

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR STUDIES AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS

THE EFFECT OF NATIONAL CULTURE AND INSTITUTIONS
ON TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

ANDREA CHUNG
SPRING 2012

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Labor Studies and Employment Relations
with honors in Labor Studies and Employment Relations

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Elaine Farndale
Assistant Professor in Labor Studies and Employment Relations
Thesis Supervisor

Mark Anner
Professor of Labor Studies and Employment Relations
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This study explores how culture and institutions influence the type of training and development programs organizations implement. Institutional Theory and institutional isomorphism, in particular coercive and normative mechanisms, are used as a framework. As little research has previously been done on training and development in the context of culture and institutions, this work is largely explorative. The study utilizes a 3x5 design, with the three countries (France, Germany, and the U.S.) as the independent group, and the five training methods (succession planning, formal career planning, high-flier programs, mentoring programs, and job rotation) as the dependent variables. The data used in this study is taken from the 2010 Cranet Survey, which collects data on human resource management practices used in organizations of various sizes and sectors from countries all over the world. Results indicate that a country's culture and institutions have little influence over the training and development practices of organizations. Other factors such as strategic choice may offer alternate explanations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Cultural Dimensions.....	4
Institutions.....	6
The United States.....	7
Germany.....	10
France.....	14
Chapter 3 Training Methods.....	18
Succession Planning.....	19
Formal Career Planning.....	20
High-flyer Programs.....	21
Mentoring Programs.....	23
Job Rotation.....	25
Chapter 4 Methods.....	28
Measures.....	28
Participants.....	29
Research Design.....	30
Procedure.....	31
Chapter 5 Results.....	32
Chapter 6 Discussion.....	36
Chapter 7 Conclusion.....	44
Appendix.....	46
References.....	52

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I'd like to thank Dr. Elaine Farndale for being my guide throughout this entire process. Her patience and understanding toward me were astounding and I am truly grateful for all the countless hours she spent meeting with me and reviewing my work. I surely could not have gotten through all of this without her. I'd also like to thank Dr. Mark Anner for taking the time to review my paper. Lastly, I'd like to express my gratitude for my friends and family. It is you who kept me going in those moments where I wanted to give up, with your encouraging words and never ending support.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Training and development is a very important area of Human Resource Management (HRM). This is mostly due to the need of companies to stay abreast of the constantly changing technology, and growing base of knowledge and service practices necessary to stay competitive and successful (Brewster & Hegewisch, 1994, p. 107). Indeed, organizations spend billions of dollars every year on just management training and development (Saks, Tamkin, & Lewis, 2011, p. 181).

Organizations take into account many different factors when deciding how to implement training and development initiatives. Some of the most typical considerations are administrative costs and business needs, which both have similar impacts on training practices across various organizations. However, other important factors such as local culture and institutions also need to be considered. In contrast to the aforementioned considerations, these two factors often have varying effects on training practices for organizations located in different countries. This is because culture and institutions present are very unique and particular to an individual country. Therefore training practices are likely to vary between countries, as organizations must react to the distinct pressures and influences they are faced with. This concept is supported by the Institutional Theory, which states that organizations make decisions based on expectations from society and institutional demands. Although basing decisions on these expectations does not always yield them most effective or efficient results, organizations do so to try to survive and gain legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 340-341).

However, what eventually occurs as a majority of organizations bend to the same pressures, is that they all start to behave similarly. This phenomenon is called isomorphism (Frumkin & Gelaskiewicz, 2004, p. 285-286). Isomorphism can help explain why training practices across different types of organizations located in the same country may be similar, and at the same time, why those training practices of similar types of organizations located in different countries may be different.

Isomorphism can be categorized in two ways, either as competitive, which involves pressures from the competitive market, or institutional, which involves pressures from local culture or influential organizations (Pauwe, 2004, p. 42). In this study, we will focus on institutional isomorphism.

According to Frumkin & Gelaskiewicz (1983), institutional isomorphism is comprised of three types of institutional mechanisms that impact how organizations behave. They are coercive, mimetic, and normative mechanisms. Coercive mechanisms pertain to pressures from influential organizations. The government or trade unions would be examples of coercive mechanisms. In the context of our study, these coercive mechanisms, which include laws and regulations created by institutions, put pressure on organizations to utilize certain training and development practices. Mimetic mechanisms involve pressure to use the best practices of other successful organizations. An example is the growing use of 360 degree performance feedback systems. As we are focusing on culture and institutions, mimetic mechanisms will not be used in this study. Normative mechanisms pertain to the influence that a country's local culture and employee backgrounds have on decisions. Factors such as expectations from society and employee educational background would be considered here (Pauwe, 2004, p. 42-43). In the context of our study, normative mechanisms would influence employers into adopting training practices

that employees come to expect as standard in the industry, while at the same time also conforming to societal expectations.

Taken together, the Institutional Theory and institutional isomorphism (with focus on normative and coercive mechanisms) will be used as a basis for our study to make inferences as to which training methods would most likely be used in a country based on its cultural dimensions and institutions. As not much past research that brings together training and development activities with cultural and institutional perspectives exists, this will largely be an exploratory study. Therefore, most of our findings will be largely speculative, with the main goal being to provide a foundation for a more robust future study in the area of training and development and comparative international HRM.

CHAPTER 2

Cultural Dimensions

As discussed previously, normative mechanisms may influence HRM training and development practices. A primary normative mechanism is a country's local culture. Therefore, one way to determine what type of training and development practice will likely be utilized in a particular country is to observe the country's culture.

