance
4	Skills & Knowledge	The basics, required for the job
5	Individual Capacity	The performer's own intellectual, physical, mental, and emotional capabilities
6	Motives	Intrinsic motivation of the performer

Source: Dean, 1999.

These six subsystems are subject to intervention such that individual performance might be modified and improved. According to the human performance model, the intervention to the subsystems is completed in a systematic way and is grounded in scientifically derived theories and consistent practical empirical evidence (Dean, 1999).

### **Approaches to Performance Improvement**

Performance improvement approaches (Dean & Ripley, 1997, 1998c) combine various applied models that were developed during the past three decades and that have been used to assess and analyze human performance. These approaches, developed principally in the North American context, are designed to positively modify the performer's outcomes and accomplishments in the workplace. The main approaches to performance improvement are human resource development (HRD), human performance technology (HPT), and organizational development (OD). Table 2 highlights the areas of intervention of each approach.

**Table 2**  
**Approaches to Performance Improvement**

<b>Approach</b>	<b>Area of Intervention</b>	<b>Description</b>
Human Resource Development (HRD)	Formal instructional design & training	Using the training function of the organization to enhance strategy, structure, systems
Human Performance Technology (HPT)	Workplace performance technologies	On-the-job training and job-aids that reduce the costs of the training dollar
Human Performance Technology (HPT)	Systems and process redesign	Designing an entire electronic system that brings the information, feedback and proper resources to the workplace of the individual in order to align the organization, process and job performer levels of the organization
Organizational Design (OD)	Organizational culture	Managing the white-space of the organization chart especially in times of rapid change

Source: Dean & Ripley, 1998c.

Human resource development (HRD) utilizes training to build individual skills and knowledge in order to improve individual behavior. HRD, as espoused by the Academy of Human Resource Development, attempts to identify individual interests, values, competencies, and needs to develop capable people for future jobs and thus enhance the capacity of the organization.

Human performance technology (HPT) uses systematic approaches to analyze individual and organization performance needs and improve processes. A rigorous up-front analysis is conducted in hopes of genuinely understanding the performance problem. Following the up-front analysis, a manager can design and develop a performance intervention, and revise it as needed after implementation (Dean & Ripley, 1997).

Organizational design (OD) is a planned process of team-wide change, managed from the top to increase organizational effectiveness and organizational health through planned interventions. The OD process is designed to change the organization's culture from one which avoids an examination of social processes in communication, decision-making, and planning, to one which institutionalizes and legitimizes this examination (Dean, 1999).

The success of these approaches has been uneven, however, in sustainably improving the performance of individuals in the workplace. For example, there is the case of the manager of leadership development at a large company during the 1980s. After training 350 of 550 managers, the manager discovered that training alone did nothing to change long-standing managerial systems. He also witnessed the dramatic savings in time and cost to the company by simply offering job-aids as opposed to training, but still the fundamental systems of management did not improve (P. Dean, personal communication, February, 1999).

In contrast to those interventions, performance improvement approaches that aligned structure, systems, processes, and job performance led to cost savings, as non-value added steps of processes were eliminated. This change was positive but usually ended up being merely incremental and not as beneficial as whole-systems change. Indeed, whole systems of employees changing whole systems with large-scale systems change techniques, such as future search (Weisbord, 1992), resulted in more radical change. These examples highlight the importance of system-wide approaches to performance improvement as compared to approaches that focus exclusively on changing the behavior of individual performers.

### **Managing People: Psychological versus Sociological Approaches**

An important premise of HRD approaches to performance improvement is the psychological rather than the broader sociological foundation upon which HRD interventions are based. Human resource management in the United States is rooted in psychology and focuses on the improvement of individual worker motivation and needs (Hofstede, Bond, & Luk, 1993). Accordingly, HRD approaches focus on the analysis of individual employee needs, reward systems, and job enrichment as means of improving individual worker performance (Fisher, 1989). In Europe, however, the management of people in organizations has evolved from a sociological perspective that focuses on the social system, the economic and political context, and the nature of the relationships among government, unions, and management. A primary concern in many European countries is who has the power to decide which issues, such that industrial democracy falls into the domain of workers and industrial policy corresponds to government (Schneider & Barsoux, 1997). This is seen in laws that determine how worker organizations are represented on German company boards, the authority of quality of work-life councils in Sweden, and the power of strict labor codes in France, Spain, and Latin American countries. The nature of the employment relationship between employee and employer differs, both legally and psychologically, in different countries. While law dictates what is

regulated and to what degree, the social paradigm establishes mutual expectations between workers and companies.

