The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science

Organization Development and Change Interventions : A Seven-Nation Comparison

Ellen Fagenson-Eland, Ellen A. Ensher and W. Warner Burke

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

$SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

NTL
INSTITUTE

NTL Institute

Additional services and information for *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jab.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jab.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://jab.sagepub.com/content/40/4/432.refs.html

Organization Development and Change Interventions

A Seven-Nation Comparison

Ellen Fagenson-Eland
George Mason University

Ellen A. Ensher
Loyola Marymount University

W. Warner Burke
Columbia University

The present study compares differences in organization development (OD) interventions using Hofstede's (1980) four dimensions of culture as a framework for studying seven countries' practices. The seven countries examined were Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In general, Hofstede's theoretical approach proved to be a useful framework for comparing OD practices as the majority of the authors' hypotheses were, at a minimum, partially supported. However, when those hypotheses were not supported, some interesting patterns emerged that provide intriguing directions for future research.

Keywords: organization development and change; international management

Organization development (defined here broadly to include organizational change, which will be used synonymously with the term *organization development* in this arti-

432

cle) theories, interventions, and various approaches to managing change have proliferated, although at varying rates, to almost every geographic region around the world (Burke, 2002; Cummings & Worley, 2005; Sorenson, Head, Mathys, Preston, & Cooperrider, 1995). Several factors have spurred this international burgeoning of organization development (OD). For one, an increasing number of organizations have expanded to reach global market places, causing OD methodology to spread and be shared more extensively (L. A. Peterson, 1997; M. F Peterson et al., 1995). Global expansion has, in turn, generated complex and rapid growth of organizations. This growth has necessitated the need to manage change and thus has increased the utilization of OD (M. F. Peterson et al., 1995; Pettigrew, Woodman, & Cameron, 2001). In addition, a growth in the number, size, and sophistication of organizations in developing nations has provided additional arenas for OD practice (Golembiewski & Lau, 1994). Finally, the increasing availability of technological innovations and resources has enabled organizations to invest in the management of planned change and organizational effectiveness activities (Cummings & Worley, 2005). Given this globalization and the rapidly changing nature of business, this article will examine OD interventions from an international perspective. Although taking a global look at management issues is important, it is not often done. According to Werner and Brouthers (2002), only 5% of the leading management journals publish articles that use international samples.

OD's Roots

OD has its foundation in five major research stems beginning in the 1950s. Kurt Lewin and his colleagues played an instrumental role in the development of the first two stems of OD: laboratory training and action research/survey feedback (French & Bell, 1990). Rensis Likert is credited with the evolution of the third stem that relates to the human relations movement and application of participative management to improving organizational effectiveness (Burke, 1982). However, in the past three decades, OD in the United States has expanded its repertoire of techniques to include not only productivity and quality-of-work initiatives but also activities related to strategic change and organizational transformation (Fagenson & Burke, 1990; Preston, 1995). OD has been found to improve individual and group performance, to increase achievement of organizational goals, and has spread to almost all industries and sectors across the United States (Anderson, 2000; Church & Burke, 1995). Despite having its roots in U.S. and British management theory (Burke, 1982), OD is no longer a methodology used primarily in these countries (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Sorenson et al., 1995). Therefore, an understanding of how OD is used in various countries with emerging OD disciplines is important to study in order to gain a more broad-based and global perspective of the OD field (Lau & Ngo, 2001; Pettigrew et al., 2001).

Ellen Fagenson-Eland is a professor in the School of Management at George Mason University.

Ellen A. Ensher is an associate professor in the Hilton Center for Business at Loyola Marymount University.

W. Warner Burke is a professor and Edward Thorndike Chair of the Department of Organization and Leadership, Teachers College at Columbia University.

Culture and OD

Hofstede (1980, 1993, 1996, 1998), with his groundbreaking research on dimensions of culture, offered empirical evidence that demonstrated the importance of national culture on management practices and organizations (Hoppe, 2004). Hofstede defines culture as the collective programming of the mind. In his landmark study based on a sample of IBM employees in 40 different countries, Hofstede (1980) identified four unique dimensions of culture. These dimensions of culture are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and masculinity/femininity (each of these four dimensions will be described below). Hofstede's original methodology and instrument have been replicated numerous times by other researchers, and additional countries and measures have been added as appropriate (Hofstede, 2001). Subsequent researchers have found that there are distinct differences in individual behavior, values, and organizations based on national culture and have provided support for Hofstede's perspective (Bond, 1988; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Mitchell, Smith, Seawright, & Morse, 2000; Trompenaars, 1993). Similarly, researchers in OD have argued that these different patterns in the use of organizational change interventions across countries and geographic regions are to be expected because the practice of OD is tied to national culture (Brown, 1982; Golembiewski, 1993; Jaeger, 1986; Lau, 1996). Because different countries have different values, customs, and styles of interacting, the types of interventions OD practitioners employ are anticipated to vary with the cultures in which they are practiced (Kim & Hoon, 1998; Lau, 1996; Lau & Ngo, 2001; van Eijnatten & van der Zwaan 1998). Jaeger (1986) suggested that when deciding to practice a specific OD technique, consideration should be given to the cultural context; interventions that clash least with the deepest values of a culture should be chosen.

International OD

Although much has been written about the types of OD interventions that have been used by North American practitioners (Church, Burke, & Van Eynde, 1994; Fagenson & Burke, 1990), little research has explored OD practices used by practitioners in multiple countries in diverse geographic areas (Pettigrew et al., 2001). Numerous studies have examined OD practices in individual countries or regions (Coetsee, 1993; Gustavsen, 1987; Head, 1994; Lau, 1996; Lau & Ngo, 2001; Preston, 1995; Preston & DuToit, 1993), but few have compared OD practices across several countries or regions (Lau, McMahan, & Woodman, 1996; Pettigrew et al., 2001; Tregaskis, 1997). Moreover, the majority of the past cross-country comparison research in OD has been largely descriptive and atheoretical. The present study remedies these limitations by expanding our knowledge in two ways: (a) by demonstrating how Hofstede's cultural dimensions can be used to predict the likelihood of the usage of specific OD interventions and (b) by comparing differences in organizational change interventions between seven countries. This provides us with an integrated illustration of OD practice internationally.

As noted previously, seven countries were studied in this research. They were Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These countries were chosen for several reasons. First, we selected countries that represented diverse areas of the world and that were varied in their use of, and preference for, differing OD practices (Jaeger, 1986). For example, the United States and United Kingdom have a longer history in OD and are considerably more developed in their approach to OD than the other countries that are emerging in their OD practices (Sorenson et al., 1995). Second, we chose countries that represented a broad spectrum of Hofstede's cultural dimensions so that we could effectively draw comparisons between them (Hoppe, 2004; Jaeger, 1986). Third, we selected countries where local collaboration was available to ensure the accuracy of data collection and participant identification (Berry, 1996; Harpaz, 1996; Tavakoli, Keenan, & Crnjak-Karanovic, 2003).

OD Interventions and Approaches

Before venturing into an examination of OD practices on a multinational basis, it is helpful to consider the types of OD interventions practiced in general. Most of the research has been conducted on samples from the United States and Great Britain (Ogbor, 2000; L. A. Peterson, 1997; Pettigrew et al., 2001). In addition, several methods have been applied to identify the types of change interventions employed by U.S. practitioners including summaries of personal experiences of practitioners, records of requests from clients, an analysis of the content of publications about OD efforts, and surveys of practitioners (Fagenson & Burke, 1990; French & Bell, 1990; Sanzgiri & Gottlieb, 1992).

In the United States, there has been an emphasis on two basic types of OD change philosophies (Beer & Nohria, 2000): technostructural, which is based on work flow and task performance (Beer & Walton, 1990; Burke, 2002), and human processual, which is based on interpersonal and intergroup relationships (Beer & Walton, 1990; Burke, 2002). Other interventions frequently used in the United States include activities that help line managers to adapt new business strategies and establish long-term goals, interventions that help managers to adjust to changes brought about by new workplace technologies, and activities that help managers to assume new management practices that fit with foreign cultures and maximize productivity and profits (Fagenson & Burke, 1990). Furthermore, large-scale systems interventions (those targeting processes and structures that span an entire organization) have increased in use, as opposed to efforts focused on small groups, such as conflict management or localized team building (Burke, 2002; Church et al., 1994). Activities used less often include employee development (including career development, coaching, and the design of performance appraisal and reward systems), long-term culture change efforts, and integrating technology into the workplace (Burke, 2002; Fagenson & Burke, 1990).

