CIHRS Research Paper Series

Also see additional works at: http://ler.la.psu.edu/cihrs/series/research-paper-series.

Series #: 2-2015

The Effects of National Culture and Organizational Culture on Training and Development

Danni Qin

The Pennsylvania State University

The Effects of National Culture and Organizational Culture on Training and Development

Danni Qin
The Pennsylvania State University
2015

Abstract

Although both national culture and organizational culture have been studied to influence human resources practices in multinational corporations, only a few researchers appear to have examined the combined effects of these two cultural factors on companies' HR practices, especially on training and development. Therefore, this current study will fill the gap by investigating the combining effect of both national culture and organizational culture on training and development in the company. Furthermore, the relationship between employees' cultural orientation and training effectiveness will also be addressed. The next sections of this study will explore how these three different factors can influence MNC's selection and design of training programs.

Keywords: *multinational corporations, national culture, organizational culture, training*

Introduction

Since the early 1990s, there has been a surge in research regarding international human resource management (IHRM), due to the increased influence of multinational corporations (MNC). The increase on IHRM studies reflects the growing recognition of human resource management as a major determinant of success in international business (Shen, 2005). Among all the areas within HRM, researchers have examined the strategic importance of training and development, which is a fundamental component of international human resource management (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Research shows that investment in training can contribute to higher employee productivity, which in turn enhances financial and market performance (Peretz & Rosenblatt, 2011). Therefore, training and development have been seen as one of the most crucial activities for MNCs to win in the global competition.

Training is a strategic effort by an organization to improve employees' performance on the jobs through learning, usually by changing employees' attitude or increasing their skills and knowledge (Nadler, 1984). A typical training intervention usually takes 5 steps: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (ADDIE) (Allen, 2006). First, an organization runs a training analysis to determine whether training is the best solution to address the current issues within the organization (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). Second, the organization designs the training program according to the information obtained from the analysis phase. Third, a variety of training techniques can be used to facilitate the development and implement stages of training (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). Finally, in order to assess the total value of training, training evaluation is conducted (Lewis & Thornhill, 1994).

The ultimate objective of training intervention is its benefit to the performance of organization, which is assessed by training evaluation (Lewis & Thornhill, 1994). Researchers have investigated different approaches to address training effectiveness (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Mathieu & Martineau, 1997). Kirkpatrick (1987)'s typology is the prevalent framework for measuring training effectiveness. His model includes four levels of training effectiveness: reactions, learning, change in behaviors, and organizational results (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). In Kirkpatrick's four level model, the fourth level is to evaluate the transfer of training outcomes to the workplace, which is viewed as one of the key criteria for evaluating training effectiveness (Simosi, 2012). Transfer of training is defined as the extent to which trainees can apply the KSA (knowledge, skills and attitudes) gained in a training context back to the job (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992), and it has become a critical issue for researchers and practitioners (Chiaburu & Tekleab, 2005). Researchers have investigated the factors that facilitate or impede the transfer of training. Simosi (2012) indicated that organizational culture is strongly related with training transfer. Chiaburu & Tekleab (2005) presented that both individual and contextual factors can influence training transfer.

Considering all the various factors that influence training effectiveness, MNCs have to address different concerns when designing their training and development interventions in order to achieve higher training outcomes. Three main factors are considered in this current study to address how MNCs select and design their training programs. On the organizational level, this research argues that both national culture and organizational culture have an effect on how MNCs select and design their training programs. On the individual level, the study argues that employees' experience of training effectiveness will be influenced by the way they perceive national culture as well as organizational culture.

First of all, in order to achieve high business performance, MNCs need to adapt their HR practices to the national culture in which they operate (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Therefore, training and development practices may vary across countries. Second, a lot of research has shown the importance of meeting organizational interests in designing training programs (Callahan et al., 2006). For example, it is one of the best practices for organizations to align training practice with organizational

strategy (Bjornberg, 2002). Since organizational strategy is influenced by its organizational culture (Johnson, 1992), the effectiveness of training programs should also be influenced by the culture built in the organization (Palthe & Kossek, 2003). Kissack & Callahan (2010) argued that organizational culture shapes, influences, and redefines each steps of training programs. Therefore, organizational culture provides another explanation to address the difference among training design in MNCs. Moreover, a successful training intervention should enable employees' acquisition and mastery of knowledge, skills, and behaviors delivered through training programs. Therefore, individual differences (i.e. employees' different cultural orientation) should be considered when designing training program. For example, for the collectivist, training focused on individual-level clues and information was less effective in enhancing his or her performance than was training based on group-level information (Earley, 1994).

Although both national culture and organizational culture have been studied to influence human resources practices in MNC, only a few researchers appear to have examined the combined effects of these two cultural factors on companies' HR practices, especially on training and development. Therefore, this current study will fill the gap by investigating the combining effect of both national culture and organizational culture on training and development in the company. Furthermore, the relationship between employees' cultural orientation and training effectiveness will also be addressed. The next sections of this study will explore how these three different factors can influence MNC's selection and design of training programs.

The concept of "fit"

This current study is based on the assumption that the effectiveness of training and development program is based on context. We emphasize the importance of internal and external context for shaping HR practices in an organization. This approach is called "best-fit" approach, which is rooted in the strategic contingency theories of the 1970s and 1980s (i.e. Miles & Snow, 1978, Porter, 1985). "Fit" refers to the motion of alignment, which is one of the most important conceptions in Human Resource Management. "Best fit" approach argues that HR practices that are put into use should be aligned with the context where the company is operating in. This approach is often contrasted with the "best practice" approach, which states that there are certain HR practices that will work effectively in any context. There are different kinds of fit between HR practices and context. In this study, we focus on the following three forms of fit: environment fit, organizational fit and macro-micro fit.

Environment fit

Environment fit can be described as the alignment between HR practices and the external environment (Wood, 1999). This concept is similar to the concept of "institutional fit", which requires HR practices to be legitimate in the environment where the organization is operating in. For example, organizations should consider the legislation, regulations and national culture in a specific country when developing HR practices, to ensure the legitimacy of HR system. Researchers (Boon, Paauwe, Boselie, & Den Hartog, 2009) state that environment fit in HRM is positively related to organizational performance. In this current study, the influence of national culture on training and development design well reflects the concept of "environment fit". We are going to illustrate how the training and development program is affected by the national culture that the company is operating in, and how to environment fit can contribute to higher firm performance.

Organizational fit

The second form of fit that will be covered in this study is organizational fit, which focuses on the link between HRM system and other aspects of the organization, such as technology system, production system and control system (Wood, 1999). This requires that organization should align its HR practices

4

with organizational structures, systems and processes (Wright, Dunford, & Snell, 2001). From a HR system-design perspective, organizational fit highlights the alignment between the HRM practices in place and the broader organizational context, such as organizational culture, technology systems and production techniques. In this study, we are going to apply the concept of organizational fit to discuss the influence of organizational culture on MNC's training and development design. We emphasize the fit between the organizational context (culture) and training and development design.