To describe the cultures of the countries in question, we will be using one of the most widely used frameworks in research involving national culture: Geert Hofstede's four cultural dimensions of Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance (Jones, 2007, p. 6).

Power Distance measures the degree to which the less powerful members of an organization accept and expect unequal distribution of power. Those in high power distance countries will likely accept rigid, hierarchical organizational structures with autocratic management styles without justification. Conversely, those in small power distance countries will prefer flatter organizations with democratic management styles, and demand explanation when power is not equally distributed (Hofstede, 1984, p.83; Hofstede, n.d.; Brewster et al., 2007, p.22). Therefore, the power distance level of a country can mainly be determined by how much a society accepts power differences in society.

Individualism represents the extent to which individuals are integrated into groups. In very individualistic countries, people are expected to only take care of themselves and their immediate families. On the other hand, in collectivist countries, people are integrated into tight knit ingroups which offer protection in exchange for loyalty. In an organization, this would

translate to individuals focusing on personal achievement and recognition in an individualistic country, and individuals focusing on fitting into and working well with a group in a collectivist country. In essence, individualism describes how a person identifies most, either as “I” or “we”, or by how much members of society see themselves as individuals as opposed to belonging to a larger whole (Hofstede, 1984, p. 83; Hofstede, n.d.; Brewster et al., 2007, p. 23).

Masculinity refers to the degree to which masculine values dominate society. Masculine values embody assertiveness, competition, achievement, and material prosperity. Feminine values can be characterized as modest and nurturing, with a high emphasis on relationships and quality of life. In short, masculine societies can be described as being performance oriented, whereas feminine societies can be described as being welfare oriented (Hofstede, 1984, p. 84, 98). Therefore, the masculinity of a country can mainly be determined by looking at how important success is in society.

Uncertainty avoidance describes the level of discomfort a society feels toward ambiguity or uncertainty, and the degree to which it will take to avoid such conditions. In countries with high uncertainty avoidance, organizations will embrace rigid bureaucracies, a strong code of rules, conformity, and job security. Organizations in countries with low uncertainty avoidance will be more relaxed, flexible, and open to new ideas (Brewster et al., 2007, p. 23; Hofstede, 1984, p. 83). Thus, the uncertainty avoidance level of a country can mainly be described by how comfortable society is with change.

Hofstede developed these cultural four dimensions by reviewing IBM employee attitude surveys conducted between 1967 and 1973 in over 70 countries. After analyzing the questions and results, he noticed that there existed four distinct cultural dimensions. Subsequently, based

on employee responses, Hofstede gave each country a comparative numerical score ranging from 1-100 (Hofstede, 2001, p. 41).

Although Hofstede's cultural dimensions are used widely as a framework in many comparative HRM studies, there are several critiques that should be noted. One is that the dimensions do not take into consideration the constant changes that occur in culture (Signorini, Wiesemes, & Murphy, 2009, p. 258). Another criticism that McSweeney (2002) notes is that Hofstede treats a nation's culture as homogenous, when there are many subcultural influences present (p. 94). The failure to account for the ever increasing multiculturalism of nations, as people immigrate around the world is another shortcoming Fang (2010) describes (p. 167). Other critiques of Hofstede's framework focus on his methodology. According to Jones (2007), many do not consider a survey an adequate tool for measuring culture, and furthermore do not believe that his sample, which consisted of workers from one multinational company, was representative of the population (p. 5).

Although these criticisms of Hofstede's cultural dimensions exist, his framework of national culture continues to be one of the most used by researchers, and has several strengths including "relative accuracy" and "rigorous design" (Jones, 2007, p. 6).

Institutions

Institutions are the other primary coercive mechanism that may influence HRM training and development practices. The laws and regulations that institutions enact create pressures for organizations to conform to. Indeed, according to Brewster and Hegewisch (1994), institutions are important consideration when implementing training and development programs in a foreign country (p. 128). In this study, we will use the term "institution" to refer to established entities

which have significant influence and impact on society: mainly government, the educational system, and trade unions.

The three countries that will be discussed in this study are the United States, France, and Germany. After describing the cultural dimensions and institutions present in each country, we will attempt to determine which training methods might accordingly be most dominant.

The United States

We will first discuss the United States (U.S.) in terms of culture using Hofstede's four dimensions.

The U.S. is a low Power Distance country with a score of 40, which is below the world average of 55. In terms of individualism, the United States can be described as very individualistic, as the highest scoring country in the dimension at 91 (almost double the world average of 43). For masculinity, the U.S. can be considered a masculine country scoring 62 in comparison to the world average of 50. Lastly, the U.S. can be characterized as a low Uncertainty Avoidance nation with a score of 46, lower than the world average of 64 (Hofstede, n.d.). As a whole, the US can be characterized as a society that strives for power equality, individual achievement, success, and new ideas.

Next, we will discuss any institutions present in the U.S. relevant to training and development from three perspectives: the government, educational systems, and trade unions.

The United States federal government does little to regulate training and development in private organizations. According to Clardy (2008), the main extent of mandated training is "often industry-specific, [and includes] overtime pay for time spent in training... [for] nonexempt employees only..." (p. 27).

However, the U.S. Federal Government does run several publicly funded job training and development programs for the US workforce. According to Ducha and Graves (1999) these federal training programs are often welfare oriented, and “emphasize social goals” as opposed to economic (p. 4).

Within the Department of Labor, the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) develops and oversees training and employment opportunities for low income or unemployed workers. One of the main laws it directs is the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, which aims to decrease family dependence of government programs such as welfare (Marquardt, Nissley, Ozag, & Taylor, 2000, p. 140).