In Western Europe, Kakabadse (1995) noted that OD in the United Kingdom has focused primarily on creating more humanistic environments through such activities

as team building and motivational programs. Research and practice in OD from the United States and the United Kingdom have formed the foundation for the practice of OD internationally (Cole, 1995). Since the first OD World Congress convened in 1978, international OD has moved away from simply transferring Western research and practice to other countries to developing its own unique approaches taking into account each country's own national culture.

Impact of National Culture on OD Interventions

OD intervention practices among the seven countries are predicted to vary systematically according to Hofstede's (1980, 1996, 1998, 2001) research on national culture. The placement of the seven countries examined in this study along the four dimensions of culture are based on Hofstede's (2001) index scores and are described below.

Power Distance

The first criterion, power distance, refers to the extent to which members of a society accept that power is distributed unequally in organizations (Hofstede, 1980). Organizations in cultures high in power distance tend to be highly centralized with several layers of hierarchy, and their nonmanagement employees are mostly from the lower classes (Hofstede, 1996). Organizations situated within cultures low in power distance have fewer management levels and tend to employ more participative and egalitarian decision-making methods (Harzing & Hofstede, 1996). Of all the countries examined in this study, South Africa has the highest degree of power distance in comparison to the other countries. Thus, on the basis of Hofstede's (1980) original data, we initially would have predicted that South Africa would be least likely to use group process activities.

However, the political and social structure of South Africa has undergone tremendous change in the last decade with the dissolution of apartheid. Since Nelson Mandela ascended to power in the early 1990s, the country has made concerted efforts to decrease the existing inequality between blacks and whites. Therefore, we suspected that the power distance score based on Hofstede's original data would no longer be entirely accurate. Recent researchers have found this supposition to be accurate. Thomas and Bendixen (2000) found that contrary to Hofstede's original findings, South Africa has a low power distance score, which would lead us to very different predictions. In fact, research reporting OD activities in South Africa mentioned that interventions were designed to manage resistance to political and organizational change simultaneously (Coetsee, 1993), and to combat the use of violence by teaching alternative problem-solving approaches (Preston & DuToit, 1993). Because of the efforts to reduce inequality and thus power distance, we now would predict that, compared with practitioners in other countries, South African OD practitioners would be more likely to use interventions designed to bridge differences and bring coworkers together, such as group process interventions.

Hypothesis 1: OD professionals in South Africa will be more likely to engage in group process activities than OD professionals in the other six comparison countries.

Uncertainty Avoidance

The second criterion, uncertainty avoidance, refers to the extent to which organizational members do not tolerate unpredictability and ambiguity (Hofstede, 1980). Finland is much higher in uncertainty avoidance than the other six countries examined, which will likely have an impact on its preferred OD practices. In fact, a study of OD activities in the Finnish health care system reported that the preferred OD methods included survey feedback, process consultation, and team and leadership development (Lindstrom, 1992). However, the author of that study noted that documentation was extremely lacking concerning the use of such interventions and implied that other interventions might be used more widely in Finland but just not reported. A more recent review of the literature revealed a dearth of research related to Finnish OD practices as well. However, lacking other data, we hold to our original supposition and make our predictions on Finnish OD practices based on its high-uncertainty-avoidance score.

People in high-uncertainty-avoidance cultures respect figures of authority (because they provide stability), are inclined to resist change, avoid conflict and risk taking, and abide by many formal rules (Hofstede, 1980). People in low-uncertainty-avoidance cultures tend to establish fewer rules and engage more in risk taking and participative decision making (Hofstede, 1980). Finland is high in uncertainty avoidance, which means that Finnish OD practitioners are likely to avoid interventions related to drastic change and ones that involve long periods of ambiguity such as cultural change or organizational structure interventions. Moreover, Finnish practitioners in their quest to achieve certainty and avoid ambiguity also may be more likely to use interventions related to strategic planning.

Due to its high-uncertainty-avoidance culture, Finnish managers are also likely to place an emphasis on rules, tangible results, a highly formalized conception of management, and to focus on hierarchical control and task orientation. Therefore, OD interventions that stress productivity, efficiency, and profitability such as management style interventions are more likely to be used by Finnish OD professionals than OD practitioners in other countries. Therefore, on the basis of Finland's high-uncertainty-avoidance score, we make the following prediction:

Hypothesis 2: OD professionals in Finland will be less likely to use the following OD interventions than OD practitioners in the other six comparison countries: (a) cultural change, (b) organizational structural change, (c) management style enhancement, and (d) strategic planning.

Individualism

The third criterion, individualism, refers to the extent to which people believe that they should be primarily responsible for themselves as opposed to the collective, such as an organization or community (Hofstede, 1980). Cultures high in individualism

promote personal initiative, competitiveness, achievement, and individual decision-making processes (Hofstede, 1996). Cultures relatively lower in individualism emphasize allegiance to one's own group (Hofstede, 1996).

All seven countries in this study were relatively high on individualism. Thus, we do not expect that OD professionals in any of the comparison countries would significantly differ in their use of interventions that promote individual advancement, such as performance appraisal and reward systems. Therefore, the following hypothesis is made based on this dimension:

> *Hypothesis 3:* There will be no significant differences between the use of interventions related to performance appraisal and rewards systems between any of the seven comparison countries.

Masculinity

The fourth criterion, masculinity, refers to the extent to which organizational members value assertiveness and the acquisition of power, material goods, and other resources (Hofstede, 1980). Organizations in highly masculine cultures value career advancement and salary growth and tend to have high levels of stress and conflict (Hofstede, 1998). Those in feminine cultures tend to value the social aspects of work and have lower levels of stress and conflict (Hofstede, 1998). Finland and the Netherlands were found to have low scores in masculinity in comparison with the other five countries examined.

Countries with high scores in masculinity such as the United States tend to place an emphasis on overall achievement, rapid advancement, and high earnings (Hofstede, 1998). For example, the emphasis in the United States placed on employees adding value, being responsible for their own careers, and being able to show a return on investment for their accomplishments (Bridges, 1997) epitomizes these highly masculine characteristics. Employees are exhorted to be continuous learners, and as a result, training and development is a 59 billion dollar industry in the United States (Noe, 1999). Also, in the United States and other high masculine countries, the emphasis is placed on one's work being central in one's life and living to work rather than working to live (Harzing & Hofstede, 1996). Thus, it is likely that countries high in masculinity would be more likely to use training and development and career development initiatives than countries low in masculinity such as Finland and the Netherlands. Because countries high in masculinity value challenge, recognition, and accomplishment, they may place more emphasis on interventions designed to increase team productivity such as team-building interventions than countries low in masculinity like the Netherlands and Finland. In addition, the use of technology is often associated more with highly masculine countries rather than feminine ones (Hofstede, 2001).

Thus, we would expect that countries higher in masculinity would have a greater use of OD interventions related to technology than countries that are high in femininity. Therefore, the following prediction is made:

> *Hypothesis 4:* Countries high in masculinity (United States, United Kingdom, New Zealand, South Africa, and Ireland) will be more likely to use the following OD interventions than countries low in

masculinity (Finland and the Netherlands): (a) training and development, (b) career development, (c) team building, and (d) technology integration.

METHOD

Sample

A broad sample of countries was sought for participation in this study. The procedures used to recruit study participants have been recommended and/or used in previous international research (Lau & Ngo, 2001; Punnett & Shenkar, 1996; Sikvakumar & Nakata, 2001; Spector et al., 2002). Participants consisted of OD practitioners providing consultation to their respective organizations. These internal OD practitioners (i.e., those who worked as employees for the organizations they served, as opposed to those who worked for a consulting firm or who had an independent practice and served a variety of organizations) were employed in companies located in Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Internal OD agents were the sole focus of this study. According to Burke (2002) and Plovnick, Fry, and Burke (1982), internal practitioners provide focused and accurate knowledge of OD interventions experienced by organizations. Internal agents are experts in a single firm's OD activities and, by definition, work exclusively within one (their own) country. External OD agents serve many organizations and may work outside their homeland. Countries selected for inclusion in this research were those that contained both internal OD practitioners and a local investigator who was willing and able to return the surveys in a timely, secure, and interpretable fashion to the authors. This method of international research is called the replication method. Investigator(s) who use this method devise and manage the research but are assisted by local collaborators (Harpaz, 1996; Tavakoli et al., 2003). This method has been used quite extensively in international research investigations (Harpaz, 1996; Tavakoli et al., 2003). For example, Jaeger (1986) employed this method when he conducted research on the practice of OD in five countries.