Macro-micro fit

The last kind of fit we are going to discuss in this study is macro-micro fit, which is the alignment between organizational level analysis and individual level analysis (Wood, 1999). Both environment fit and organizational fit are macro-level analysis, since they put HR practices in an organizational setting, rather than looking at HR practices from an individual perspective. Since 2000, attention has shifted towards trying to understand how individual employees perceive and experience HR practices, which lead to the micro-level analysis. Researchers (Wright & Nishii, 2013) argue that the full impact of HR practices cannot be realized without the understanding of individual "perceived" HR practices. This suggest that in order to ensure the effective implement of training program, MNCs should not only run organizational level analysis, but also understand the individual difference in understanding training program. Therefore, in order to achieve this macro-micro fit, this current study is going to discuss the impact of individual's different perception of training program on MNC's training design.

National culture

Introduction of national culture

National culture can be defined as the collective mental programming of the people in a certain country (Hofstede, 1980). The dimensions of national culture have been studied by different researchers. Hofstede (1980)'s study is one of the most popular and influential approaches. Hofstede (1980) has identified five dimensions in national culture: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and long-term orientation. We are going to discuss them in turn.

Power distance. According to Hofstede (1980), power distance is the extent that people believe the power and status are distributed unequally in the organization. Countries with high power distance (i.e. East Asia) tend to have formal hierarchy, centralized structure and less employee participation in the decision making process (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Contrarily, countries with low power distance will put more value on employee involvement. For example, Australia has low power distance, where hierarchy is established only for convenience. Superiors are always accessible and managers rely on individual employees and teams for their expertise (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002).

Uncertainty avoidance. Uncertainty avoidance measures how much people can tolerate uncertain and unknown situations (Hofstede, 1980). In organizations, uncertainty avoidance can be shown as the reliance on clear procedures and regulations, fixed promotion process and well-known rules (Newman & Nollen, 1996). For example, France is a high uncertainty avoidance country, where hierarchy is prevalent in companies and regulations are preferred in the organizations. Contrarily, U.S. is a low uncertainty avoidance country. In the U.S., firms are less hierarchical and less rule-governed than French companies because American employees prefer to discretion that goes with ambiguity (Newman & Nollen, 1996).

Individualism – collectivism. Individualism describes the extent to which an individual derives the identity from himself or herself. Contrary, collectivism shows the extent to which an individual obtain identity from a collective group (Hofstede, 1980). Based on this concept, people within individual culture are expected to look out for themselves and their immediate families, while those in collective culture are expected to be taken care of by the "in-group" and behave in the group's best interests at the same

time. The "in-group" can be extended family, clan or organization (Hofstede, 1986). In organizations, individualism can be demonstrated by individual-based pay within a tournament work environment. Collectivism, on the other hand, can be seen as team-based rewards or group-based training. U.S. is a good example that values individual culture while China is a collectivist country (Hofstede, 1980).

Masculinity- femininity. Masculinity cultures value achievement, earnings, assertiveness, competitiveness, advancements and material rewards, while feminine culture indicates the concern for people, the quality of life, nurturing and social well being (Newman & Nollen, 1996). For example, in the U.S. where masculinity culture is valued, merit-based reward system is commonly used in the organizations. In countries like Denmark, Norway and Sweden where feminine culture is prominent, the quality of interpersonal relations and well being are more associated with workplace.

Long-term and short-term orientation. The last dimension in Hofstede's research is long-term orientation. This dimension was added after Hofstede's original research with the aim of capturing dimensions that are most prevalent in Asian countries, such as Singapore, Taiwan and Japan (Hofstede, 1991). Long-term orientation is described as patience, perseverance, respect for one's elders and a sense of obedience and duty towards the larger good (Hofstede, 1991). In practice, organizations that are long-term orientated tend to focus on long-term performance while those who are short-term orientated will focus more on "short wins". For example, U.S. is a typical short-term oriented country. In the U.S., companies tend to pursue short-term interest in order to meet shareholders' need. Moreover, employees are usually rewarded based on short-term performance and quick results.

National culture and training and development

The alignment between national culture and training and development design reflects the concept of "environment fit" introduced above. Based on the five dimensions (Hofstede, 1980) described above, we are going to discuss how the companies' design and selection of training program is influenced by national culture in a certain country. This study argues that in order to enhance training effectiveness, companies should design the training programs that fit into the national culture in which the company is operating.

Power distance. MNCs should first consider power distance when designing training programs so that training can fit into the national culture. As discussed before, organizations with high power distance tend to have formal structure and hierarchy. In Japan, which has high power distance, companies have designed training programs accordingly to adapt to the formal hierarchy. For example, training is planned and enforced in a disciplined manner at all levels in the organization (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002). Managers at all levels have responsibility for the execution of training and development plans. In Latin American countries where power distance is also high, most line workers are not involved in participative management due to the formal hierarchy in the organization (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002). Line managers in these organizations usually tried hard to please their direct supervisors in order to better survive in such a high power distance context. We mentioned Kirkpatrick's four level model in measuring training effectiveness. Power distance may have an impact on the training effectiveness as well. For example, in Asian or Latin American contexts, where there is high power distance, the reaction phase of Kirkpatrick does not work well because trainees are not likely to criticize trainers. Likewise, the learning phase of Kirkpatrick may not work well because of the potential for trainees to lose face (Wilson, 2014).

Comparatively, in countries where power distance is low, people are more uncomfortable with hierarchical structures in the organization. Research shows that management practices such as empowerment and participation are predicted to be more successful in low-power-distance organizations (Robert, Probst, Martocchio, Drasgow, & Lawler, 2000). For example, U.S. has low to medium power distance, where people are less tolerant of hierarchy. Consistent with its national culture,

6

empowerment and employee engagement are emphasized in U.S. companies, where employees' voices are more likely to be heard in the training process (Robert et al., 2000). For example, in the U.S. companies, instead of being told what the "right" answer is, employees are more comfortable to share their experience and opinions during the training.

 Uncertainty avoidance. Uncertainty avoidance in a certain country can also influence the company's training design. In Japan, general managers usually review training monthly and recognize individual training achievement formally. In order to decrease the uncertainty in the organization, supervisors at all levels have the responsibility to train employees and enforce policy and regulation regarding training and development (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002). Korea is another county that has high uncertainty avoidance. It has been repeatedly showed that in both Korea and Japan, in-house training and development practice are more commonly used for both blue-and white-collar workers (Morishima, 1995). This is because in-house training and development practices can decrease the uncertainty and ensure the consistency in the organization, which reflect the "uncertainty avoiding" context in these countries. Compared with outside consultants, having in-house trainers can be seen as a signal to ensure certainty in the organization.

 Contrarily, in Canada where the culture is more "uncertainty accepting", organizations tend to be more comfortable in new and uncertain situations. For example, outside consultants are more and more commonly used in Canadian companies, especially on training and development areas (Murray, Whitehead & Blake, 1990). Bringing in outside consultants shows an organization's acceptance of uncertain situations, which demonstrated the fit with the "uncertainty accepting" culture that are embedded in Canadian society.

 Individualism – collectivism. Research shows that higher training effectiveness can be achieved when training fit into a country's individual or collectivist culture. For example, as we mentioned above, U.S. is a highly individualistic country, where pursuing individual interest is the priority. Therefore, U.S. managers are more individual focused. Comparatively, China is a collectivist country where people have been historically focused on social interests, collective actions and an emphasis on shared responsibilities (Early, 1994). As a result, because of the strong, collectivist culture in China, Chinese managers tend to focus more on in-group loyalty and the willingness to put group interests ahead of self-interests. The difference between Chinese managers and U.S. managers brings implications to MNC's training design. According to Earley (1994), individually based training can contribute to improved self-efficacy and higher performance for U.S. managers while group-based training contributed to improved self-efficacy and higher performance for Chinese managers. This suggests that individual-based training may fit better into the individualist culture (i.e. U.S.) while group-based training works better in collectivist society (i.e. China). This is consistent with Bassi & Van Buren (1999)'s research, which demonstrates that in the U.S., only one percent of the employees are trained in team building practices among the surveyed companies.