Another act the Department of Labor administers is the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998. According to O’Leary, Straits, & Wandner (2004), the WIA “is intended to be customer focused, to help individuals access the tools they need to manage their careers through information and high-quality services, and to help employers find skilled workers” (p. 11). Another training and development program, which was created through the WIA, is the Job Corps. This program supports youth by providing formal career planning, advice, on-the job training, and assistance in obtaining a high school diploma or GED. After graduating from the Job Corps, participants can utilize support services which include career counseling and assistance with finding housing and child care (U.S. Department of Labor, 2012b).

Within the Department of Education, The National School-to-Work Office administers the School-to-Work-Opportunities Act of 1994, which helps ready students for employment by creating school-to-work programs for high school students. These programs utilize many different types of training including traditional classroom instruction, work experience, career exploration, and mentoring (Marquardt et al., 2000, p. 140). The Department of Education also

offers many programs for adults. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education creates programs for vocational and adult education, while the Division of Adult Education and Literacy creates programs to teach adults basic skills so they can complete secondary school and participate in job training programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Additionally, the Division of Vocational-Technical Education oversees the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act which “provides funds for vocational technical programs offered in secondary and post-secondary schools” (Marquardt et al., 2000, p. 141).

In terms of education, children in the United States begin their schooling around the age of 6. After completing 12 years of schooling they receive a high school diploma. At this time, students can enter the workforce, or attend college to continue their education. Obtaining advanced degrees often lead to better job prospects and raised incomes. There are several types of advanced degrees: “an Associate’s degree (acquired after 2 years of college), a Bachelor’s degree (acquired after 4 years of college), a Master’s degree (1-3 additional years in a graduate school), and lastly, a PhD (acquired after receiving a Bachelor’s degree, a Master’s degree and 5-6 additional years of college” (Marquardt et al., 2000, p. 139). As the job market becomes more competitive, many workers are choosing to return to college to pursue advanced degrees.

Although vocational training programs do exist in the United States, academic training is much more popular among the American youth. According to *The Economist* (2010), only 20% of high school students utilized vocational training in 2005, while 69% of high schoolers aimed to attend college in 2005.

In terms of trade unions, there is very little literature that discusses their role in relation to training. This is likely because training is not one of the mandatory topics of collective bargaining, which is only limited to wages, hours, and working conditions (The National Labor

College, 2006). Therefore, if a union wishes to discuss the possibility of including training in the new contract, the employer may (and will likely) refuse to negotiate on the topic. Even if the employer does agree to discuss the topic, it needs only to bargain “in good faith” and needs not to accept any of the union’s terms (Hunter, 1999, p. 12). Another reason why unions may have very little influence on training in organizations in the U.S. is that union participation rates are typically very low in the United States. In the past several decades, union membership has decreased significantly, and was only 11.9% in 2010 (Mayer, 2004, p. 1, US Department of Labor, 2012a). This makes their power over issues such as training fairly minimal.

Germany

The next country we will discuss is Germany, first in terms of culture using Hofstede’s four dimensions.

Germany is a low Power Distance country with its dimension score of 35, which is significantly below the world average of 55. Regarding individualism, Germany can be described as being individualistic, with its score of 67, which is well above the average world score of 50. For masculinity, Germany scores 66, in comparison to the world average of 50, which makes it a masculine country. Lastly, since at 65 Germany scored very close to the world average of 64, it can be characterized as a mid- uncertainty avoidance nation (Hofstede, n.d). In summary, Germany can be described as a country in which prefers equality, encourages individual achievement, values success, and is somewhat comfortable with the unfamiliar.

We will now discuss those institutions of Germany that may impact training and development, again from the three perspectives of government, education systems, and trade unions

One of the most well-known foundations of Germany is the Dual System of apprenticeship training. This system integrates many of the country's institutions such as education, government, and industry (Attwell & Rauner, 1999, p. 227).

To better understand the Dual System, it is important to first discuss Germany's educational system. Similar to the United States, German youth enter the school system in kindergarten at age 6. After students finish grade four, they have three options:

1) to continue through to high school and eventually university

2) to continue through tenth grade, and then afterward attend a full-time vocational school for two years. This vocational school is strictly in classroom training with no on the job training offered. After finishing the two year vocational school the student can either continue onto a specialized college or pursue a job in the area they went to vocational school for.

3) prepare to enter the Dual System by continuing through 9th grade and then applying to be an apprentice at a company in one of the 376 acknowledged training occupations. When selected to be an apprentice, the student will have to sign an employment contract with the company and meet defined conditions throughout the year duration of the apprenticeship. In addition to working, the apprentice will also have to attend the Berufsschule, the state-run vocational training center of their occupation, one day per week. About 70% of German students enter the Dual System. Whichever option is chosen, it is mandatory for youth to stay in full-time schooling for at least 9 years (Attwell & Rauner, 1999, p. 227-228; Wise III & Barger, 2006, p. 39; Munch, 1992, p. 20).

Germany's government plays a significant role in regulating the Dual System through four laws: the Vocational Training Act of 1969, the Vocational Training Development Act of 1981, the Craft Regulations, and the Youth Employment Protection Act of 1960. The main act in

the Dual System, the Vocational Training Act, according to Deissinger & Hellwig (2005), takes into “account of the traditional features of guild apprenticeships while at the same time submitting in-company training to homogeneous, supervisable and examinable standards” (p. 315).

The vocational schools are overseen by regional Lander governments, and participating organizations must register and pay fees to their local Chamber of Industry and Commerce or corresponding Chamber of Crafts. Each chamber has vocational training committees, made up by employee and employer representatives, who handle vocational training issues. The Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs is in charge of creating training regulations that set standards for the curriculum and testing offered (Attwell & Rauner, 1999, p. 227-229).