The local collaborators for this study included members of the Organization Development Division of the Academy of Management, the Empowering Work/Action Research Network of the Academy of Management, colleagues of individuals in this network, and/or colleagues of the authors (Mitchell et al., 2000; Spector et al., 2002). Each investigator was asked to identify OD practitioners in their countries and to distribute the surveys to them. According to Berry (1996), local collaborators are preferable to distant collaborators because they know the local traditions of their home country. Investigators in some countries, such as Finland, the Netherlands, and South Africa, had the additional responsibility of translating the surveys (when necessary) into their native languages and to retranslate the responses into English.

Investigators in all seven countries were asked to try to recruit approximately 70 internal OD consultants. In some countries, this was easier than others due to the total number of people who were internal OD professionals in that country. For example, the United States has many more internal OD professionals than Ireland, so that secur-

ing 70 responses in the United States was not problematic. Other countries were asked to participate but declined due to the unavailability of individuals who could be identified as true OD practitioners as assessed by OD experts (Evans, 1989). For example, a scholar in Turkey declined to provide assistance in data collection for the following reason: "Organization development in Turkey as a field for academics or practitioners is not as institutionalized as it is in the U.S. It would not be possible to find 10, let alone 70, internal OD practitioners." Similar problems were faced by scholars in France: "I cannot name any 'internal OD practitioners' operating in French companies," stated one French scholar who was asked for assistance.

To ensure that investigators were using the same criteria to select OD practitioners, the following definition was offered by the authors to the investigators: OD practitioners are individuals involved in helping organizations change using behavioral science principles and techniques. The investigators were also sent a list of definitions of OD practitioners by experts in the field of OD (Plovnick et al., 1982). In addition, investigators were given guidelines for the labels applied to individuals who work in this field (e.g., human resource managers, personnel administrators), as well as the varied titles of departments they work in (e.g., the organizational effectiveness department and the employee and industrial relations department).

Investigators were asked to recruit OD professionals from different industries and companies that varied in mission and size in order to ensure that the study would be about the usage of OD interventions in a particular country rather than OD in a couple of organizations in a particular country (Hoppe, 2004; Szabo et al. 2002). Data are available from the authors that describe each OD consultant's organization profile in terms of its size and industry type. We also conducted analyses within each country to assess the number of organizations that were of the same size and from the same industry. For example, in Finland, approximately 2.7% of practitioners worked in personnel firms, 10.7% worked in the government, 10.7% worked in real estate/insurance, 1.3% were in the education industry, 6.7% were in communications, 5.3% were in oil, 14.7 % were in finance/banking, 1.3% were in automotive, and so on. In terms of size, 1.4% of Finnish companies surveyed had 120 people working in them, 4% had 5,000 employees, 1.4% had 35,000 employees, and so on. This type of detailed company analysis for each company within a country is available upon request from the authors. We concluded from these analyses that the individuals distributing the surveys clearly followed our written instructions to distribute the surveys to "internal OD practitioners who are at different companies (i.e., they do not all work at one company)" and to recruit "as diverse a sample of OD consultants as possible" and *not* to survey "a single industry or just a few companies, as that would tell us more about what's happening in those companies/industries rather than in _____ " (the country was named).

Six hundred eighty-six surveys were returned to the investigators. Of these, 10 were discarded because the instructions were not correctly followed. Five hundred forty-seven surveys were completed by internal OD practitioners, the focus of the present research. Sample sizes varied from country to country. Twenty-two were collected from Ireland, 75 from Finland, 42 from the Netherlands, 79 from New Zealand, 51 from South Africa, 35 from the United Kingdom, and 243 from the United States.

These varying national sample sizes are not uncommon in international research, nor is a small sample size for a particular country due to the prevalence and availability of target respondents in that country (Fritzsche et al. 1995; Morris, Davis, & Allen, 1994; Naumov & Puffer, 2000; Tavakoli et al., 2003; http://www.ucalgary.ca/mg/GLOBE/Public/). A substantially larger U.S. sample also is quite common in comparative international research that investigates phenomena with origins in the United States (Fritzsche et al., 1995; Morris et al., 1994; Tavakoli et al., 2003).

Five hundred forty-one respondents (6 respondents did not indicate the industry they worked in) were employed in organizations in highly diverse industries including communications (4.3%), publishing/printing/graphics (1.3%), finance and banking (9.6%), data processing (9.1%), food (3.3%), government (12.2%), insurance and real estate (7.8%), sales/marketing (0.9%), automotive (1.5%), management consulting (1.7%), oil (2.4%), educational (4.1%), health care (10.7%), military (1.8%), personnel (1.8%), and other organizations (27.5%). Most companies surveyed were in the service sector (67.2%). The median number of employees per organization was 4,000, although organizations varied greatly in size. The median number of years that the OD practitioners were employed by their organizations was 5; the median number of years OD practitioners were employed in the field of OD was 10. Men comprised 60.4% of the sample, and 39.6% were women. The median age of the practitioners was 32 years.

Procedure

The OD practitioners who participated in this study were recruited through a variety of methods to complete the survey: at conferences where large numbers of OD consultants gathered, through the mail to members of OD organizations and associations, at workshops for OD practitioners, and through selected newsletters and colleague referrals. Investigators in each country used the recruitment method most appropriate for their population. This diversity of methods helped to reduce bias in the sample (Berry, 1996; Morris et al., 1994; Spector et al., 2002). However, given these varied methods, it is not possible in all cases to determine exactly how many internal OD practitioners actually saw or read the survey at a particular conference or in a particular newsletter, for example. Indeed, a researcher from France declined to participate in the study in part due to his concern that the method for identifying internal OD practitioners "is not a simple matter!" However, estimates of response rates were obtained from investigators, and they ranged from approximately 25% to 30% to 90% across the methods (e.g., approximately 90% for distribution to participants who attended a training session for OD consultants, approximately 25% for distribution at OD conferences, 30% for a newsletter distribution, etc.; Morris et al. 1994).

Each survey was accompanied by a cover letter that informed participants that the purpose of the study was to investigate the issues currently facing organizational change agents. According to the cover letter,

> While academicians know a great deal about the skills practitioners are told they should carry in their tool boxes, we know little about the extent to which they actually use these skills when called upon to engage in activities and interventions in their organizations. (Fagenson & Burke, 1990, p. 288)

Assurances of confidentiality and anonymity were conveyed in the letter. The investigators received follow-up letters that asked them to identify any problems they were having as well as any questions they needed answered—which we provided. We continually emphasized our goal to secure approximately 70 internal OD consultants for analysis purposes and suggested ways to do this. As the survey distributors were ethical scholars, we believed them when they wrote to us stating that they had secured as many responses as they could, which sometimes fell below our numerical goal.

Measures

The survey asked individuals to provide information about themselves, their organizations, and the interventions they engaged in. The items in the interventions and activities section that are the basis of this study were taken from Fagenson and Burke (1990). For each of the 55 OD interventions on the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate, using a scale of 0 (*not at all*) to 5 (*to a very great extent*), the degree to which they were currently using, have used, or had been involved in these interventions and activities in the last 3 years.

Background data were collected on the practitioner's sex, age, educational attainment, years in the field of OD/human resource management (HRM), the number of courses he or she completed in the field, whether the practitioner was an internal or external OD consultant, the number of years he or she worked in the organization, the organization type (e.g., financial, data processing, etc.), the sector in which the organization was situated (e.g., service or manufacturing), and the number of people in the organization.

Analysis

Factor analysis, scale reliabilities, and correlations. The 55 interventions and activities listed on the survey were analyzed using a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. The international, non-U.S. respondents (304) outnumbered the U.S. respondents (243). A factor analysis that combined the two samples was used in this study (Darlington, 2004; Punnett & Shenkar, 1996). Darlington (2004) recommended comparing the eigenvalue means for subsamples in order to determine whether subsamples should be combined. Samples should not be combined if the means of the eigenvalues are quite different (Darlington, 2004). The results of this analysis provided great support for combining the samples as the eigenvalue means for the two samples were quite similar (U.S. eigenvalue mean = 2.6, international eigenvalue mean = 2.8).