It should be noted that some human performance technologies encourage are moving towards working with whole systems of employees who will change their own work environments and systems. Typically, however, most HRD managers practice from a psychological premise and focus on the development of the individual.

## **Models of National Cultural Differences**

National cultural differences may be manifested in several interdependent factors in each national environment. Political, economic, legal, technological, and cultural factors influence the success of managing people and processes in organizations in other countries. If managers understand these factors, the nature of the culture, and how they affect work and work processes, they will be able to figure out how to best manage people and organizational processes in the international location. Hofstede (1980, 1997) examined the values that underlie organizational behavior and found four bipolar dimensions that explained nearly half of the variance in the work attitudes of 116,000 IBM employees in some 70 countries. *Power distance* reflects the degree to which a person accepts that there is inequality among people. *Individualism* is the degree to which people identify themselves as individuals rather than as members of a group. *Masculinity* describes the degree to which achievement values such as performance, success, competition, and assertiveness prevail over affiliation values such as quality of life, relationships with peers, care of the cohort, and solidarity. *Uncertainty avoidance* is the degree to which people prefer predictable and structured situations to unpredictable and unstructured ones. Other studies have identified similar dimensions of national cultural differences, such as achievement (doing) vs. affiliation (being), high versus low context communication, task versus relationship orientation, equity versus equality, and a tendency toward polychronic vs. monochronic time (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Hall & Hall, 1990; Trompenaars, 1993).

## **Unpacking Approaches to Performance Improvement within Different Cultures**

The research about national cultural differences suggests that the drivers or motivators of individual performance are likely to vary in different national contexts. Yet, all approaches to performance improvement -- HRD, HPT, and OD -- reflect cultural assumptions that may or may not be effective in other national cultures.

The first assumption of an HRD or HPT intervention is that performance goals can be set and manipulated. This suggests that the individual has some generalized control over the environment, whether that is control over time or control over larger organizational objectives. But in some cultures, power differences and hierarchy may be of greater concern, such that employees feel neither the right nor the duty to determine their own performance goals. Hindus, Buddhists, and some Muslims believe that destiny, or fate, determines what happens to a person. Even in some Latin American cultures the idea of "God willing" may prevail, such that setting performance goals seems futile.

A second assumption of both HRD and HPT is that what the performer does is more important than who the performer is. This is apparent in performance appraisal sessions where feedback focuses on results and not on an employee's personality. In Asian and some Latin cultures, people expect to be judged on their integrity, loyalty, and cooperative spirit, and not on their ability to perform or to achieve a goal. In some French organizations, both positive and negative feedback may be considered offensive, and the appraisal process may appear to question a person's honor and being rather than his or her actions.

A third assumption which applies to HRD and HPT is the value of an individual's expertise or expert power, over his or her cadre association, social standing, or referent power. HRD and HPT approaches

suggest that selection, rewards, and career development depend on the individual's achievement and technical ability. It is common for Latin American organizations to reward upper level managers by sending them to training sessions. In this case, training is used as an affirmation of status rather than an intervention to increase the skill level of a performer. In France, becoming a manager is largely determined by having attended an elite school -- a *grande école* -- and therefore being part of the cadre to begin with. In contrast, German organizations are more in line with the North American HRD/HPT approaches because they value technical competence and expert power as most necessary for advancement.

A fourth assumption which applies only to HRD is that individual performance is the prime determinant of organizational success, rather than the performance of the collective work group. Even in Western organizations where work teams and quality circles are used widely, team members are generally rewarded individually in addition to any group-earned bonus. In many Danish and most Japanese organizations, incentive pay that favors certain individuals over the group is considered unacceptable, reflecting a preference for equal pay for all, over equity pay to the highest contributors.

The training component of HRD highlights a fifth assumption, which is a student- or learner-centered mode of instruction, as opposed to a company-focused instruction. HRD-based instruction is largely determined by the performer in function of his or her individual job goals. In cultures where people are not used to taking as much responsibility for their own development or where training is provided as a confirmation of managerial potential rather than a means to develop it, people may resist the trainee-centered approach. A top-down system may be more common in French organizations, for example, where the line manager of the company tends to nominate a person for a course. A French employee of a U.S. company in Europe seemed confused that he was being asked to choose which training initiative to attend, rather than his supervisor telling him which course and therefore what kind of training he needed. The author once trained a group of Thai technicians. One of the first tasks the technicians were given was to develop their own learning goals. A half day later, the trainees returned empty-handed, much to the author's puzzlement. It was later explained to her that the Thais were not used to conducting such a self-initiated task nor to receiving such a lack of direction from the trainer who they perceived as their superior.