While the government is very involved in the Dual System, it does not provide subsidies, government incentives, or pay employers to provide training. Although in nine of the German Federal States, workers are allowed to take two weeks paid educational leave (Stirling & Miller, 1998, p. 111). Apprentices are paid a wage, but it is often very modest and much less than the going market rate (Attwell & Rauner, 1999, p. 227-229).

Trade unions have a fair presence in the German workforce, with 22.6% of employees as members in 2003 (Visser, 2006, p. 45). Union participation used to be even higher, however in recent years, there has been a steady decline in German membership (Visser, 2007, p. 98).

Trade Unions serve their members by collectively bargaining on topics involving working conditions, providing legal advice, and providing assistance in legal disputes. In turn, members are required to pay membership dues, which are calculated based on the employee’s wage (Jung, 2011).

The main union organization in Germany is called the German Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (DGB). According to the Encyclopædia Britannica (2012), “the DGB is primarily a blue-collar organization, but it also includes a large number of white-collar workers and civil servants.”

In terms of trade unions, collective agreements do not provide for many training privileges. Some agreements do however allow for a work release for representative training (Sterling & Miller, 1998, p. 111).

Another institution present in Germany is the Codetermination Act of 1976, which requires organizations with more than 2,000 employees to form a supervisory board comprised half of shareholders and half of employee representatives (Wiedemann 1980, p. 79). According to Wiedemann (1980), many organizations are exempted from this requirement including “mutual insurance companies..., ...the press, television, radio, churches, educational and charitable institutions” (p. 79).

The way in which employee representatives are selected to the supervisory board varies based on the size of the organization. In organizations with 8,000 or less employees the employees elect their representative. In larger organizations, electoral delegates appoint the representatives. There are strict rules regarding the makeup of the supervisory board. According to Wiedemann (1980) It must include “at least one enterprise worker, one salaried employee and one executive employee...Depending on the size of the supervisory board, two or three seats are reserved for the unions represented in the enterprise...It is indisputable that the unions have increased their influence in the management of large enterprises” (p. 79-80).

Similarly, the Works Constitution Act of 1972 requires the establishment of works councils in all organizations with five or more employees. In these smaller businesses, the employees elect their representative (Wiedemann, 1980, p. 81).

The issues that the works councils make decisions on include working conditions, employee terminations, and business decisions that would largely affect the employees. Training would likely be material covered by works councils (Wiedemann, 1980, p. 81).

France

The last country we will investigate is France. We will start with looking at the national culture as defined by Hofstede's four dimensions. France can be considered to be moderately high Power Distance country, scoring 68, which is above the world average of 55. Scoring significantly higher than the world average for individualism (43) at 71, France can be characterized as an individualistic society. In terms of masculinity, France would be described as more feminine with its scores of 43, which is lower than the 50 world average. Lastly, France can be characterized as a high Uncertainty Avoidance nation, scoring 86 which is higher than the world average of 64 (Hofstede, n.d.). In short, French society is accepting of power inequalities, very focused on personal achievement, values quality of life over success, and dislikes new, unfamiliar situations. We will now discuss those institutions of France's that involve training and development again from the three perspectives of the government, education systems, and trade unions

France's labor laws have a strong impact on training and development activities in France. Private companies with ten or more people employees must spend 1.5 percent of their wage bill for continued training. Companies that employ less ten employees must spend 0.15

percent of their wage bill. Examples of training expenditures that can be included in this minimum are training costs, transportation costs when training is off site, and employee wages during training. Often, organizations will spend more than the required legal minimum, with the average amount spent on training coming out to be around 3 percent of the wage bill. However, in the case that the employer does not pay the training minimum they will be required to pay a penalty (Cerdin & Peretti, 2001, p. 221).

Employers also are required to create a series of trainings plan for their employees. Works councils, consisting of employer and employee representatives are given the opportunity to contribute to this plan. Employers however are not obligated to use the work councils input. (Mehaut, 2005, p. 304-305)

France's training system also provides employees with individual training leave. In this option, employees can choose the training program they would like to attend. The training leave is paid for from a special fund. However, since this opportunity is expensive, only about half of the employees who apply for individual training leave receive it (Mehaut, 2005, p. 304-305).

The French educational system is comprised of three education levels, or *degrés*. The first level is covers of pre-school and elementary school. The second level consists of two cycles: The first takes place in *collégés* or lower secondary schools, and the second takes place in *lycées d'enseignement general* and *lycées professionnelles*, which are technical and vocational schools. At the third level, students receive education at universities, specialized colleges called *lycées*, or *grandes écoles* (Circé, 1995, p. 27).

In addition to educational training French youth may also receive training through two other approaches: vocational or technical education. For vocational education, students can receive a *Certificat d'aptitude professionnelle* (certification for a specific trade) or a *Brevet*

d'études professionnelles (certification for a broader vocational field such as health). In four years the baccalaureate professionnel is awarded, which qualifies the student to work in a particular occupation. For technical education, students can receive baccalauréats technologiques (which train students to be advanced technicians), or a brevet de techniciens supérieurs (which offers specialization in a technological area) (Circé, 1995, p. 42-43).

Out of the three training channels, higher education represents the highest portion of students. The second most popular options is technical education, followed by vocational education as the least popular (Circe, 1995, p. 47).

There is little literature that discusses the trade union's role in influencing training and development practices in France. However, one arena through which unions have influence is through the Comité paritaire national pour la formation professionnelle (CNFP) . This committee is comprised of union and management representatives, and their responsibilities include educating employers and employees on training regulations as well as act as a mediator between organizations and government regarding training issues (Circe 1995 p. 95).