Eleven factors emerged from the factor analysis. Each contained at least two items and had eigenvalues greater than one. These factors accounted for 61.1% of the item variance. Those items that loaded highest on each factor (.40 and above) and did not load over .40 on more than one factor were included as part of a factor. The factors that emerged had face validity and were consistent with Fagenson and Burke's (1990) factors. Scales were subsequently constructed from each of these factors. Scale scores were computed by adding the responses for each item in the scale together and divid-

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Team building	2.97	0.97		.41***	.57***	.37***	.21***	.20***	.35***	.29***
2. Strategic planning	2.42	1.17			.54***	.41***	.48***	.37***	.31***	.37***
3. Organizational structural change	2.52	1.12				.45***	.24***	.29***	.29***	.24***
4. Management style enhancement	2.42	1.21					.27***	.27***	.36***	.27***
5. Technology integration	2.02	1.36						.25***	.19***	.33***
6. Career planning activities	2.2	1.22							.30***	.35***
7. Training and development	3.18	1.12								.46***
8. Performance appraisal and reward systems	2.55	1.22								
9. Cultural change	2.17	1.14								
10. Group process activities	0.53	0.86								
11. Sex	0.40	0.49								
12. Years in current organization	8.31	7.68								
13. Number of employees	16,992.13	35,017.84								
14. Organization sector	0.33	0.47								
15. Years practiced in OD/HRM field	10.54	6.73								
16. Degree	3.72	0.54								
17. Number of courses in OD/HRM	4.00	5.49								
18. Age	41.58	8.19								

Variable	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Team building	.56***	.37***	.08	-.06	-.03	.04	.03	.07	.15**	.02
2. Strategic planning	.52***	.23***	-.04	.01	-.04	-.10*	.07	.04	.06	.04
3. Organizational structural change	.55***	.32***	-.08	.03	.10*	.02	.12**	.05	.20***	.03
4. Management style enhancement	.40***	.15**	-.09*	.02	.10*	.14**	.04	.04	.07	-.01

(continued)

443

TABLE 1 (continued)

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. Technology integration	.38***	.04	-.01	-.01	-.11*	-.07	.09*	-.06	-.00	.07
6. Career planning activities	.35***	.14**	-.04	.00	-.08	.15**	.03	.05	.00	-.04
7. Training and development	.34***	.13**	.10*	-.07	-.05	.00	.01	.21***	.04	-.06
8. Performance appraisal and reward systems	.43***	.06	.09*	-.09*	-.15**	-.01	.06	.03	.01	-.01
9. Cultural change		.32***	.04	.00	.01	.02	.13**	.02	.06	.01
10. Group process activities			-.11*	.05	-.01	.00	.03	.01	.14**	-.00
11. Sex				-.29***	-.04	-1.7***	-.21***	.03	-.03	-.31***
12. Years in current organization					.10*	.07	.18***	-.16***	.07	.44****
13. Number of employees						.20***	.12**	.04	.02	.06
14. Organization sector							.07	.07	-.02	.06
15. Years practiced in OD/HRM field								-.04	.10*	.53***
16. Degree									.06	-.09
17. Number of courses in OD/HRM										.10*
18. Age										

NOTE: OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management. Average *N* = 532. Team building, strategic planning, organizational structural change, management style enhancement, technology integration, career-planning activities, training and development, performance appraisal and reward systems redesign, cultural change, and group process activities: 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *to a small extent*, 2 = *to some extent*, 3 = *to a moderate extent*, 4 = *to a great extent*, 5 = *to a very great extent*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*, 3 = *college*, 4 = *graduate school*.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

ing the total by the number of items in the scale. Only scales with reliabilities higher than .60 were used in subsequent analyses. The items composing these scales, their factor loadings, and individual scale alphas are available from the authors. The means, standard deviations, and correlations for these scales are presented in Table 1.

Regressions. Two-step hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. As a control measure, all background variables that were found to vary significantly with either the intervention measures and/or a particular country (these analyses are available upon request from the authors) were entered in Step 1. In Step 2, the seven different countries included in the study were entered. Comparisons of each country with one another on each of the intervention measures were conducted using a dummy coding procedure. Each country was dummy coded as 1, and the comparison country was coded as 0 (Hardy, 1993). Thus, the regression for each intervention scale was run seven times. The results of these analyses are shown in Tables 2-10.

Only the country comparisons that were significant in Step 2 are reported (the nonsignificant findings are available upon request from the authors).

RESULTS

Power Distance Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1 predicted that OD professionals in South Africa would be more likely to engage in group process interventions than OD professionals in the other six countries. This was well supported as South African OD practitioners were more likely to use group process interventions than their counterparts in Finland, the United States, Ireland, New Zealand, and the Netherlands. The country that was more likely than South Africa to use group process activities was the United Kingdom (see Table 2).

Uncertainty Avoidance Hypotheses

Hypothesis 2 predicted that Finnish OD professionals would be less likely to use the following OD interventions than their counterparts in each of the other six comparison countries: (a) cultural change, (b) organizational structural change, (c) management style enhancement, and (d) strategic planning. This hypothesis received some support (see Tables 3, 4, and 5). Specifically, as shown in Table 3 and in support of Hypothesis 2a, Finnish OD professionals were found to use significantly less cultural change interventions than their counterparts in four of the countries including New Zealand, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and the United States. There were, however, no significant differences found in the usage of cultural change interventions between Finnish OD practitioners and their counterparts in Ireland or the Netherlands.

Hypothesis 2b predicted that Finnish OD professionals would be less likely to use organizational structural change interventions than their counterparts in each of the six comparison countries. This hypothesis was not supported as there were no significant differences found between any of the countries for this intervention.

TABLE 2
Results of Regression Analysis for Group Process Activities

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.04	.02	2.09*		
Age	−.17*					
Organization sector	−.04					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.14**					
Degree	−.03					
Number of employees	−.03					
Sex	−.10					
Years in current organization	.07					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.10					
Step 2[a]		.09	.05	2.51**	.04	3.00**
South Africa[b]	.27***					
South Africa[c]	.19***					
South Africa[d]	.26**					
South Africa[f]	.18**					
South Africa[g]	.22**					
Ireland[h]	−.15**					
New Zealand[h]	−.20**					
Finland[h]	−.33***					
The Netherlands[h]	−.19**					
United States[h]	−.33***					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Hypotheses 2c and 2d predicted that Finnish OD practitioners would be more likely to use management style enhancement and strategic planning interventions, respectively, than their counterparts in each of the six comparison countries. These hypotheses were not well supported. Finnish OD professionals were not significantly more likely to use management style enhancement interventions (see Table 4) or strategic planning interventions (see Table 5) than any of the comparison countries with the exception of the Netherlands.

TABLE 3
Results of Regression Analysis for Cultural Change

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.06	.04	2.93**		
Age	−.15*					
Organization sector	.07					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.07					
Degree	.03					
Number of employees	−.02					
Sex	.11*					
Years in current organization	.05					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.24***					
Step 2[a]		.14	.10	4.26***	.08	5.74***
New Zealand[b]	.31***					
United Kingdom[b]	.18**					
South Africa[b]	.19**					
United States[b]	.29***					
New Zealand[c]	.13*					
Finland[c]	−.21***					
The Netherlands[c]	−.13*					
Finland[e]	−.27**					
The Netherlands[e]	−.18*					
Finland[f]	−.35***					
The Netherlands[f]	−.24***					
United States[f]	−.19*					
New Zealand[g]	.29***					
United Kingdom[g]	.16*					
South Africa[g]	.16*					
United States[g]	.25*					
Finland[h]	−.22**					
The Netherlands[h]	−.15*					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

TABLE 4
Results of Regression Analysis for Management Style Enhancement

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.05	.03	2.44*		
Age	−.12					
Organization sector	.12*					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.09					
Degree	.02					
Number of employees	.07					
Sex	−.09					
Years in current organization	.05					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.06					
Step 2[a]		.07	.03	1.86*	.02	1.09
The Netherlands[b]	−.14*					
Finland[g]	.19*					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*$p < .05$.