### **Drivers of Organizational Performance Across Cultures**

If we join what we have learned about the assumptions of performance improvement approaches with knowledge about national cultural differences, we may conclude that drivers of organizational performance will vary in different cultural contexts. In the next section, we suggest what performance improvement specialists might do specifically to adjust the delivery of performance improvement interventions to respond to these cultural differences.

Preliminary results of a recent study conducted in Austria, China, France, Germany, Hong Kong, and the Netherlands identified at least three principal drivers of performance that vary according to cultural contexts (Hofstede, 1998). The first driver of performance, noted in France and Austria, is the skill or expert level of the manager. Expert power stems from employees' recognition that the manager possesses special technical and administrative knowledge about the business (French & Raven, 1960). Performance improvement interventions in these countries might be more effective if they integrated some reference to expert or managerial influence. This could motivate employees to go along with the manager's recommendations, resulting in changes and improvement in individual performance. The recognition of the value of expert power is characteristic of Hofstede's (1980) uncertainty avoidance dimension of national culture, and both France and Austria score relatively high on it. This leads to the following proposition:

*Proposition 1. Performance improvement interventions that include reference to expert power or managerial influence will be more effective in national cultures that demonstrate high uncertainty avoidance.*

The second driver of performance, identified in Hong Kong and China, combines the importance of family and clan relationships, national bonds, and respect for ethical norms with entrepreneurial creativity. This might suggest that a collectivist approach to performance improvement might be effective in these countries, such that loyalty and identity is based on the clan system and strong social relationships. This discovery is consistent with Hofstede's (1980) earlier findings that Hong Kong and other Southeast Asian countries scored high on the collectivist dimensions of national cultural differences. Of course, one intervention of HPT, called whole-systems change, involves a collectivist or "whole organizational" approach to performance improvement, rather than an individualist approach. Thus, performance improvement specialists working in Southeast Asia would likely experience considerable success with this type of intervention. This suggests the following proposition:

*Proposition 2. Performance improvement interventions that incorporate a "whole organizational" or systems approach will be more effective in national cultures that demonstrate high collectivism.*

The third driver of performance, identified in Germany and the Netherlands, is the vision and the goals of the organization's founder. The finding is similar to the expertise phenomenon identified in Austria and France, yet it suggests the strength of a different type of expert power. In this case, expert power is attributed to the founder due to his [or her?] historically superior knowledge of the business. In these countries, a clear communication of the vision of the founder may be required to encourage many employees to improve their performance. Performance improvement (PI) specialists would want to integrate that vision into the delivery of PI interventions, such that the founder's goals become the expectations or principles of the organization. Assuming the founder has considerable influence within the organization, the goals will serve as criteria for performance, and clear and regular reference to the goals would motivate people to improve their performance. In cultures where the skill of the manager is the driver of performance, people can be motivated to improve performance based on the demonstrated expert power of the manager and/or his or her ability to control organizational resources (Pfeffer, 1992). Interestingly, although expert power is generally associated with high uncertainty avoidance, Germany and the Netherlands scored moderate on this dimension (Hofstede, 1980). A respect for expert power is also associated with relatively low levels of power distance, to the extent that people believe that the use of power should be legitimate -- instead of accepting that power is a basic fact of society. Consistent with this view, both Germany and the Netherlands score low on the power distance scale (Hofstede, 1980). This leads to the following proposition:

*Proposition 3. Performance improvement interventions that incorporate reference to a strong and legitimate vision of the founder/owner will be more effective in national cultures that demonstrate high uncertainty avoidance and low power distance.*

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

In this article, we examined traditional HRD, HPT, and OD approaches to performance improvement and suggested that they might be more successful in international locations if they are designed with national cultural considerations in mind. We unpacked the three principal performance improvement approaches to identify five basic assumptions and propose that these assumptions might not be valid in many international environments. We argued that performance improvement interventions that may have been overwhelmingly successful in North American organizations could fail in international locations, due to divergence in national cultural attitudes regarding authority, task, relationships, environmental control, and social relationships, among other things. Our intent was to expand upon current thinking in the performance improvement field by bringing to it a model of national cultural influences and to discuss how performance improvement approaches might be modified to divergent international environments.