Now that we have discussed each of the country's cultural dimensions and important institutions (as summarized in Table 1), we will move on to define various training methods. Consequently, hypotheses as to which types of countries each training method will be popular in will be proposed.

Table 1
Summarization of Countries' National Culture and Institutions

	National Culture	Government	Education	Trade Union
United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low power distance • Very individualistic • Masculine • Low uncertainty avoidance 	Department of Labor and Education provides programs for disadvantaged	Academics much more important than vocational training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little presence • No influence on training
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low power distance • Individualistic • Masculine • Mid-uncertainty avoidance 	Heavily regulates Dual System	Dual System vocational training most popular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair presence • Influence in supervisory boards and works councils
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately high power distance • Individualistic • Feminine • High uncertainty avoidance 	Mandates amounts to be spent on training	Academics much more important than vocational training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate presence • Mediator between organizations and government

CHAPTER 3

Training Methods

The five training methods that will be discussed in this study are succession planning, formal career planning, high-flyer programs, mentoring, and job rotation. These particular methods were chosen largely because of their breadth in terms of purpose and target, ubiquity, and availability of data in the survey used.

Succession Planning

Succession planning is the ongoing process by which individuals are identified to be potential successors of supervisory positions in an organization. After being selected, a training plan is developed to provide the individual the opportunity to develop their core-competencies so they are prepared to take on the new position (Maginn, 2008, p. 40; Huang, 2001, p. 736). The use of succession planning has been increasing due to the increase in mergers and acquisitions and retirement of baby boomers (Martin, 2005, p. 8), as positions change or open and need to be filled.

Succession planning is an important way to communicate to employees what the company values in an employee, and the traits necessary for promotion and eventual leadership opportunities. Indeed, the manner in which the individuals are first identified as potential successors, along with the decisions as to who is actually promoted into the position serve to “embed and perpetuat[e]” the organization’s culture (Hansen & Lee, 2009, p. 235).

Countries that are individualistic are likely to utilize succession planning, due to its nature of singling out high performing individuals. It is also probable that in masculine countries succession would often be used, due to the competitive nature that is present within the selected

group of individuals to fill a position. High uncertainty avoidance countries, which embrace clear planning, job security and rigid bureaucracies, would be also likely to utilize succession planning, due to the fact that it is a method that ensures that key positions will be filled in a carefully calculated and controlled manner. Out of the three countries discussed in this study, Germany most closely matches with the aforementioned cultural dimensions and would be most likely the country where use of succession would be present.

In terms of institutions, Germany's organizations would be likely to utilize succession planning due to the high participation of citizens in the apprenticeship component of the Dual System. In this program, organizations agree to take in a student and teach them about the industry and skills valuable for success in the future. Often, at the end of the apprenticeship, the organization will go on to hire the student. Employers are well aware that apprenticeships can provide a pipeline of future employees. Therefore it is in their best interest to train them well in areas they can potentially be hired in (Thelen, 2004, p. 52). Indeed, according Dehen (1928), the main purpose of apprenticeships is to create an "elite core of skilled workers fully versed in the firm's production system and loyal to the company" (as cited in Thelen, 2004, p.56). Furthermore, von Behr (1981) noted that "those workers who received firm-sponsored training were explicitly being groomed for leading positions within the firm" (as cited in Thelen, 2004, p. 56). This directly parallels succession in that during the apprenticeship, the organization is making sure the students are being taught the skills they need to become a future leader in the company. Accordingly, I propose the following hypothesis:

H₁: There will be a higher use of succession planning in Germany than in France or the United States.

Formal Career planning

Formal career planning pertains to the intent of employers to help their employees progress their careers through the advancement of skills and competencies (Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley, 2002, p. 94). Although employee's interests are taken in to account, needs of the organization are what ultimately determine which development programs are implemented (Herr, 2001, p. 200). Formal career planning often starts with planning a career path within the organization. In order to progress to a desired position, employees are given more responsibilities, different training opportunities, job rotation assignments, and mentoring opportunities to gain the skills necessary in that position (McDonald & Hite, 2005, p. 420).

Formal career planning benefits the employees because they are being given the opportunity to develop new skills and move into higher positions. Additionally, they can create and attain personal goals which can lead to self-fulfillment. The organization benefits in increased employee motivation and productivity. Additionally, the organization can plan and create training budgets in advance (Charney & Conway, 2005, p. 189-190).

Individualistic countries would be likely to use formal career planning due to the focus of individual achievement. In masculine countries, there would likely be less use of formal career planning program. Since formal career planning involves the organization working with the employee to help them achieve personal goals, this would be more characteristic of a feminine country which is often described as being nurturing and highly focused on relationships. As for uncertainty avoidance countries, formal career planning would likely be fairly common, as the method is meticulously planned out in advance and leaves little room for uncertainty. Accordingly to McDonald and Hite (2005), "the traditional view of organizational career development was grounded in the mindset of making a career within an organization and of

predictable, stable jobs” (p. 420). Of the three countries discussed in this study, France most closely matches with the aforementioned cultural dimensions and would likely be the country where use of formal career planning would be highest.