Individualism Hypothesis

Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be no significant differences in the use of interventions related to performance appraisal and rewards systems for any of the seven comparison countries. This hypothesis was not well supported. In fact, some interesting patterns of difference emerged. In general, the Netherlands and South Africa used performance appraisal and rewards systems interventions significantly less than their counterparts in most of the other countries. Specifically, the Netherlands used these types of interventions significantly less than OD practitioners in Ireland, New Zealand, Finland, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and the United States. A similar pattern of findings was discovered for South Africa, as South African practitioners used these types of interventions significantly less than those in New Zealand, Finland, and the United States (see Table 6).

TABLE 5
Results of Regression Analysis for Strategic Planning

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.03	.01	1.44		
Age	−.04					
Organization sector	−.08					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.05					
Degree	.04					
Number of employees	−.04					
Sex	−.00					
Years in current organization	.02					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.15*					
Step 2[a]		.09	.05	2.51**	.06	3.84**
The Netherlands[b]	−.14*					
Ireland[c]	.11*					
New Zealand[c]	.20***					
United States[d]	−.32*					
The Netherlands[d]	−.25**					
The Netherlands[f]	−.24***					
South Africa[f]	−.17*					
United States[f]	−.30***					
Ireland[g]	.16**					
New Zealand[g]	.29***					
Finland[g]	.19*					
New Zealand[h]	.18*					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Masculinity Hypotheses

Hypothesis 4 predicted that OD practitioners in the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, South Africa, and Ireland would be more likely to use the following OD interventions than practitioners in Finland and the Netherlands: (a) training and development, (b) career planning, (c) team building, and (d) technology integra-

TABLE 6
Results of Regression Analysis for Performance
Appraisal and Reward Systems Redesign

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.05	.03	2.74**		
Age	.04					
Organization sector	.05					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.02					
Degree	.04					
Number of employees	−.16**					
Sex	.12*					
Years in current organization	−.07					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.12*					
Step 2[a]		.17	.14	5.65***	.12	9.07***
The Netherlands[b]	−.33***					
South Africa[b]	−.15*					
New Zealand[c]	.10*					
The Netherlands[c]	−.32***					
South Africa[c]	−.14*					
The Netherlands[d]	−.31***					
The Netherlands[e]	−.28***					
The Netherlands[f]	−.41***					
South Africa[f]	−.24***					
United States[f]	−.16*					
Ireland[g]	.20***					
New Zealand[g]	.50***					
Finland[g]	.45***					
United Kingdom[g]	.25***					
South Africa[g]	.22**					
United States[g]	.61***					
New Zealand[h]	.26***					
Finland[h]	.18*					
The Netherlands[h]	−.20**					
United States[h]	.23*					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

TABLE 7
Results of Regression Analysis for Training and Development

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.06	.04	3.09**		
Age	.00					
Organization sector	.02					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.03					
Degree	.20***					
Number of employees	−.08					
Sex	.10					
Years in current organization	.01					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.06					
Step 2[a]		.15	.12	4.71***	.09	6.52***
The Netherlands[b]	−.31***					
The Netherlands[c]	−.31***					
The Netherlands[d]	−.37***					
The Netherlands[e]	−.25***					
The Netherlands[f]	−.23***					
Ireland[g]	.24***					
New Zealand[g]	.28***					
Finland[g]	.42***					
United Kingdom[g]	.22***					
South Africa[g]	.26***					
United States[g]	.59***					
The Netherlands[h]	−.23***					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
**p < .01. ***p < .001.

tion. Hypothesis 4a was supported (see Table 7). Hypothesis 4b was partially supported as the Netherlands, but not Finland, was found to use career-planning interventions significantly less than the comparison countries (see Table 8). Hypothesis 4c was partially supported as OD practitioners in the United States and the United Kingdom were significantly more likely to use team building than their counterparts in the Netherlands and Finland (see Table 9). As shown in Table 10, Hypothesis 4d was partially

<div align="center">

TABLE 8
Results of Regression Analysis for Career-Planning Activities

</div>

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.06	.04	2.95**		
Age	−.12					
Organization sector	.19***					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	−.01					
Degree	.04					
Number of employees	−.14**					
Sex	.03					
Years in current organization	.10					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.11					
Step 2[a]		.12	.08	3.50***	.06	4.05***
United Kingdom[b]	−.17**					
The Netherlands[b]	−.21**					
United States[b]	−.28***					
Finland[c]	.20***					
South Africa[c]	.15**					
Finland[e]	.26**					
South Africa[e]	.20*					
The Netherlands[f]	−.13*					
New Zealand[g]	.16*					
Finland[g]	.28**					
South Africa[g]	.22**					
United Kingdom[h]	−.16*					
The Netherlands[h]	−.20**					
United States[h]	−.26**					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

supported. OD practitioners in New Zealand and the United States were more likely to use technology integration interventions than OD practitioners in Finland. In addition, OD practitioners in New Zealand were also more likely to use technology integration interventions than practitioners in the Netherlands.

TABLE 9
Results of Regression Analysis for Team Building

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.05	.03	2.50*		
Age	.02					
Organization sector	.07					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.14**					
Degree	.01					
Number of employees	−.10					
Sex	.11*					
Years in current organization	−.03					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.10					
Step 2[a]		.09	.06	2.76***	.04	2.99**
United Kingdom[b]	.14*					
United States[b]	.17*					
Finland[c]	−.12*					
The Netherlands[c]	−.18**					
Finland[e]	−.21*					
The Netherlands[e]	−.25**					
United Kingdom[g]	.22**					
United States[g]	.34**					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = l, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

DISCUSSION

This study examined how Hofstede's four dimensions of national culture could be used to predict the usage of specific OD interventions among seven different countries. Descriptive statistics for the seven countries are presented in Table 11. In general, Hofstede's theoretical approach proved to be a useful framework to compare OD practices as the majority of our hypotheses were at least partially supported. However, when those hypotheses were not supported, some interesting patterns emerged.

TABLE 10
Results of Regression Analysis for Technology Integration

Variable	β	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1		.04	.02	2.12*		
Age	.09					
Organization sector	−.02					
Number of courses in OD/HRM	.01					
Degree	−.03					
Number of employees	−.13*					
Sex	.02					
Years in current organization	−.06					
Years practiced in OD/HRM field	.11					
Step 2[a]		.10	.07	3.05***	.06	4.16***
New Zealand[b]	.21**					
United States[b]	.28***					
Finland[c]	−.20***					
South Africa[c]	−.15**					
New Zealand[e]	.18*					
Finland[f]	−.24***					
United Kingdom[f]	−.13*					
The Netherlands[f]	−.13*					
South Africa[f]	−.19**					
New Zealand[g]	.16*					
New Zealand[h]	.20**					
United States[h]	.26**					

NOTE: Organization sector: 0 = service sector, 1 = manufacturing sector. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*; 3 = *college*; 4 = *graduate school*. Sex: 0 = male, 1 = female. OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management.
a. Only significant findings are reported.
b. Country = six dummy variables. Finland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Finland = 0).
c. Country = six dummy variables. United States is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, USA = 0).
d. Country = six dummy variables. Ireland is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, Ireland = 0).
e. Country = six dummy variables. United Kingdom is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, United Kingdom = 0).
f. Country = six dummy variables. New Zealand is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, New Zealand = 0).
g. Country = six dummy variables. The Netherlands is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, the Netherlands = 0).
h. Country = six dummy variables. South Africa is not represented to avoid redundancy (each dummy = 1, South Africa = 0).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Power Distance

Our hypothesis for the dimension of power distance centered primarily on South Africa in comparison with the six other countries, because in Hofstede's original data collection, the results showed that South Africa was distinctly higher on the power distance dimension than the other six countries. This difference between South Africa