There is considerable debate, however, regarding the degree to which organizational processes become homogeneous, or more convergent, as an organization becomes more international. The argument

for convergence is based on the idea that the demands of industrialization, competition, and worldwide integration factor out any national or cultural differences in organizational processes, technology, and structure (Child, 1981). Many have observed that global organizations and their leaders are powerful agents for convergence as they bring cultural beliefs from the parent country to the host or partner country into organizational management practices. For example, the influence of Western management practices on the Arabian Gulf region, brought largely by expatriate managers, is strong. Observers now note that even local, national managers tend to use a type of participative management, which is not a common technique in this region (Al-Jafary & Hollingsworth, 1983). Many companies in Asia, including very traditional Korean firms, are hungry for advice from Western consultants that will help them restructure operations, divest poorly performing units, and even “rightsized” their workforces (Clifford, 1999). These same consultants are helping Western firms do business in Asia, too.

The convergence argument, however, competes strongly with the argument for divergence. Those who believe in divergence argue that the effects of national and regional culture on organizations will remain very evident, particularly at the level of individual and personal behavior, and may also depend on external factors such as the country's stage of development, its location, and its propensity to change (Webber, 1969). In different cultural situations, different assumptions about the roles of organizational systems may apply. Further, there has been growth of intra-country fragmentation, leading to increased segmentation of national markets and differentiation of management practices within countries (Segal-Horn, 1996). For example, China is widely diverse geographically, racially, ethnically, and socially. People in the major Han group of China have said that people living just six miles away were foreigners (De Mente, 1994: 173), so one should expect to find significant differences among Chinese people.

Even the concept of human resource management, which assumes that people can be deployed and maximized like capital or raw material, is a uniquely American concept that is not necessarily shared by organizations worldwide (Brewster & Bournois, 1991). In the discussion of convergence versus divergence, a convincing argument can be made that while convergence of management styles may occur at the macro and strategic levels of many organizations, the divergent effects of national culture are most strongly felt at the level of human resource management and individual performance improvement.

This presents a particular challenge to researchers and practitioners in the performance improvement field. Decades of work in performance improvement have shown that sustainable, positive results in large North American organizations have occurred as a result of systemic interventions (Dean, 1999). Esque and Patterson (1998) identify a number of case studies that document performance improvement in the specific areas of productivity, quality, customer satisfaction, competitiveness, and cost efficiency.

It may be that systemic performance improvement approaches are fundamentally sound, but the delivery methods will need to be adjusted to be understood and embraced by people in organizations in other countries and regions. Adjusting the delivery of performance improvement interventions to local cultures and attitudes would be particularly important for companies using the multidomestic corporate-level strategy as discussed by Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989) or the “insider” strategy as discussed by Ohmae (1990). For multidomestic or “insider” organizations, knowledge tends to be developed and retained within each individual unit as part of the strategic intent to be locally responsive. The parent organizations of multidomestic firms often have minimal involvement in the management procedures and processes of subsidiary organizations. This means that if the parent wants to transfer important performance improvement competencies to subsidiaries, it must make a special effort to insure that competencies are adapted to local situations.

For some organizations, it may not be as imperative to adjust performance improvement delivery to local cultures and attitudes. Take, for example, organizations that use an international or global corporate-level strategy, as discussed by Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989), or organizations dedicated strictly to export

activity, as discussed by Ohmae (1990). Firms that use the international strategy or export create value by transferring skills and products to foreign markets where domestic firms lack them. The parent company that uses the international strategy exports its knowledge, as well as its products, to overseas units. There are few, if any, employees in overseas locations, aside from distributors who are not normally considered part of the exporting organization. Firms using the global strategy work hard to integrate operations across all overseas units and keep costs under strict control. Knowledge is developed and retained at headquarters, and overseas operations are expected to implement it without much adaptation (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). It could be argued that the global integration strategy assumes that knowledge transfer and learning by subsidiaries will converge with and adapt to that of headquarters -- not the other way around. Figure 1 illustrates the four strategies and the dimensions by which they vary.

**FIGURE 1.  
GLOBAL ORGANIZATIONAL TYPES \***

<b>PRESSURES TO GLOBALLY INTEGRATE OPERATIONS</b>	High	<b>GLOBAL</b>  •Assets are centralized and globally scaled •Strategy is to build cost advantages through centralized, global-scale operations	<b>TRANSNATIONAL</b>  •Assets are dispersed, interdependent and specialized •Strategy is to develop global efficiency, flexibility, and worldwide learning capability
	Low	<b>INTERNATIONAL</b>  •Some core competencies are centralized, others decentralized •Strategy is to exploit parent-company knowledge through worldwide diffusion and adaptation	<b>MULTIDOMESTIC</b>  •Assets are decentralized and self-sufficient •Strategy is to build flexibility to respond to national differences through strong national operations
		Low	High
		<b>PRESSURES TO BE LOCALLY - RESPONSIVE</b>	