In terms of institutions, French employers would be the most likely to employ formal career planning do to their high views of education. According to Circé (1995), people in France view vocational education as being second rate and only fit for those unable to pursue the “prestige path of academic education” (p. 41). The French educational system is similarly very stratified by social classes, with the grandes écoles, considered as the most prestigious path of education to pursue (Reed-Danahay, 1996, p. 4). These schools are usually only attended by the elite and tend to recruit only students from the highest social classes (Vogt, 1983, p.508). This trend carries through even in vocational training, where most training efforts have been focused the elites (Circé, 1995, p. 31). In the professional world, formal career planning can be seen as analogous to education, as both involve self-improvement, learning and advancement. Therefore, I propose the following hypothesis:

H₂: There will be a higher use of formal career planning in France than in Germany or the United States.

High-flyer Programs

High-flyer programs are created to recruit, retain, and accelerate the development of high potential individuals (Harris & Feild, 1992, p.62). The development activities these individuals participate in vary widely, but can include mentoring programs, job rotation, attendance to unique training courses, and the coordinating of a special project. Often times, organizations identify high potential new recruits and place them through a sequence of different positions and trainings, with the intent of eventually placing them in management and executive positions.

Participants in these high-flyer programs are likely to be exposed to rigorous performance appraisals, most often the 360 degree performance appraisal (Larsen, London Weinstein, and Raghuram, 1998, p. 64-66).

High-flyer programs are likely to be utilized in countries with low power distance because lower level employees are being selected to be trained for high positions, which would be narrowing the power gap. It is also likely that countries with high individualism would utilize the high-flyer programs due to their values of recognition and personal achievement. These values are exemplified in the fast career track programs which select only certain employees and develop them especially apart from the other employees. In masculine countries, there would also probably be a high use of these high-flyer programs due to their competitive and achievement oriented nature, which are two values that dominate these societies. Also according to Hansen and Lee (2009) fast-track programs are defined in terms of promotion or pay increases (p. 126), which would fit well in masculine countries, where material prosperity is very important. As for low uncertainty avoidance countries, such fast-track career planning would likely be prevalent, as participants involved in such programs must always be on their toes and striving to meet high company standards in whatever development activity they are placed in, which is often difficult to predict. Of the countries discussed in this study, the United States matches most similarly with the aforementioned cultural dimensions and would likely be the country where use of high-flyer programs would be highest.

It also appears the high-flyer programs would be used most frequently in the United States when reviewing the country's institutions. The government, education and trade unions' very hands off approach on training and development, correspond to the uncertainty that the high-flyer programs are characterized by. Additionally, the U.S. government's focus on training

youth parallels the organizations' frequent use of high-flyer programs to develop recent graduates and new employees. Both are providing opportunity to those who are new to the workforce. This may be tied to the sentiment that youth are the key to the future, and thus it is important to invest in those that show high potential, providing them with opportunities to be successful. Hence, I propose the following hypothesis:

H₃: There will be a higher use of high-flyer programs in the United States than in France or Germany.

Mentoring Programs

Mentoring programs involve pairing together an experienced, senior member with more junior member of the organization. Throughout this mentoring relationship, the senior member (mentor) provides support to the employee (protégé), offering them advice and guidance on professional and personal development (Hezlett & Gibson, 2005, p. 446; McCauley, 2005, p. 443). This arrangement is beneficial on many levels. For the organization, mentoring programs can lead to reduced turnover, and increased employee performance and motivation (Charney & Conway, 2005, p. 206; Bassi, 1997, p. 16). For the protégé, having a mentor provides a wealth of benefits such as access to organizational resources, networking opportunities, and development of skills such as time management (McCauley, 2005 p. 443; Hezlett & Gibson, 2005, p. 458). These benefits also often lead to increased self-esteem, confidence, and enthusiasm (Charney & Conway, 2005, p. 206). The mentor can also benefit from the mentoring relationship. In taking on this leadership role, mentors often learn a lot about their own developmental needs, and increase their leadership and feedback skills (Hezlett & Gibson, 2005, p. 458; Charney & Conway, 2005, p. 203).

According to Charney and Conway (2005), mentoring relationships are built on mutual “respect and commitment” (p. 204). Therefore, such a development program would not likely be common in a high power distance country because a mentor will probably not feel that he has to respect his protégé. As a result he would likely not put forth his full effort or available time to develop the relationship. Additionally, individuals in such countries may feel uncomfortable working in such close contact with a superior. Consequently, they would not feel comfortable adapting the relationship to their benefit, which is a very important aspect of a mentoring relationship according to Hezlett & Gibson (2005, p. 450). In contrast, for individualistic countries, mentoring would likely be commonly used, as the one-on-one relationship focuses on developing an individual to be more successful in the workplace. According to Laird (1985, p. 82), many Fortune 500 companies in the United States use mentoring programs to help high potential employees move up in the organization. Furthermore, a mentor would typically only show interest in helping his own protégé, and not any other mentor’s, which is characteristic of an individualistic country ingroup.

As for masculine countries, mentoring programs may be less prevalent due to their nurturing and relationship aspects, which are representative of feminine countries. Indeed, mentoring relationships are most successful when the mentor is sincerely invested with the aiding in the development of his protégé (Bassi, 1996, p. 16). Interestingly, women participate in mentoring relationships more often than men (Schramm, 2011, p. 96), which may imply that women are more attracted to these types of programs due to their feminine characteristics. Moreover, organizations use mentoring programs to bolster the promotion of women and minorities, which is representative of the welfare-oriented feminine societies. As for countries with high uncertainty avoidance, use of mentoring programs would likely be common as they are

often very formal with implementation. Usually, the Human Resources department will organize the pairings, set the length of the program, and provide guidelines, tools, training, and orientation sessions to help the mentor and protégé pairs form a positive relationship (Charney & Conway, 2005, p. 206-209). Therefore due to the very structured execution of mentoring programs, they are likely to be commonly used in high uncertainty avoidance countries. Since Germany seems to match most with the aforementioned cultural dimensions, it is likely that mentoring programs would be most frequently utilized there over France and the United States.