TABLE 11
Descriptive Characteristics for All Countries for the Study Variables

Variable	Finland		United States		Ireland		United Kingdom	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Team building	2.81	0.84	3.18	0.92	2.73	1.06	3.06	1.10
2. Strategic planning	2.52	1.05	2.25	1.15	2.90	1.32	2.42	1.09
3. Organizational structure change	2.76	0.90	2.44	1.12	2.47	1.07	2.85	1.34
4. Management style enhancement	2.66	1.17	2.35	1.21	2.80	1.05	2.73	1.22
5. Technology integration	1.50	1.13	2.21	1.37	2.53	1.58	1.50	1.07
6. Career planning activities	2.72	1.25	2.04	1.18	2.59	1.13	1.90	1.32
7. Training and development	3.39	1.07	3.38	1.00	3.47	1.05	2.98	1.25
8. Performance appraisal and reward systems	2.69	1.02	2.72	1.11	2.73	1.32	2.02	1.40
9. Cultural change	1.53	0.95	2.31	1.09	2.24	1.23	2.38	1.16
10. Group process	0.35	0.56	0.52	0.89	0.38	0.58	0.53	0.82
11. Sex	0.35	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.18	0.39	0.34	0.48
12. Years in current organization	9.35	7.75	7.83	6.63	13.27	9.31	7.60	7.90
13. Number of employees	8,702.56	10,432.19	15,478.42	31,347.55	21,574.00	38,283.51	62,903.16	60,169.39
14. Organization sector	0.39	0.49	0.36	0.48	0.53	0.51	0.74	0.44
15. Years practiced in OD/HRM	10.09	6.93	11.34	6.49	8.85	5.11	10.97	7.26
16. Degree	3.89	0.36	3.75	0.45	3.62	0.80	3.76	0.61
17. Number of courses in OD/HRM	6.44	9.83	4.23	4.93	3.64	3.89	2.71	3.78
18. Age	43.16	8.18	42.54	7.76	39.38	7.54	42.12	7.20

(continued)

455

TABLE 11 (continued)

	New Zealand		The Netherlands		South Africa	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Team building	2.83	0.97	2.39	1.00	2.98	1.00
2. Strategic planning	3.02	1.13	1.92	0.88	2.37	1.29
3. Organizational structure change	2.35	1.08	2.53	0.95	2.58	1.38
4. Management style enhancement	2.27	1.19	2.06	1.36	2.59	1.06
5. Technology integration	2.52	1.30	1.67	1.23	1.58	1.34
6. Career planning activities	2.24	1.11	1.73	1.22	2.55	1.17
7. Training and development	3.05	1.05	1.89	1.13	3.17	1.05
8. Performance appraisal and reward systems	3.13	1.12	1.24	1.08	1.99	1.07
9. Cultural change	2.50	1.10	1.58	1.00	2.25	1.22
10. Group process	0.43	0.80	0.49	0.82	1.05	1.18
11. Sex	0.47	0.50	0.05	0.22	0.27	0.45
12. Years in current organization	7.17	8.05	12.10	10.18	5.94	6.57
13. Number of employees	5,091.90	14,896.57	25,850.20	57,810.34	15,499.91	21,328.58
14. Organization sector	0.06	0.23	0.26	0.45	0.18	0.39
15. Years practiced in OD/HRM	8.74	6.40	15.68	6.52	6.29	4.82
16. Degree	3.60	0.79	3.26	0.45	3.96	0.28
17. Number of courses in OD/HRM	2.11	3.19	3.39	3.69	3.49	2.70
18. Age	40.33	7.07	47.39	6.78	32.50	6.19

NOTE: OD/HRM = organization development/human resource management. Team building, strategic planning, organizational structural change, management style enhancement, technology integration, career-planning activities, training and development, performance and reward systems redesign, cultural change, and group process activities: 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *to a small extent*, 2 = *to some extent*, 3 = *to a moderate extent*, 4 = *to a great extent*, 5 = *to a very great extent*. Sex: 0 = *male*, 1 = *female*. Organization sector: 0 = *service sector*, 1 = *manufacturing sector*. Degree: 1 = *elementary school*, 2 = *high school*, 3 = *college*, 4 = *graduate school*.

456

and the others would logically lead us to the prediction that South African OD practitioners would be less likely to use conflict reduction activities than their counterparts in the other six countries.

Instead, we predicted the opposite. More recent research on South Africa's power dimension index found that South Africa's power dimension index is now dramatically lower than it had been before (Thomas & Bendixen, 2000). This latest empirical finding, coupled with the current social and political situation in South Africa, led us to predict that South African OD practitioners would be more likely than their counterparts in other countries to focus on helping groups of employees work together effectively by relying on group process interventions. This was found to be true with the exception of the United Kingdom. This lack of significant difference between South Africa and the United Kingdom may be explained by the very strong British influence that exists among South African managers and thus OD practitioners. The majority of the decision makers in South African organizations tend to be mature white men who were educated and acculturated under strong British influence, so perhaps British values infiltrated South Africa, thus influencing OD practices (Thomas & Bendixen, 2000).

The findings related to power distance highlight two important aspects of conducting theory-based cross-cultural research such as this. First, it is important to consider the evolving nature of the political and economic climate because it may have important implications for dimensions of culture such as power distance (Scott, 1995). Second, as borders become increasingly more permeable and globalization leads to greater homogeneity in business, it is important to consider not only the unique national culture but also the overlay of influence wrought by other countries via an importation of education, products, systems, and ultimately—values.

Uncertainty Avoidance

The hypotheses related to uncertainty avoidance revealed some interesting findings. As predicted, due to Finland's high-uncertainty-avoidance score and thus its people's aversion to change, we found that Finnish OD professionals were less likely to use cultural change interventions than their counterparts in New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. However, contrary to our predictions, there were no differences found between Finland and the Netherlands or Ireland on the usage of cultural change interventions.

Perhaps these findings can best be understood by a closer examination of the measures used. Managing a cultural change intervention involves high-level OD competencies and typically takes several years for full implementation (Worley, Hitchin, & Ross, 1996). The three countries in which there were no differences on the cultural change interventions variables are less established in their OD practices than the other four countries (Golembiewski & Lau, 1994; Lau, 1996). Thus, it seems likely that Finland as well as the Netherlands and Ireland would engage in less activities of this nature than the other four countries. As Finland, the Netherlands, and Ireland mature in their OD practices, it would be interesting to conduct a follow-up study to determine if these countries increase their use of cultural interventions.

Individualism

This was the only dimension in which all of the seven countries were similar to one another, as all of them were high in individualism. Thus, consistent with Hofstede's model, we predicted that there would be no differences on the OD intervention that would seem most consistent with high individualism such as performance appraisal and rewards systems redesign. Contrary to predictions, however, some interesting differences were found. Practitioners in the Netherlands and South Africa were significantly less likely than those in other countries to use performance appraisal and reward systems interventions.

We can speculate that perhaps there is another dimension, communalism, that may explain this seemingly anomalous finding at least for South Africa. Thomas and Bendixen (2000) surveyed 586 managers using Hofstede's (1980) VSM94 instrument to assess dimensions of culture. As noted earlier, these authors found differences between Hofstede's original findings and their own more recent results. Specifically, they found a much higher score in individualism than what was reported by Hofstede's original data. These authors speculate that perhaps another dimension related to values of black African collectivism, which was not adequately captured by this instrument, is relevant (Boon, 1996; Schneier & Bendixen, 1997; Senghor, 1965; Shutte, 1993). Thomas and Bendixen (2000) suggested that communalism, collectivism, and individualism should be seen as distinct elements that coexist in cultures and should be investigated more thoroughly in future research.

The finding for the Netherlands for rewards and performance appraisal may be explained by probing more deeply into the unique culture of the Netherlands. The Netherlands enjoys relatively low unemployment and a fairly placid labor environment with few strikes; further, surveys reveal a generally satisfied citizenry (Bolt, 1995). In addition, organizations are dominated by men, and the social structure between classes is very distinct (Janin, 2000). Therefore, interventions that rely on performance appraisal and reward systems interventions where managers are required to give developmental feedback may be less necessary in a society where there is high demographic homogeneity and where roles and expectations of individuals in distinct social classes and work positions are very well defined. Instead, managers may be more likely to rely on informal systems of feedback and well-defined social sanctions and norms.

Masculinity

As predicted, we found that OD practitioners in the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, South Africa, and Ireland, because of their high scores on the masculinity index, were more likely to use training and development and career development initiatives than practitioners in low-masculine countries such as Finland and the Netherlands. We found this prediction to be true for the Netherlands, but not for Finland. This is an important finding as it suggests that OD practitioners working in countries with a high-masculinity score should carefully consider using both training and career development initiatives.