 In countries that are high in collectivism, employees tend to build relationships with certain groups in the organization. Therefore, the skills in horizontal coordination and communication have been considered as one of the most important skills for employees in Japan (Kagono, Nonaka, Sakakibari & Okumura, 1985). Accordingly, Japanese companies have adopted such development practices in their training programs to develop employees' skills in coordination and communication. Other collective countries such as China and South Korea also emphasize on developing employees' interpersonal skills. For example, in South Korea, team spirit, as well as the commitment to company and coworkers are valued in the management training (Koch, Nam & Steers, 1995).

 Masculinity – femininity. As discussed above, countries with feminine culture emphasize on well-being, gender equality as well as the quality of relationships. For example, in Denmark, which is dominated by feminine culture, companies usually emphasize on participation, equity, democracy and

ethics when designing training programs (Madsen & Albrechtsen, 2008). Norway, another typical case of feminine country, put emphasis on well being and life-long learning for employees (Skule, Stuart, & Nyen, 2002). These design well embodies the characteristics of femininity culture.

Contrary, countries with masculine culture show their value in assertiveness, competitiveness and achievements, which can be seen, in their training designs. For example, MBO (Management by Objectives) is commonly used in U.S. companies, which encourages employees to focus on rewards, short-win and achievable goals (Schneider, 1988). Research also shows that U.S. companies emphasize the importance of performance in human resource development (Swanson, 1995). These characteristics are tied with the masculine culture in the U.S.

In Hofstede's (1986) study, feminine or masculine culture may also influence the interaction between trainer and trainee (teacher and student), which provide insight for MNCs when they design training programs. Hofstede (1986) pointed out that in feminine society, trainer tends to use average student as the norm, while best students are used as norm in masculine societies where performance and achievements are emphasized (Hofstede, 1986). The attitudes towards failure in learning environment also vary in these two societies. For example, a trainee's failure may be seen as a minor accident in a feminine society, while failure is treated a severe problem in a masculine society where success and self-achievement is highly valued (Hofstede, 1986). This suggests that companies should consider the impact of feminine/masculine culture when designing training programs.

Long-term and short-term orientation. McMurrer & Van Buren (1999) show that Japanese companies attach importance to lifetime employment, which create an environment for employees to develop skills. In this context, on-the-job training is commonly used in Japanese companies for skill development (Morishima, 1995). Lifetime employment results in the systematic job changes for employees (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002). Japanese companies have designed training programs to adapt to this working environment. For example, they use broad job responsibilities and frequent rotation programs to develop employees' organizational skills, so that employees can be well equipped for the job changes (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002). This lifetime employment and training fit well with the long-term value in Japan.

Other countries like China and Korea also emphasize on the lifelong employment. Organizations in South Korea and China usually make a formal commitment to employees' future (Drost, Frayne, Lowe, & Geringer, 2002). For example, in Korea, organizations put more emphasis on molding future managers to fit the corporate culture and value and training is seen as the way to achieve this goal (Koch, Nam & Steers, 1995).

Contrarily, U.S. is an example of short term orientated country, where companies focus on achieving short-term goals in order to meet shareholder's need. In such countries, managers are seeking short-term approaches to achieve organizational goals with a focus on human resources' instrumental value, which is contrasted with "long-term" approach where the developmental value of employees are emphasized. Therefore, in these short term orientated countries, employees tend to have low job security. Research shows that in short term orientated countries, work units that stressed "quick fixes" to problems usually outperformed work unit that adopted a more permanent solution to problems (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Meanwhile, work units with less job security outperformed work units with more job security in these short-term oriented cultures (Newman & Nollen, 1996). This shows the importance of fit between national culture and HR practices. It also brings implications to MNC's training design. For example, in short-term orientated countries, managers may emphasize on designing training programs that can help employees to improve their technical skills in a short period. While in long-term orientated countries, managers may focus on the effectiveness of training design in developing employees' soft skills, which may take longer time to achieve.

8

Summary

Based on the Hofstede's five dimensions, we discussed the importance of consistency between national culture and company's training design. We argue that in order to achieve higher training effectiveness, MNCs need to adapt their training practices to the national cultures in which they operate. For example, researchers found that self-focused training has a stronger impact on employees' self-efficacy as well as their job performance in individualist culture, while group-focused training has a stronger impact on learners' job performance in collectivist culture (Earley, 1994). This suggests that creating a fit between national cultures and training methods can lead to positive outcomes in the organization. This is also consistent with the concept of "environment fit", which can lead to higher firm performance.

Organizational culture

Introduction of organizational culture

Organizational culture can be defined as a complex set of values, beliefs, assumptions, and symbols that define the way that a firm conducts its business (Barney, 1986). It sets the shared norms, values and beliefs for people in an organization to follow "the way things are done around here" (Schneider, 1988). Organizational culture is like "glue" that holds organizations together through adding cohesiveness and coherence among the parts (Schneider, 1988). Schein (1996) argues that organizational culture is one of the most powerful and stable forces that are operating in an organization.

For decades, organizational culture has emerged as one of the dominant themes in management studies. Kopelman and colleagues (1990) suggested that organizational culture values can ultimately influence organizational effectiveness by enhancing the quality of outputs or reducing labor cost. Organizational culture was also found to be an important factor to influence job performance and employee retention (Sheridan, 1992). Peters & Waterman (1982) argue that one of the salient traits of highly successful organizations is that they have advanced organizational culture. They believe organizational culture has significant positive economic value to the organizations. Barney (1986) believes that organizational culture is one of several attributes that differentiate firms from other competitors. He also argues that organizational culture can be a source of sustainable competitive advantage for the firm if that culture is valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable (Barney, 1986).

Particularly, in MNCs, organizational culture can ensure the consistency of the organization strategy when it's introduced from headquarter to subsidiaries. Researchers argued that organizational culture can be used as a way of control for headquarters over their subsidiaries (Schneider, 1988). For many multinational companies, the reason of creating a strong organizational culture is to encourage motivation, increase commitment and the possibility of employees sharing a common view in the organization (Schneider, 1988).

Besides the influence on firm performance, organizational culture was also found to have strong influence on human resource management practices in MNCs. This is because managers usually implement HRM practices based on their assumptions on the nature of both the task and the employees. However, these assumptions are shaped by different organizational culture (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999). Therefore, organizational culture has the influence on shaping HRM practices and the "culture fit" has been emphasized in human resource management. For example, in MNCs, candidates are usually carefully screened to "fit" into the existing organizational culture by assessing their behaviors beliefs and values (Schneider, 1988). When it comes to performance management, organizational culture which emphasizes that employees tend to expect direction and close supervision will encourage mangers to set specific performance goals and detailed planning to guide their employees (Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999). Similarly, an organization whose culture emphasizes on individual contribution will be more likely to design a reward system which rewards on the basis of individual performance (Aycan, Kanungo, &

9

Sinha, 1999). Training and development, another important part of human resource management, is therefore strongly influenced by the organizational culture as well.