When looking at Germany's institutions, it is apparent why mentoring programs would likely be used. The very popular Dual-System is comprised mainly of an apprenticeship with an additional classroom learning component. Since most of the training is completed on site, high use of internal methods of training has become the norm. Mentoring is an example of a highly internal method of training, as the employee learns from another employee within the organization. All learning takes place through advice and guidance, and very little occurs in the way of external training, unless an outside development course is suggested to be taken. Another reason why the apprenticeship portion of the Dual-System is similar to mentoring is that a current experienced member of an organization is teaching a less experienced worker new skills. Consequently, I propose the following hypothesis:

H₄: There will be a higher use of mentoring programs in Germany than in France or the United States.

Job Rotation

Job rotation is when an employee is moved between different positions within the organization to be provided with a breadth of experiences and various types of training (Bennett,

2003, p. 7; Tracey, 1992, p. 21). Employees can rotate between jobs in the same department (within functionally) or to a different department (cross-functionally) (Bennett, 2003, p. 7; Gensing, 2005, p. 50). The jobs they rotate between may vary in responsibility levels. For instance, prospective managers may be placed in line jobs so they can gain direct experience in the entirety of the organization's operations. Alternatively, the potential managers may move laterally to provide management experience in various situations (Tracey, 1992, p. 20-21). Campion (1994) notes that although job titles and departments change with rotations, compensation remains unchanged (p. 1519).

Use of job rotation can benefit both the employee and employer. Employees may experience increased motivation, learning, job satisfaction, productivity and decreased boredom (Campion, 1994, p. 1519; Gensing, 2005, p. 50). Employers using job rotation can make better promotional decisions by observing the employees' abilities in the different roles (Eriksson and Ortega, 2006, p. 654).

Job rotation is likely to be commonly used in masculine countries. This is supported by Bennett (2003), who states that employers often utilize job rotation for high-flyers identified to potentially rise up into the most senior positions within the company (p. 7-8). Here, male characteristics of high achievement and competition are being exhibited. Countries with high uncertainty avoidance are not likely to utilize job rotation often. This is because workers are exposed to many unfamiliar job functions. Instead of moving around to all different jobs, workers would likely want to stay put in a job they are familiar with. Of the countries discussed in this study, the U.S. matches most similarly with the aforementioned cultural dimensions and would likely be the country where use of job rotation would be the most common.

In terms of institutions, employers in the United States would also be the most likely out of the three countries mentioned in this study, to employ job rotation due to the lack of restrictions government and unions have over the employer. The absence of such constraints serves to make it very easy to move employees into varying positions and departments across the organization. Accordingly, I propose the following hypothesis:

H₅: The use of job rotation will be higher in the United States than in Germany or France.

CHAPTER 4

Methods

The data that will be used in this study is taken from the 2010 Cranet Survey, which collects data on HRM practices used in organizations of various sizes and sectors from countries all over the world. The organization that creates the survey, “Cranet[,] is...the largest HRM network in the world” (Cranet, 2009).

Along with Cranet, the Cranfield School of Management acts as a partner in the survey’s design. Surveys are based on a comprehensive literature review on HRM topics, and questions are designed to be factual as opposed to opinion based, to avoid subjectivity issues. Initially, the survey is written in English and then is later translated in the local language when distributed in other countries (Cranet, 2009).

After the survey is written, it is administered through postal mail, online, or “computer aided interviewing” (Cranet, 2009). The average response rate spans from between 12-25%, with the respondent usually being the person who handles human resource management in the organization. After the data is collected, it is reviewed and corrected by the Cranfield School of Management. (Cranet, 2009)

Measures

The specific question from the 2010 Cranet Survey utilized in this study is as follows:

To what extent do you use the following methods for formal career planning:

- | | Not at all | | | | To a very great extent |
|--------------------------|------------|---|---|---|------------------------|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| • Formal career planning | | | | | |
| • Succession plans | | | | | |
| • Planned job rotation | | | | | |
| • “High-flyer” schemes | | | | | |
| • Mentoring | | | | | |

Participants

For our study, the participants of interest are those organizations located in the United States, Germany, and France who responded to the 2010 Cranet Survey. There were 157 organizations from France, 420 organizations from Germany, and 1052 organizations from United States who participated (Refer to Table 2). As mentioned previously, these organizations are of various sizes and come from several sectors.

Table 2
Means of Development Practices

Variables		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
Formal Career Planning	France	133	1.08	1.015	0.088
	Germany	403	1.07	1.089	0.054
	USA	420	1.22	1.114	0.054
	Total	956	1.14	1.092	0.035
Succession Planning	France	131	1.2	1.14	0.1
	Germany	407	1.84	1.183	0.059
	USA	417	1.16	1.134	0.056
	Total	955	1.45	1.202	0.039
Job Rotation	France	126	1.53	1.143	0.102
	Germany	406	0.9	1.045	0.052
	USA	415	0.75	0.985	0.048
	Total	947	0.92	1.061	0.034
High-flyer Programs	France	129	1.77	1.253	0.11
	Germany	406	1.42	1.372	0.068
	USA	408	0.44	0.868	0.043
	Total	943	1.04	1.281	0.042
Mentoring	France	131	1.03	1.123	0.098
	Germany	405	1.55	1.211	0.06
	USA	420	1.9	1.137	0.055
	Total	956	1.63	1.201	0.039

Research Design

This study involves a 3x5 design, with the three countries (France, Germany, and the United States) as the independent group, and the five training methods (succession planning, formal career planning, high-flyer programs, mentoring programs, job rotation) as the dependent variables.