\* Adapted from Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989

We predict that the adaptation of performance improvement delivery methods to local cultural differences will be easiest and most appropriate for firms that follow a transnational (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989) or fully globalized (Ohmae, 1990) strategy. In these organizations, knowledge and know-how is routinely developed jointly and shared among subsidiaries worldwide. The transnational organization seeks out the different contributions made by national units and integrates them after some adaptation to local conditions into worldwide operations (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). The transnational organization is pressured to integrate operations worldwide to keep costs low and at the same time must be highly responsive to local market and subsidiary culture. Transnational organizations continuously encounter friction as they try to reconcile these apparently contradictory forces, but somehow they are committed to achieving a balance. This suggests that best practices in performance improvement that have been discovered in North America, or anywhere, more likely would be welcomed by organization members of foreign subsidiaries of transnational firms, because of their greater experience and tolerance for both change and adaptation.

## References

- Al-Jafary, A., & Hollingsworth, A. (1983, Fall). An exploratory study of managerial practices in the Arabian Gulf region. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 143-152.
- Bartlett, C., & Ghoshal, S. (1989). *Managing across borders: The transnational solution*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Black, J., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(1), 113-136.
- Brewster, C., & Bournois, F. (1991). Human resource management: A European perspective. *Personnel Review*, 20(6), 4-13.
- Child, J. (1981). Culture, contingency and capitalism in the cross-national study of organizations. In L. Cummings & B. Shaw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, pp. 303-356. Greenwich, CT: JAI Publishers.
- Clifford, M. (1999). Fetch me a westerner. *Business Week*, 180, E4.
- Dean, P.J. (1999). *Performance engineering at work*. Washington, DC: International Society for Performance Improvement.
- Dean, P., & Ripley, D. (1997). *Performance improvement pathfinders: Models for organizational learning systems*. Vol. 1. Washington, DC: International Society for Performance Improvement.
- Dean, P., & Ripley, D. (1998a). *Performance improvement interventions: Instructional design and training*. Vol. 2. Washington, DC: International Society for Performance Improvement.
- Dean, P., & Ripley, D. (1998b). *Performance improvement interventions: Performance technologies in the workplace*. Vol. 3. Washington, DC: International Society for Performance Improvement.
- Dean, P., & Ripley, D. (1998c). *Performance improvement interventions: Culture and systems change*. Vol. 4. Washington, DC: International Society for Performance Improvement.
- De Mente, B. (1994). *Chinese etiquette & ethics in business*. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Business Books.
- Esque, T., & Patterson, P. (1998). *Getting results: Case studies in performance improvement*. Washington, DC: HRD Press, Inc. and the International Society for Performance Improvement.
- Fisher, C. (1989). Current and recurrent challenges in HRM. *Journal of Management*, 15, 157-180.
- French, J., Jr., & Raven, B. (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory*, pp. 607-623. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hall, E., & Hall, M. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hoecklin, L. (1995). *Managing cultural differences: Strategies for competitive advantage*. Wokingham, UK: Addison-Wesley.
- Hofstede, G. (1980, Summer). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 14-42.

- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1998, October 9). Presentation at the closing plenary sponsored by AIB Fellows in honor of Geert Hofstede. 1998 Annual Meeting of the Academy of International Business, Vienna, Austria.
- Hofstede, G., Bond, M., & Luk, C. (1993). Individual perceptions of organizational cultures: A methodology. *Organization Studies*, 14(4), 483.
- Laurent, A. (1986). The cross-cultural puzzle of international human resource management. *Human Resource Management*, 25(1), 91-102.
- Ohmae, K. (1990). The borderless world. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 32-42.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Schneider, S., & Barsoux, J-L. (1997). *Managing across cultures*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Segal-Horn, S. (1996). The limits of global strategy. *Strategy and Leadership*, 24(6), 12-17.
- Stolovitch, H., & Keeps, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of human performance technology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer.
- Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: The Economist Books.
- Webber, R. (1969). Convergence or divergence? *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 4(3), 75-83.
- Weisbord, M. (1992). *Discovering common grounds*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Worley, C., Hitchin, D., & Ross, W. (1996). *Integrated strategic change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

## **Biography**

Carol Sánchez is Associate Professor of Management and Director of International Business Programs at Grand Valley State University's Seidman School of Business. She earned her D.B.A. in strategic management from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. From 1977-1990, Carol worked as a manager for a U.S. development organization in five Latin American countries. She consults with organizations on issues of strategy and structure and she teaches management in the U.S. and abroad. Her research interests include international management, international business education, the effects of social variables on managerial actions, and top management teams. She has published in many major management journals.