Different kinds of organizational culture

Organizational culture varies among industries and companies. Researchers have been trying to categorize organizational cultures into different types. For example, Wallach (1983) believes that organizational culture is the combination of three cultures: bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture. However, the degree of each culture may vary in different organizations (Wallach, 1983). According to his definition, the characteristic of bureaucratic culture is hierarchical, organized, and systematic with a clear lines of authority and responsibility (Huey Yiing & Zaman Bin Ahmad, 2009). Organizations with a high degree of bureaucratic culture tend to have clear structures and procedures. An innovative culture can be defined as a creative, result-driven, challenging context. Organizations that value innovative culture tend to tolerate risks, encourage innovation and learning. A supportive culture has the characteristic of teamwork, people-oriented, encouraging and trusting context (Huey Yiing & Zaman Bin Ahmad, 2009). Organizations with a supportive culture emphasize the cooperation among team members as well as individual need and development. Wallach (1983) believes that any organizational culture can be combined with these three cultures with different degrees. Wallach (1983) also argues for the importance of the fit between organizational culture and individual employees' need and personality.

Bass & Avolio (1990) emphasized the distinction between two organizational cultures: transformational culture and transactional culture. Transactional culture focuses on the explicit and implicit contractual relationships. In such context, managers are negotiators as well as resource allocators, and employees are not connected to the mission of the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1990). By contrast, in a transformational culture, Bass & Avolio (1990) state that there is a sense of purpose and a feeling of belongings. Managers and employees share mutual interest in this culture context. They argue that transformational culture supports the change and innovation in the organization while transactional culture tend to maintain the status quo. In other word, transformational culture focuses on long-term interest while transactional culture emphasizes on short-term interest.

Similar to transformational culture, continuous-learning culture is another type of culture that embraces change, innovation and risk-taking in the organization. Continuous-learning culture has been studied by many researchers. Studies have shown the impact of continuous learning culture in HRM field. We are going to discuss the influence of continuous-learning culture on training design in later sections.

Organizational culture and training design

A typical training process involves five steps: analysis, design, develop, implement and evaluation (ADDIE model) (Allen, 2006). Research shows that organizational culture has a strong impact on each step of a training program through the entire training process. We are going to analyze how organizational culture shapes, influences and redefines training programs step by step. The alignment between national culture and training and development design reflects the concept of "organizational fit" introduced above.

Training process starts with an analysis phase that includes a need assessment to evaluate the organization need, job tasks and employee's readiness for the training (Moore & Dutton, 1978). Organizational culture plays an important role in this phase mainly through the trainers chosen by the organization (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). For example, a training and development program will most likely identify with or select a trainer who can bring the similar values and missions with the organizational values (Kissack & Callahan, 2010), so that the expected behaviors in an organization can

be transferred by the trainer from top manager to the learners (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). Therefore, organizational culture plays a critical role in training even before the trainer meets the learners.

The design phase uses information obtained from the analysis phase to create an effective training or development plan. This phase requires a clear objectives of the training program as well as a good understanding of the organizational context. Therefore, in order to design a successful training intervention, designers should carefully analyze the learning objectives, individual trainees' learning styles and preferences, as well as levels of learners' self-direction and collaboration with one another (Sadler-Smith, 1996). Organizational culture may have a strong influence in the design phase because organization culture shapes the learning environment in an organization, including leaners' learning styles and preferences, which are the key points in this phase (Kissack & Callahan, 2010).

Based on the blueprint from design phase, designers will move on to the development phase, which is to create and test the learning outcomes (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). The emphasis in this phase is on training transfer, which depends heavily on trainee characteristics and their work environment, which are most likely to be connected with the organizational culture in an organization (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). Therefore, organizational culture has a strong impact on the design phase to ensure the training transfer.

Next, after the first three steps, the implementation step of a general training and development model involves selecting a training method and putting the training program into practice (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). In this phase, learner's learning outcomes and their learning styles have a significant impact on designer's selection of training method (Riding and Sadler-Smith, 1997). These aspects are strongly influenced by the organizational culture, which should be taken into consideration. For example, it's more likely that the hiring manager hires those who can better fit into the organizational culture. As a result, all the learners will share organizational values and beliefs, which have an influence on their learning style that determines the training method (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). Therefore, organizational culture largely influenced how training is implemented.

Evaluation is the final step in training and development process, which is used to assess the effectiveness of a program. How to measure the effectiveness of a training program usually reflects top managers' values and thoughts, because the "success" of a training intervention should be well aligned with the organizational strategy and objective (Kissack & Callahan, 2010). Organizational culture plays an important role in this stage because it defines the way things are done and it also has a great influence on how leaders establish their strategic objectives. This explains the importance of organizational culture in training evaluation.

Because of the contribution of training effectiveness to organizational objectives, the strategic value of training evaluation has been studied in both academic and practical areas. For example, researchers are interested in how organizational culture can influence the training effectiveness, and further increase the organizational performance. The next section will discuss how these researchers address the relationship between organizational culture and training effectiveness.

Organizational culture and training effectiveness

Organizational culture and training success. Transfer of training or training success can be defined as the extent to which trainees can apply the KSA (knowledge, skills and attitudes) gained in a training context back to the job (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992), and it has become a critical issue for researchers and practitioners (Chiaburu & Tekleab, 2005). Researchers argue that organizational culture can be a critical factor in training success. Organizational culture can promote training success because it serves as a powerful tool to influence employee behaviors and improve performance. For example, the organizational culture, which attaches importance on employee growth and development, employee

involvement, will have a positive impact on training success (Ballesteros-Rodríguez, De Saá-Pérez, & Domínguez-Falcón, 2012).

One of the most important concepts that facilitate training success is *continuous learning culture*, as we discussed above. Continuous learning culture is defined as an "organization-wide concern, value, belief and expectation that general knowledge acquisition and application is important" (Tracey, et al, 1995). This concept emphasizes that the acquisition of knowledge and skills are essential job responsibilities of any employee. Therefore, in organizations, which emphasizes on the learning culture, the training will focus on open exchange of information, as well as the encouragement of learning/training application in the pursuit of organizational goals (Simosi, 2012), which can promote the training transfer in the organization. Researchers also find the direct relationship between continuous learning cultures with training motivation among learners (Chiaburu & Tekleab, 2005). The positive relationship between continuous learning culture and training transfer has been investigated by many researchers.

Researchers argue that continuous learning culture encourages employees to rake risk and continuously challenge themselves in order to facilitate his or her learning experience, which increases innovation in the organization. Moreover, companies that place high value on continuous learning usually see training as a long-term investment (Hinkin & Tracey, 2010), which values employees' growth and development. Therefore, an emphasis on innovation is shared within the organization. Accordingly, the training program may also emphasize these aspects by increasing innovation. In order to pursue innovation, organizations that have continuous-learning culture usually develop formal training systems to reinforce achievement and provide opportunities for personal development (Dubin, 1990). By promoting innovation, continuous learning culture supports the training transfer in the organization.

When it comes to training design, continuous learning culture requires the social interaction and work relationships between trainees. This is because by working together in a highly interactive work context, organizational members can gain an understanding of each other's tasks and responsibilities, which facilitate their learning experience. Therefore, cooperation and cohesion among employees and managers are encouraged (Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavanagh, 1995). As a result, the learning process which is supported by social interactions and relations in this context (Tracey, et al, 1995) may result in more bonding and teamwork in the training design. This explains the direct influence of continuous learning culture on training design.