We also looked at a third variable that we felt reflected the values of a highly masculine culture—team building. Again, we predicted that OD practitioners in the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, South Africa, and Ireland would be more likely to use team-building initiatives than practitioners in Finland and the Netherlands. We found this to be true for OD practitioners in the United States and the United Kingdom in comparison with the Netherlands and Finland, but it was not found to be true for New Zealand, South Africa, or Ireland. We speculate that perhaps these findings may be due to the unique sociopolitical aspects present in each of the various cultures (Scott, 1995). For example, the United States and the United Kingdom are both very culturally diverse, and although they certainly experience strife due to cultural diversity, there are many laws and a societal norm in place that guard against discrimination (Fagenson, 1993). In comparison, South Africa, with its recent history of apartheid and conflict between blacks and whites; Ireland, with its long history of conflict between Catholics and Protestants; and New Zealand, with its burgeoning conflict over its past treatment and relations with its indigenous people, all have experienced entrenched conflict with specific groups. In comparison, although the United States and the United Kingdom certainly have their share of problems, the conflict between specific groups is not as extreme (Boon, 1996; Coetsee, 1993; Head, 1994; Lewis & Cave, 2002; Preston, 1995). Therefore, OD practitioners in the United States and the United Kingdom may be more willing to broach team-building sessions more openly than practitioners working in countries where conflict is so pervasive and deadly that it would be difficult to build a team.

Finally, we examined a fourth masculinity variable, the use of technology integration interventions. In support of our hypothesis, we found that OD practitioners in the United States and New Zealand were more likely to use technology integration interventions than those in Finland. New Zealanders were also more likely to use technology integration interventions than OD practitioners in the Netherlands. It is curious, however, that we found that neither the United Kingdom nor South Africa were more likely to use technology integration interventions than OD practitioners in Finland and the Netherlands. The pattern of findings may be explained by examining the use of technology overall. The United States is a world leader in technological interventions, and the integration of technology into every aspect of business is thriving (Cummings & Worley, 2005). Although organizational decision makers in the United Kingdom and South Africa are also savvy purveyors of technology, they may be more bound by tradition than the United States (Boon, 1996; Coetsee, 1993; Kakabadse, 1995). As for New Zealand, this country is an avid consumer and developer of new technology, and thus, its OD practitioners might be particularly enamored of technology interventions (Lewis & Cave, 2002).

Limitations

Although this study strongly supports the importance of considering national dimensions of culture when prescribing specific OD interventions, it is not without its limitations. Before discussing the main conclusions of the findings overall, some caveats should be mentioned. First, this study relied on the reports of internal OD prac-

titioners exclusively (Fagenson & Burke, 1990). External OD practitioners often engage in somewhat different projects and interventions than internal consultants, and thus, their reports might yield different findings (McMahan & Woodman, 1992). The internal OD practitioners in this study were, however, experienced professionals who had an average of 10½ years of experience in the field and 8 years of experience in their current organizations.

Second, the number of completed surveys varied between countries. Although the number of respondents was lower for some countries, it should be noted that each respondent was providing information about an entire organization's OD activities. Moreover, these interventions affected a multitude of people in a variety of different firms.

Third, this study gathered data from seven organizations, covered four continents, represented a cross section of countries with both emerging and more established approaches to OD, and represented various aspects of Hofstede's national dimensions of culture. A broader sample of participating countries, although difficult to obtain (Pettigrew et al., 2001), would likely provide more robust findings and increase the generalizability of these results. However, because this study is the first to provide a multicountry, cross-cultural comparison of OD interventions within the framework of national culture, the results provide a valuable introductory analysis (Sikvakumar & Nakata, 2001). The countries in this study were representative of three clusters in the GLOBE study (e.g., the Germanic Europe cluster—the Netherlands; the Nordic Europe cluster—Finland; the Anglo cluster—England, Ireland, South Africa, United States, New Zealand; http://www.ucalgary.ca/mg/GLOBE/Public/).

Fourth, future research should also examine interventions that were not investigated in the current study such as six sigma initiatives, that is, improving the quality of products and/or services (Burke, 2002), to further expand our understanding of intervention usage internationally.

One final point regarding interventions for further study: Planned organizational change is typically conducted in a linear fashion with Phase (or Stage) 1 followed by Phase 2, by Phase 3, and so on (Burke, 2002). Yet, the way organization change actually occurs in organizations is often anything but linear because much of the management of the change process is a matter of dealing with unanticipated consequences of the interventions (Burke, 2002; Cummings & Worley, 2004; Pascale, Millemann, & Gioja, 2000). Therefore, in the future, it might be fruitful to study the consequences of interventions rather than the interventions themselves. With these points in mind, we pose the following conclusions and issues for consideration.

Implications and Conclusions

Specific economic and political situations may have spurred OD efforts in many of the countries we studied with emerging OD practices (Scott, 1995). There is a strong possibility that these factors also play a role in the choice of interventions in other countries. Therefore, it is important to note that the use of specific OD interventions could be influenced not only by dimensions of national culture but also by an organization's culture or even the interaction between national and organizational culture (Lau

& Ngo, 2001). In addition, it is impossible to obtain data on an entire country or culture (Harpaz, 1996). Instead, samples are used to make inferences about nations and culture regarding a targeted population (Harpaz, 1996). Future research should explore the concurrent influences of national culture, economics, politics, organizational culture, and other factors in decision-making processes regarding OD interventions and determine whether some of these factors are more influential than others.

Most important, though, we need to look at the implication of the findings reported in this study for the practice of OD in general. In a sense, the results of this study underscore the importance of examining OD cross-culturally. In some cases, we found that specific interventions did not travel well across cultures. A recent study by Yang (2002) illustrates this point. Yang showed that multirater feedback as practiced in the United States is not embraced in Taiwan. The cultural value of "saving face" is simply more powerful than the value of receiving feedback from subordinates. The standard OD intervention, team building, should work in this more collective society, but not if the process included feedback to the team leader. If team building focused primarily on the group as a whole, team building, as practiced in the United States, might work in Taiwan and other parts of the world that are more collective than individual. Furthermore, the United States' versions of conflict resolution, which condones direct confrontation, does not work in Japan where a third party functions as a "go-between" on behalf of the two conflicting parties (Burke, 2002). As interesting as these findings of cultural differences are, it is important to note, however, that there were also a number of important similarities found among the types of OD interventions used by our cross-cultural participants. In fact, when working cross-culturally, it may be that we should focus more on values than on interventions per se.

Culture by definition concerns values (Hofstede, 1980). If OD is to travel around the world, then the values that underlie the field should be examined more carefully. Still, we first need to determine whether it is safe to assume that wherever OD is conducted, practitioners deeply believe in, for example (Burke, 2002), (a) involving people in decisions that directly affect them, (b) confronting the constant tension between individual needs and the goals of the group and organizations, and that (c) organizational members have the right to be informed and communicated with in an open and honest manner. If these and other OD values can travel internationally, then the specificity of an intervention is not all that important. What is important then is to shape the intervention into any form that makes sense for the local culture as long as OD values are recognized and manifested (Head & Sorenson, 1993). But how much do OD values reflect U.S. values (e.g., transparency, open communication), and how transcultural are they (Harzing & Hofstede, 1996)? Rather than use the well-worn phrase, "More research is needed," let us simply pledge to continue this kind of exploration and inquiry.

In conclusion, this study is unique as it provides a comprehensive, theoretically based, cross-cultural comparison of OD practices between countries both with well-established OD practices and ones with an emerging OD discipline. The current research suggests that OD practitioners should carefully consider dimensions of national culture when recommending specific OD interventions, particularly for their global clients. Indeed, expatriate OD practitioners would be well-advised to partner

with local OD practitioners who can serve as advisers to inform them of often over-looked and unique dimensions of national culture.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. (2000). *Fast cycle organization development*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*, 133-141.

Beer, M., & Walton, A. E. (1990). Developing the competitive organization: Intervention and strategies. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 154-161.

Berry, M. (1996). From American standard to cross cultural dialogues. In B. J. Punkett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), *Handbook of International Management Research* (pp. 463-482). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Bolt, R. (1995). *The xenophobe's guide to the Dutch.* Horsham, UK: Ravette Books.

Bond, M. H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 1009-1015.

Boon, M. (1996). *The African way: The power of interactive leadership*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Zebra.

Bridges, W. (1997). *Creating You and Co.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brown, L. (1982, Winter). Is organization development culture bound? *Academy of Management Newsletter*.

Burke, W. W. (1982). *Organization development: Principles and practices*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Burke, W. W. (2002). *Organization change: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chinese Cultural Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *18*, 143-164.

Church, A. H., & Burke, W. W. (1995). Practitioner attitudes about the field of organization development. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research and organizational change and development* (Vol. 8, pp. 1-46). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Church, A. H., Burke, W. W., & Van Eynde, D. F. (1994). Values, motives, and interventions of organization development practitioners. *Group & Organization Management*, *19*, 5-50.