Organizational culture and training failure. Besides the positive effect on training effectiveness, training failure can be also seen as a consequence of organizational culture. As we mentioned before, top managers create and sustain the organizational culture. Cohen (1990) found that trainees with more supportive supervisors tend to have stronger beliefs in the programs' usefulness, which is an important signal in training success. Therefore, senior managers' attitude and support is critical in training programs. For example, in organizations where the top managers believe that training is a simple and unimportant function will end up employing incompetent trainers, discouraging transfer of learning and failing to recognize positive transfer of training (Bunch, 2007). Similarly, organizational culture that is characterized by considering training as an investment without return, or that look for blames when mistakes occur are not appropriate for talking risks by implementing the new techniques and knowledge acquired during training (Ballesteros-Rodríguez, De Saá-Pérez, & Domínguez-Falcón, 2012). Another example can be demonstrated by an organization that focuses on "short-term" interest and immediate profit. A training program, which is designed for employees' long-term development and growth, is more likely to fail because of the incongruence between organizational culture and training design.

Therefore, training failure can be seen as a manifestation of the values, beliefs, and assumptions shared by members of various levels of organizational culture, especially the opinions from top managers.

Summary

Based on the discussion above, we can see that organizational culture reflects the pattern of shared meaning associated with formal training programs offered by the organization (Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavanagh, 1995). Therefore, including a culture analysis in training design can create awareness for trainers and organizations of potential problems and incongruence between the program and the organization, which may undermine the success of the program. Creating a fit between organizational cultures and training design can bring positive outcomes to the organization through training effectiveness. This also reflect the importance of "organizational fit" mentioned above, which can lead to higher firm performance.

A case example

GE is known for its strong organizational culture, which always reflected its top managers' attitude and leadership characteristics through GE's history. Crotonville is GE's management development institute, which is known as the John F. Welch Leadership Development Center (Schneier, 1994). This center is committed to excellence in leadership development by sharing best practices and values. Crotonville's mission is to develop present and future leaders, introduce cultural change and spread key corporate initiatives throughout GE (Schneier, 1994). Through the years, Crotonville helps GE employees look toward the future and gain crucial insight by exchanging knowledge with customers, suppliers and colleagues (General Electric Capital, n.d.).

Crotonville was established in 1956. Since then, it was continuously used to facilitate GE's major organizational change, which connects GE's organizational culture with its training & development. When Welch first learned about Crotonville in 1981, he said, "I want a revolution to start at Crotonville. I want it to be part of the glue that holds GE together (Schneier, 1994)." This shows Welch's belief in the reciprocal influence of organizational culture and the leadership programs at GE. In 1985, Welch realized the need for a new set of values and templates in the organization because he felt GE leadership was weaker after World War II (Schneier, 1994). He then decided on the strategy build a winning team in the organization. In order to facilitate this change, there's a need for mechanisms to implement the changes in core values. Crotonville was then chosen to implement new visions from senior managers to employees. During this period, Welch invested a great deal of time and energy in coaching and developing team players and team building at Crotonville (Schneier, 1994), since teamwork was one of the core values in GE's organizational culture.

Welch's vision was also represented through the form of training at Crotonville. For example, Welch believes that the over 80% of the development should learn through life experience. As a result, more than 80% of the training programs focus on "learning by doing", such as on-the-job training and mentoring programs (Schneier, 1994). The remaining 20% consists of highly leveraged, formal development activities (Schneier, 1994). This demonstrates the strong influence of organizational culture on training design.

Since the early 1980s, GE has been very aggressive about getting strong leadership on the hard issues, such as downsizing, reducing levels of management and driving productivity, which also reflected Welch's leadership characteristics (Schneier, 1994). Crotonville, again was used to facilitate this strategic change. Until now, most of the development programs in Crotonville have an emphasis on leadership development. During the past decades, GE started to focus on female leadership (General Electric Capital, n.d.). In order to support female leadership, GE designed women coaching and mentoring programs, with the aim of helping grow, attract and retain successful women throughout the company. The development programs focus on leadership, advancement and career-broadening opportunities in a variety of ways to help women to increase their influence in the organization.

13

Corporate Culture vs. National Culture

International HRM strategies

When multinationals go global, they need to find the balance between corporate culture and national culture as both cultures may have impact on company's training design. Companies that focus on corporate culture may emphasis on the control from headquarter and tend to adopt universal global HR practices to manage the global company. However, companies that focus on the difference among national cultures may use a "differentiation" approach to increase the local responsiveness (Schneider, 1988). These companies tend to give local subsidiaries autonomy in managing their own organizations, considering the impact of national culture. This raises the issue of differentiation vs. integration and autonomy vs. control in multinationals. These organizations need to consider which local vs. global HR practices needed to integrate a global company (Schneider, 1988). Therefore, both corporate culture and national culture need to be taken into consideration when multinationals design their training programs.

For example, according to Bartlett & Ghoshal (1989)'s theory, MNCs can be categorized into four types based on different levels of integration/responsiveness: international firms, global firms, multidomestic firms and transactional firms. Among them, global firms focus on integration and therefore they are home country centered. They emphasize on the strong control from headquarter and they usually send managers from home country to set up subsidiaries. Global firms are pursing global efficiency by emphasizing on integration (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). This suggests that global company values the consistency of organizational culture among all the subsidiaries. In such companies, the transfer of organizational culture overweighs national culture difference in different countries. This may bring implications to the training design in such companies.

Contrary to global firms, multidomestic firms focus on differentiation across country and therefore they are locally centered. They usually give local managers autonomy and they usually use host-country nationals (HCNs) to manage subsidiaries (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). In this way, multidomestic firm can achieve global flexibility by maximizing the differentiation between countries. The characteristics of multidomestic firms show that the difference of national culture is valued in such companies. Compared to organizational culture, national culture difference is more critical in such companies. Managers usually focus more on developing HRM practices that can meet local customers' need. This suggests that local managers have the autonomy to design their HR practices and policies.

Transnational firms, however, combined the advantages of both global firms and multidomestic firms by maximizing both global integration and local responsiveness. These organizations tend to build a flexible integrated interdependent network structure to facilitate global learning (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). This suggests that both national culture and organizational culture are considered in transnational firms. These companies are trying to seek the balance between organizational culture consistency and national culture difference.

Therefore, MNCs can achieve their business goals by using different international strategies based on different levels of differentiation/integration. Furthermore, since different international strategies focus on a different degree of national culture and organizational culture, the combined effect of these two cultures may play a different role in different organizations, which provides different implications to MNC's training design.

A case example

IKEA is a multinational that embraces both organizational culture and national culture when it's going global. On the one hand, as a Swedish company, IKEA has a very strong organizational culture, which rooted in Swedish values, the so-called "IKEA soul". IKEA requires all its managers to fully appreciate the

14

IKEA soul. When it comes to training design, IKEA attaches high importance to its organizational culture as well. For example, headquarter identifies and sends out Swedish managers to local stores in other countries to train managers around the world (King, 1996), in order to bring the "IKEA soul" around the world. The executive training often included intensive "cultural" weeks, which cover the Sweden and KIEA's values. Through the formal training and working with role models from headquarter, managers can soon acquire IKEA's values really naturally (King, 1996).

On the other hand, IKEA also emphasizes on local responsiveness based on national culture differences. For example, all country managers are required to run their business according to local conditions or local settings. This is because IKEA believes that customers can get better service if business varies according to local needs, and local conditions. This results in a decentralized structure of IKEA. In order to adapt to local responsiveness, IKEA's training team has been working on creating a more local learning environment (King, 1996). Curt Temin, head of IKEA's purchasing development center, once said "we sought to make learning more relevant and more compelling, which avoided having to fly every country's people back to Scandinavia." This reflected IKEA's emphasis on differentiation and local responsiveness.

Based on the consideration of both organizational culture and national culture, IKEA eventually designed its training approach as self-managed learning (King, 1996). In this approach, employees work in small learning groups, which provide challenging tasks and mutual support among each other. Trainees work in the same group and can support and learn from each other. Local managers diagnose individual's leaning needs, specify their own development goals and decide how they should be attained (King, 1996). Local managers are also responsible for individual's performance review. In this way, IKEA encourages local managers to take responsibility for their own country's learning process based on local needs. By working closely with local employees, managers are also encouraged to be more flexible and innovative. Meanwhile, since all the mangers have the "IKEA soul" in mind, this learning approach can also reinforce IKEA's values across its global workforce. As a result, self-managed learning approach not only fits well with IKEA's goal as a decentralized organization with emphasis on local responsiveness, but also facilitate the communication between managers across country borders, which bring IKEA's organizational value down to each subsidiary.

Individual level analysis
Intended and perceived HRM practices

As we mentioned above, in order to achieve macro-micro fit, we should consider both organizational level analysis and individual level analysis. This is because the full impact of HRM practices can't be achieved without the understanding of individual's different perception of these practices put in place. This lead to the discussion between "intended" HRM practices and "perceived" HRM practices (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2011).

According to Wright & Nishii (2013), "intended" practices are the outcome of a process where organization has developed an HRM strategy with the aim of executing the business strategy. "Intended" practices are those that are defined and developed by managers. However, not all the "intended" practices are implemented effectively. In other words, there may be a gap between "intended" practices and "actual" practices. One of the factors that may close this gap is individuals' "perceived" practices.

"Perceived" practices focus on employees' beliefs about why HR adopts certain practices (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2011). This is because the same HR practice may be regarded in different ways. Individuals may react based on how they perceive the HRM practices and these reactions may differ among individuals. For example, pay-for-performance may be seen as a sign of empowerment by some people (Nishii et al., 2011), who believes this compensation design can bring higher commitment and

performance. At the same time, however, pay-for-performance can also be regarded as a cost-saving approach by some employees (Nishii et al., 2011), who think it as a sign that employees are costs.

Nishii et al. (2011) argue that this individual difference in perceptions may play an important role in organizational behaviors. In other words, the difference in "perceived" practices may influence organizational performance. For example, their study (Nishii et al., 2011) found that when employees perceive that HR practices reflect a commitment to quality, and employees are treated as assets, then employees tend to have higher commitment and satisfaction, which lead to higher organizational performance. Contrarily, when employees' viewed HR practices are based on cost control, they will have more negative attitudes towards these practices (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2011). Therefore, in order to achieve desired organizational outcomes, it is important to have not only the right HR practices in place, but also the right employee perceptions of those practices (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2011). In other words, "perceived" practices can influence the effectiveness of HR practices. In the following section, we are going to apply the concept of "perceived" practices to discuss the role of individual perception in MNC's training and development design.

When we analyzed the influence of organizational culture and national culture on company's training design, we only discussed the organizational level influence on training success. We didn't mention the individual difference towards training design among learners, since different learners may have different culture orientation, perceptions and experience towards the same training design. As mentioned above, a successful training design should enable employees' acquisition and mastery of knowledge, skills, and behaviors delivered through training programs. Therefore, individual differences (i.e. employees' different cultural orientation) should be considered when designing training programs (Earley, 1994). On individual level, this section will examine the impact of employees' different understanding towards national and organizational culture on their experience of particular training programs used in the company. In other words, we are going to discuss how the "perceived" training practices will influence the training effectiveness in the organizations.

Subculture and training effectiveness

Individuals may hold different cultural orientation towards the similar national culture, which may affect the training effectiveness, which can be measured as the extent to which trainees can apply the KSA (knowledge, skills and attitudes) gained in a training context back to the job (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). In an individualist country, for example, some employees may be actually collectivists. For these employees, training focused on individual-level clues and information was less effective in enhancing his or her performance than was training based on group-level information (Earley, 1994). In this example, these collectivists share a *subculture* that is different from the prevalent organizational culture.

Subculture is another form of organizational culture that may affect individual's perception and understanding of training design. Subculture can be defined as a collection of individuals with a shared identity and experience different from those of the larger culture (Gelder, 2007). In an organization, subcultures are byproducts of association in various groupings based on functions specific to and unique from the larger organization (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988). Subcultures may influence individual's perception and reactions to the central organizational culture through the influence of localized leaders. These localized leaders may influence employees' values, norms and perceptions in a different way. Researchers argue that subculture can be more powerful in an organization because it is a more immediate and engaged work context for employees, and it provides a common basis for identification and more focused and coherent than the dominant organizational culture (Lok, Westwood, & Crawford, 2005). Therefore, researchers point out that subculture, as one type of organizational culture, can shape people's learning experience in a more actively way compared with the dominant organizational culture (Egan, 2008).

16

Egan (2008) categorized subculture into three types: bureaucratic subcultures, innovative subcultures and supportive subcultures. His study shows that the relationship between employees' perceived *subculture* and motivation to training transfer is stronger than the relationship between perceived organizational culture and motivation to training transfer (Egan, 2008). His finding supports that organizational subculture has a more significant impact on employees' training effectiveness. Since subculture reflect several individuals' unique values, perception, and beliefs towards organizational culture, Egan (2008)'s study suggests that we can't neglect the individual level analysis since individual's perceived subculture characteristics have a strong impact on employees' learning process. Therefore, the key element to preparing a person successfully for entry into a new culture is clarifying that person's expectations concerning the future culture relative to his or her individual culture orientation (Latham, 1988).

Individual's self-efficacy and training effectiveness

Another factor that strongly relates to training process is trainees' self-efficacy. Self-efficacy can be defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands" (Wood & Bandura, 1989). Some research has found that performance self-efficacy can strongly influence both learning and transfer of training. Studies showed that individuals with higher self-efficacy are more likely to transfer the training to the job (Ford, Smith, Weissbein, Gully, & Salas, 1998). Ford et al (1998) argue that the relationship between self-efficacy and transfer of training is evident where people with high self-efficacy tend to achieve higher training performance.

Other study argue that self-efficacy can't directly influence training effectiveness, but can serve as a moderating effect in the relationship between organizational culture and training transfer (Simosi, 2012). For example, Simosi (2012) believes that the relationship between organizational culture and training transfer is stronger for those who have higher self-efficacy. This suggests that even when individuals share the similar national culture and organizational culture, their training performance may differ due to their difference in self-efficacy.

Individual's perceived learning experience and training effectiveness

When we talked about the impact of organizational culture on training effectiveness, we mentioned the importance of senior managers' support in training process. However, in the same organization, different employees may have different perception of supervisor's support in their training experience. Research shows that perceived supervisor support is a critical indicator in employees' training success. This is because when employees perceive higher support from supervisors, they tend to have stronger beliefs in the training program's usefulness, which will lead to higher training performance (Chiaburu, & Tekleab, 2005). Egan (2008)'s study also provide similar implication. His research shows that employee's perceived leadership behavior is an indicator for training transfer (Egan, 2008). This is because leadership behaviors can provide part of the impetus for the emergence of a particular set of values and perceptions that eventually turn into organizational culture that affects employees' learning experience (Egan, 2008).