Coetsee, L. (1993). A practical model for the management of resistance to change: An analysis of political resistance in South Africa. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *16*, 1815-1837.

Cole, D. W., RODC. (1995). The future of international organization development. In P. F. Sorensen, RODC, T. C. Head, N. Mathys, J. Preston, & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Global and international organization development* (pp. 308-319). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Cummings, T., & Worley, C. (2004). *Organizational development and change*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2005). *Organization development and change* (8th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Darlington, R. (2004). *Factor analysis*. Retrieved from http://comp9.psych.cornell.edu/Darlington/factor.htm

Evans, P. (1989). Organization development in the transnational enterprise. In R. Woodman & W. Pasmore (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-38). London: JAI.

Fagenson, E. A. (1993). *Women in management: Trends, issues and challenges.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fagenson, E. A., & Burke, W. W. (1990). Organization development practitioners' activities and interventions in organizations during the 1980s. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *26*, 285-297.

French, W. L., & Bell, C. H., Jr. (1990). *Organization development: Behavioral science interventions for organization improvement* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fritzsche, D., Huo, Y., Sugal, S., Tsai, S., Kim, C., & Becker, H. (1995). Exploring the ethical behaviors of managers: A comparative study of four countries. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *12*, 37-61.

Golembiewski, R. (1993). Organization development in the third world: Values, closeness of fit and culture boundness. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *16*, 1667-1691.

Golembiewski, R., & Lau, C. (1994). Organizational development applications in developmental settings: An addendum about success rates. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *2*, 295-308.

Gustavsen, B. (1987). Scandinavia: Management in reform societies. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *17*, 86-96.

Hardy, M. (1993). *Regression with dummy variables*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Harpaz, I. (1996). International management survey research. In B. J. Punkett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), *Handbook of international management research* (pp. 37-58). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Harzing, A., & Hofstede, G. (1996). Planned change in organizations: The influence of national culture. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, *14*, 297-342.

Head, T. (1994). Organization development in Ireland. *Organizational Development Journal*, *12*(2), 59-66.

Head, T., & Sorenson, P. (1993). Cultural values and organization development: A seven nation study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *14*, 3-7.

Hofstede, G. (1980, Summer). Motivation leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, *9*(1), 42-63.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, *7*, 81-94.

Hofstede, G. (1996). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. In J. Billsberry (Ed.), *The effective manager: Perspectives and illustrations* (pp. 243-262). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1998). A case for comparing apples with oranges: International differences in values. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, *39*, 16-31.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoppe, G. (2004.) An interview with Geert Hofstede. *Academy of Management Executive*, *18*, 75-79.

Jaeger, A. (1986). Organization development and national culture: Where's the fit? *Academy of Management Review*, *11*, 178-190.

Janin, H. (2000). *Culture shock: A guide to customs and etiquette in the Netherlands*. Singapore: Times Media Private Limited.

Kakabadse, A. (1995). Organization development in the United Kingdom: Where now, where in the future? In P. F. Sorensen, T. C. Head, N. Mathys, J. Preston, & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Global and international organization development* (pp. 87-95). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Kim, N., & Hoon, S. (1998). The concept and dynamics of peace: Implications for organizational behavior in Asia. *Organization Science*, *9*, 522-534.

Kirkman, B., & Shapiro, D. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams. The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *4*, 557-569.

Lau, C. (1996). A culture-based perspective of OD implementation. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, *9*, 49-79.

Lau, C., McMahan, G., & Woodman, R. (1996). An international comparison of organization development practices: The U.S. and Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *9*, 4-19.

Lau, C., & Ngo, H. (2001). Organization development and firm performance: A comparison of multinational and local firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *32*, 95-114.

Lewis, A., & Cave, S. (2002). New Zealand: Venture capital outlook in New Zealand. *International Financial Law Review*, *35*, 77-78.

Lindstrom, K. (1992). Work organization and well being of Finnish health care personnel. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Environmental Health*, *18*, 90-93.

Mitchell, R., Smith, B., Seawright, K., & Morse, E. (2000). Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 974-994.

Morris, M., Davis, D., & Allen, J. (1994). Fostering corporate entrepreneurship: Cross cultural comparisons of the importance of individualism versus collectivism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *25*, 65-88.

Naumov, A., & Puffer, S. (2000). Measuring Russian culture using Hofstede's dimensions. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *49*, 709-718.

Noe, R. (1999). Introduction to employee training and development. In *Employee training and development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ogbor, J. (2000). Organizational leadership and authority relations across cultures: Beyond divergence and convergence. *International Journal of Commerce & Management*, *10*, 48-73.

Pascale, R. T., Millemann, M., & Gioja, L. (2000). *Surfing the edge of chaos: The laws of nature and the new laws of business*. New York: Crown Business.

Peterson, L. A. (1997). International HRD: What we know and don't know. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *81*, 63-79.

Peterson, M. F., Smith, P. B., Akande, A., Ayestaran, S., Bochner, S., Callan, V., et al. (1995). Role conflict, ambiguity and overload: A 21 nation study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 429-452.

Pettigrew, A., Woodman, R., & Cameron, K. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 697-713.

Plovnik, M., Fry, R., & Burke, W. (1982). *Organization development: Exercises, cases and readings*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Preston, J. C. (1995). Organization development in the U.S.A.: It's only growing pains. In P. F. Sorensen, T. C. Head, N. Mathys, J. Preston, & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Global and international organization development* (pp. 66-75). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Preston, J., & DuToit, L. (1993). Endemic violence in South Africa: An OD solution applied to two educational settings. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *16*, 1767-1793.

Punnett, B. J., & Shenkar, O. (Eds.). (1996). *Handbook for international management research*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Sanzgiri, J., & Gottlieb, J. Z. (1992). Philosophic and pragmatic influences on the practice of organization development, 1950-2000. *Organizational Dynamics*, *21*, 57-69.

Schneir, C., & Bendixen, M. (1997). Establishing dimensions of South African ethnicity. In S. M. Scott (Eds.), *Sixth symposium on cross-cultural consumer and business studies* (pp. 157-162).

Scott, R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Senghor, L. (1965). *On African socialism*. New York: Stanford University Press.

Shutte, A. (1993). *Philosophy for Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: UCT.

Sikvakumar, K., & Nakata, C. (2001). The stampede towards Hofstede's framework: Avoiding the sample design pit in cross cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *32*, 555-574.

Sorensen, P. F., Head, T. C., Mathys, N., Preston, J., & Cooperrider, D. (1995). Introduction. In P. F. Sorenson, T. C. Head, N. Mathys, J. Preston, & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Global and international organization development* (pp. 1-2). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Spector, P., Cooper, C., Sanchez, J., O'Driscoll, M., & Spark, K. (with Berin, P., Bussing, A., Dewe, P., Luo, L., Miller, K., Renault de Moraes, L., et al.). (2002). Locus of control and well being at work: How generalizable are Western findings? *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 453-471.

Szabo, E., Brodbeck, F., Hartog, D., Reber, G., Weibler, J. & Wunderer, R. (2002). The Germanic Europe cluster: Where employees have a voice. *Journal of World Business*, *37*, 55-68.

Tavakoli, A. A., Keenan, J. P., & Crnjak-Karanovic, R. (2003). Culture and whistleblowing: An empirical study of Croatian and United States managers utilizing Hofstede's cultural dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *43*, 49-64.

Thomas, A., & Bendixen, M. (2000). The management implications of ethnicity in South Africa. *Journal of International Business*, *31*, 507-519.

Tregaskis, O. (1997). The role of national context and HR strategy in shaping training and development practice in French and U.K. organizations. *Organization Studies*, *18*, 839-856.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: Brealey.

van Eijnatten, F., & van der Zwaan, A. (1998). The Dutch IOR approach to organizational design: An alternative to business process reengineering. *Human Relations*, *51*, 298-318.

Werner, S., & Brouthers, L. (2002). How international is management? *Journal of International Business Studies*, *33*, 583-592.

Worley, C., Hitchin, D., & Ross, W. (1996). *Integrated strategic change: How organization development helps to build competitive advantage*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Yang, T. (2002). *Interdependent self, power distance, face saving concerns for others and their relationships with attitudes toward upward appraisal in Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, NY.