Similarly, when we talked about continuous learning culture above, we discussed the positive influence of such culture on training effectiveness. However, we didn't mention individuals' perception of such organizational culture (Chiaburu, & Tekleab, 2005). In fact, research shows that employee's perception of continuous learning culture is critical to employees' training-related motivation (Chiaburu, & Tekleab, 2005), which is also an indicator to employees' training effectiveness.

Managers' perceived organizational culture and training effectiveness

As mentioned above, individual employees have different perceptions towards organizational culture. However, the perception towards organizational culture may vary not only from learner to learner, but also from manager to manger. Researchers are interested in investigating whether variant perceptions of organizational culture coexist among managers and how it relate to the training success (Keeton & Mengistu, 1992). Studies found that managers at different levels in an organization have different perspectives concerning that organization, and therefore hold different views of the organization's culture. In other words, organizational culture may not be shared across all the members in the organization. Subcultures may exist in the organization (Keeton & Mengistu, 1992). The reason can be explained by a perceived lack of communication between upper-level and lower-level managers. When these managers get involved in training design, their various perception of organizational culture can be reflected through different training programs. Therefore, organization need to consider the differences in perception of values held by different mangers when they design the training and development programs.

Summary
When we discussed the impact of organizational culture and national culture, we tend to ignore the individual difference between learners. However, research shows that individual characteristics (i.e., self-efficacy, perceived organizational subculture, perceived learning experience) have a strong impact on employees' learning process. Therefore, identifying differences in perception of valued held by organization members would have implications for training and development programs. These findings suggest that in order to achieve higher training effectiveness, organizations should also pay attention to individual level difference when they design training and development programs. As Nishii et al. (2011) suggested, managers should ask employees about their perceptions on HR practices (training and development design in this study) and these feedbacks can provide valuable information about why some training design works or doesn't work. Companies that ignore these individual perception differences risk hurting their overall performance (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2011).

Conclusion
This current study discussed the effects of national culture and organizational culture on MNC's training and development design. On the organizational level, this research argues that both national culture and organizational culture have an effect on how MNCs select and design their training programs. On this level, training practices are the so-called "intended" practices. First of all, based on Hofstede (1980)'s five dimensions of national culture (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and long-term orientation), we discussed how each dimension affects company's training design. We argue that in order to enhance training effectiveness, companies should design training programs that fit into the national culture in which the company is operating, which well reflects the "environment fit" between training design and national context around it.

Next, we discussed the relationship between organizational culture and company's training design, which is an example of "organizational fit" we introduced above. We argued that organizational culture has strong impact on each step of the training process: analysis, design, develop, implement and evaluation. We then demonstrated how organizational culture can influence training effectiveness. We argue that both training success and training failure can be seen as a manifestation of the values, beliefs and assumptions that shared by members in the organization. We then used GE as an example to illustrate our ideas. This section suggests that organizational culture should be taken into consideration when companies design their training programs.

Moving forward, this study illustrated the combined effect of both national culture and organizational culture on training and development design by using the story of IKEA. We argue that

multinationals vary depending on different level of differentiation/integration. Therefore, when companies go global, they have to consider both national culture and organizational culture and find the balance between differentiation vs. integration when they design the training and development programs.

The last part of this study focus on the individual level analysis. We first described the difference between "intended" practices and "perceived" practices, and emphasized the importance of individual level analysis. On individual level, we argued that individual employees' experience of training effectiveness will be influenced by the way they perceive national culture as well as organizational culture since individual characteristics (i.e., self-efficacy, perceived organizational subculture, perceived learning experience) have a strong impact on employees' learning process. These suggests that in order to achieve higher training effectiveness, besides an organizational level analysis, organizations should also pay attention to individual level difference when they design training and development programs, which is consistent with the concept of "macro-micro fit".

References

Allen, W. C. (2006). Overview and evolution of the ADDIE training system. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 8*(4), 430-441.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., & Sinha, J. B. (1999). Organizational culture and human resource management practices: The model of culture fit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*(4), 501-526.

Baldwin, T.T. and Ford, J.K. (1988) Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(1), 63-103

Ballesteros-Rodríguez, J. L., De Saá-Pérez, P., & Domínguez-Falcón, C. (2012). The role of organizational culture and HRM on training success: evidence from the Canarian restaurant industry. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(15), 3225-3242.

Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1989). *Managing across borders: The transnational solution*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 656-665.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In W. Pasmore & r. W. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (pp. 231-272). Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly, 17*(1), 112-121.

Bassi, L. J., & Van Buren, M. E. (1999). The 1999 ASTD state of the industry report. *Training & Development, 53*(2), 3-27.

Bjornberg, L. (2002). Training and development: best practices*. Public Personnel Management, 31*(4), 500-516.

Boon, C., Paauwe, J., Boselie, P., & Den Hartog, D. (2009). Institutional pressures and HRM: developing institutional fit. *Personnel Review, 38*(5), 492-508.

Bunch, K.J. (2007). Training failure as a consequence of organizational culture. *Human Resource Development Review, 6*(2), 142–163.

Callahan, J. L., Whitener, J. K., Mathis, R. S., & Carden, L. L. (2006). Messages to the profession: a discursive content analysis of Training & Development tables of contents. In F. A. Nafhuko (Ed.), *CD-ROM Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development Conference*, Columbus, OH.

Chiaburu, D. S., & Tekleab, A. G. (2005). Individual and contextual influences on multiple dimensions of training effectiveness. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 29*(8), 604-626.

Cohen, D. J. (1990). What motivates trainees? *Training and Development Journal, 44*(11), 91-93.

Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group and Organization Studies, 13*, 245–273.

Drost, E. A., Frayne, C. A., Lowe, K. B., & Geringer, J. M. (2002). Benchmarking training and development practices: a multi-country comparative analysis. *Human Resource Management*, *41*(1), 67-86.

Dubin, S. S. (1990). Maintaining competence through updating. In S. L. Willis & S. S. Dubin (eds.), *Maintaining professional competence* (pp. 9-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Earley, P. C. (1994). Self or group? Cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *39* (1), 89-117.

Egan, T. M. (2008). The relevance of organizational subculture for motivation to transfer learning. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 19*(4), 299-322.

Ford, J. K., Smith, E. M., Weissbein, D. A., Gully, S. M., & Salas, E. (1998). Relationships of goal orientation, metacognitive activity, and practice strategies with learning outcomes and transfer. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 218.

Gelder, K. (2007). *Subcultures: Cultural histories and social practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

General Electric Capital. (n.d.) Training and Development. Retrieved from
http://www.gecapital.in/careers-training-development.html

Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (2010). What makes it so great? An analysis of human resources practices among Fortune's best companies to work for. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 51*(2), 158-170.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*(3), 301-320.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Huey Yiing, L., & Zaman Bin Ahmad, K. (2009). The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behavior and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 30*(1), 53-86.

Johnson, G. (1992). Managing strategic change—strategy, culture and action. *Long Range Planning, 25*(1), 28-36.

Kagono, T., Nonaka, I., Sakakibara, K., & Okumura, H (1985). *Strategic vs. evolutionary management.* Amsterdam: North Holland.

Keeton, K. B., & Mengistu, B. (1992). The perception of organizational culture by management level: Implications for training and development. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 205-213.

King, S. (1996). European cases of self-managed learning. *Management Development Review, 9*(2), 8-10.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1987). Evaluation of training. In R. Craig (ed.), *Training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development* (pp.310-319), New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kissack, H. C., & Callahan, J. L. (2010). The reciprocal influence of organizational culture and training and development programs: building the case for a culture analysis within program planning. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *34*(4), 365-380.

Koch, M., Nam,S.H., & Steers, R.M. (1995). Human resource management in South Korea. In L.F. Moore & P.D. Jennings (eds.), *Human resource management on the Pacific Rim: Institutions, practices, and attitudes* (pp.217-241). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kopelman R. E., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1990). The role of climate and culture in productivity. In B. Schneider (eds.), *Organizaitonal climate and culture* (pp. 282-318). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Latham, G. P. (1988). Human resource training and development. *Annual Review of Psychology. 39*: 545-582.

Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (1994). The evaluation of training: An organizational culture approach. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 18*(8), 25-32.

Lok, P., Westwood, R., & Crawford, J. (2005). Perceptions of organizational subculture and their significance for organizational commitment. *Applied Psychology, 54*(4), 490–514.

Luk, H. (Ed.) (1990). *Enterprise labor management*. Beijing: Labor Personnel Press (in Chinese).

Madsen, M. T., & Albrechtsen, C. (2008). Competing discourses of leadership: Transformational leadership as blurring mechanism for masculinities in Denmark. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 24*(4), 343-353.

Mathieu, J.E. and Martineau, J.W. (1997). Individual and situational influences on training motivation. In Ford, J.K. (ed.), *Improving training effectiveness in work organizations* (pp.193-223). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

McMurrer, D. P., & Van Buren, M. E. (1999). The Japanese training scene. *Training & Development, 53*(8), 42-46.

Miles, R. E., Snow, C. C., Meyer, A. D., & Coleman, H. J. (1978). Organizational strategy, structure, and process. *Academy of management review, 3*(3), 546-562.

Moore, M. L., & Dutton, P. (1978). Training needs analysis: Review and critique. *Academy of Management Review, 3*(3), 532-545.

Morishima, M (1995). The Japanese human resources management system: A learning bureaucracy. In L.F. Moore & P.D. Jennings (eds.), *Human resource management on the Pacific Rim: Institutions, practices, and attitudes*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Murray, V.V., Whitehead, D., & Blake, W. (1990). Managing the HR function: The Prentice-Hall survey. In V.V. Murray, D. Whitehead, & W. Blake (eds.), *Human resources in Canada* (pp.15543-15582). Toronto: Prentice-Hall.

Nadler, L. (1984). *The handbook of human resource development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *27*(4), 753-779.

Nishii, L. H., Lepak, D.P., & Schneider, B. (2011). Perception is reality: How employees perceive what motivates HR practices affects their engagement, behavior and performance. *Cornell University ILR School*, 14, 1-7.

Nyaw, M.K. (1995). Human resource management in the People's Republic of China. In L.F. Moore & P.D. Jennings (eds.), *Human resource management on the Pacific Rim: Institutions, practices, and attitudes* (pp.187-216). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Palthe, J., & Ernst Kossek, E. (2003). Subcultures and employment modes: Translating HR strategy into practice. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 16*(3), 287-308.

Peretz, H., & Rosenblatt, Z. (2011). The role of societal cultural practices in organizational investment in training: A comparative study in 21 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*(5), 817-831.

Peters, T.J. & Waterman, R.H. (1982). *In search for excellence*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Porter, M. (1985). *Competitive advantage*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Riding, R. J., & Sadler-Smith, E. (1997). Cognitive style and learning strategies: Some implications for training design. *International Journal of Training and Development, 1*(3), 199-208.

Robert, C., Probst, T. M., Martocchio, J. J., Drasgow, F., & Lawler, J. J. (2000). Empowerment and continuous improvement in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India: Predicting fit on the basis of the dimensions of power distance and individualism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 643-658.

Sadler-Smith, E. (1996). Learning styles: a holistic approach. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 20*(7), 29-36.

Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 471–499.

Sarkar-Barney, S. (2004). The role of national culture in enhancing training effectiveness: a framework. *Advances in Human Performance and Cognitive Engineering Research, 4,* 183-214.

Schneider, S. C. (1988). National vs. corporate culture: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management, 27*(2), 231.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* 229–241.

Schneier, C. E. (Ed.). (1994). *The training and development sourcebook*. Human Resource Development. Business & Economics.

Shen, J. (2005). Towards a generic international human resource management (IHRM) model. *Journal of Organizational Transformation and Social Change, 2*(2), 83.

Sheridan, J. E. (1992). Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 1036–1056.

Simosi, M. (2012). The moderating role of self-efficacy in the organizational culture- training transfer relationship. *International Journal of Training and Development, 16*(2), 92-106.

Skule, S., Stuart, M., & Nyen, T. (2002). International briefing 12: Training and development in Norway. *International Journal of Training and Development, 6*(4), 263-276.

Swanson, R. A. (1995). Human resource development: Performance is the key. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 6*(2), 207-213.

Tannenbaum, S. I., & Yukl, G. (1992). Training and development in work organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 43*(1), 399-441.

Tracey, J. B., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1995). Applying trained skills on the job: The importance of the work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(2), 239 -252.

Wallach, E.J. (1983), Individuals and organizations: the cultural match. *Training and Development Journal, 37*, 29-36.

Wilson, J. P. (2014). International human resource development: Learning, education and training for individuals and organizations. *Development and Learning in Organizations, 28*(2).

Wood, R. E., & Bandura, A. (1989). Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 407-415.

Wood, S. (1999). Human resource management and performance. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 1*(4), 367-413.

Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., & Snell, S. A. (2001). Human resources and the resource based view of the firm. *Journal of Management, 27*(6), 701-721.

Wright, P.M. & Nishii, L.H. (2013). Strategic HRM and organizational behavior: Integrating multiple levels of analysis. In J. Paauwe, D.E. Guest and P.M. Wright (eds.), *HRM & performance: Achievements & challenges*. Chichester: Wiley.

Center for International Human Resource Studies

The Center for International Human Resource Studies is an initiative of the School of Labor and Employment Relations at the Pennsylvania State University (USA), which aims to encourage IHRM scholarly research, and to serve the International HR practitioner community. Through targeted events, our goal is to develop a strong community of academics and practitioners passionate about international HRM, enabling the sharing of ideas to advance knowledge and practice in the field. The activities of the CIHRS are led by a core team of academics in the School of Labor and Employment Relations – Dr Elaine Farndale (Center Director), Dr Sumita Raghuram, Dr Helen Liu, Dr Jean Phillips, and Dr Stan Gully – supported by researchers and a network of CIHRS Fellows who are leading experts in the IHRM field from across the globe. CIHRS Fellows currently include: Ingmar Björkman (Aalto University, Finland), Chris Brewster (Henley Business School, UK), Paula Caligiuri (Northeastern University, USA), Lisbeth Claus (Willamette University, USA), Tony Edwards (Kings College London, UK), and Randall Schuler (Rutgers University, USA).