Procedure

An ANOVA will be performed on the means of the responses regarding use of training practices from each of the three countries, to determine if there is a significant difference between any of the countries. Since the question regarding usage of training methods is answered via a scale, an average of all responses of each country will be used as the mean of that country.

After the ANOVA is completed, a post hoc Tukey test will be carried out to determine the individual differences in means of each country.

CHAPTER 5

Results

Table 3
ANOVA for Mean scores of Development Practices

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>MSE</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Formal Career Planning	2	2.543	2.138	0.118
Succession planning	2	53.562	40.099	.000*
Job Rotation	2	29.516	27.673	.000*
High-flyer programs	2	137.601	101.832	.000*
Mentoring	2	39.668	29.134	.000*

Note. ANOVA = analysis of variance

Table 4
Mean Score Differences of Development Responses
 Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Country supplying questionnaire	(J) Country supplying questionnaire	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	f	
Formal Career Planning	France	Germany	0.011	0.109	0.995	
		USA	-0.139	0.109	0.408	
	Germany	France	-0.011	0.109	0.995	
		USA	-0.149	0.076	0.121	
	USA	France	0.139	0.109	0.408	
		Germany	0.149	0.076	0.121	
	Succession Planning	France	Germany	-.644*	0.116	0
			USA	0.043	0.116	0.928
Germany		France	.644*	0.116	0	
		USA	.687*	0.081	0	
USA		France	-0.043	0.116	0.928	
		Germany	-.687*	0.081	0	
Job Rotation		France	Germany	.630*	0.105	0
			USA	.780*	0.105	0
	Germany	France	-.630*	0.105	0	
		USA	0.15	0.072	0.095	
	USA	France	-.780*	0.105	0	
		Germany	-0.15	0.072	0.095	
	High-flyer Programs	France	Germany	.349*	0.117	0.009
			USA	1.33*1	0.117	0
Germany		France	-.349*	0.117	0.009	
		USA	.982*	0.081	0	
USA		France	-1.331*	0.117	0	
		Germany	-.982*	0.081	0	
Mentoring		France	Germany	-.518*	0.117	0
			USA	-.865*	0.117	0
	Germany	France	.518*	0.117	0	
		USA	-.347*	0.081	0	
	USA	France	.865*	0.117	0	
		Germany	.347*	0.081	0	

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of country on usage of formal career planning, succession planning, job rotation, high-flyer schemes, and mentoring. An alpha level of .05 was used to denote significance. The results (summarized in Tables 2 and 4) suggest several findings.

H₁ stated that there would be a higher use of succession planning in Germany, than in France or the United States. There was a significant effect of the country at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 952) = 40.01, p = 0.000$] (Refer to Table 3). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of Germany ($M=1.84, SD=1.18$) differed significantly from both France ($M = 1.20, SD = 1.14$), and the United States ($M=1.16, SD=1.13$), with Germany holding the highest mean (Refer to Table 2 and Table 4). Therefore, the highest use of succession planning was in Germany, meaning H₁ was supported.

H₂ stated that there would be a higher use of formal career planning in France, than in Germany or the United States. There was not a significant effect of the country at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 953) = 2.14, p = 0.118$] (Refer to Table 3). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores between France ($M = 1.08, SD = 1.02$), Germany ($M=1.07, SD=1.09$) and the United States ($M=1.22, SD=1.11$) did not significantly differ (Refer to Table 2 and Table 4). Therefore, no country utilized formal career planning significantly more than the others. Accordingly, H₂ was not supported.

H₃, stated that there would be a higher use of high-flyer programs in the United States than in France or Germany. There was a significant effect of the country at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 940) = 137.60, p = 0.000$] (Refer to Table 3). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of France ($M=1.77, SD=1.25$), Germany ($M = 1.42, SD = 1.37$), and the United States ($M=.44, SD=.87$) all differed significantly

from each other, with France holding the highest mean (Refer to Table 2 and Table 4).

Therefore, France had the highest usage of high-flyer programs, which means that H_3 was not supported.

H_4 , stated that there would be a higher use of mentoring programs in Germany than in France or the United States. There was a significant effect at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 953) = 39.67, p = 0.000$] (Refer to Table 3). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of France ($M=1.03, SD=1.12$), Germany ($M=1.55, SD=1.21$), and the United States ($M=.1.90, SD=1.14$) all differed significantly from each other, with the United States holding the highest mean (Refer to Table 2 and Table 4). Therefore, the United States was found to use mentoring programs frequently. This did not support H_4 .

Finally, H_5 stated that the use of job rotation would be higher in the United States than in France or the Germany. There was a significant effect at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 944) = 27.67, p = 0.000$] (Refer to Table 3). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of France ($M=1.53, SD=1.14$) differed significantly from both Germany ($M = .90, SD = 1.05$), and the United States ($M=.75, SD=.99$), with France holding the highest mean (Refer to Table 2 and Table 4). Therefore, the results showed its most frequent use of job rotation in France. This did not support H_5

CHAPTER 6

Discussion

In this study we explored the presence of various training and development practices used in organizations across the United States, Germany, and France in relation to the culture and institutions present in each country. Based on Institutional Theory and isomorphism, we expected that training methods that fit with cultural norms and institutions of a particular country would be present. This is because cultural norms cause normative mechanisms and institutions create laws and regulations causing coercive mechanisms. Together, these mechanisms pressure organizations to act similarly in implementing the same training methods that would be expected by employees and comply with laws. However, as only one of our hypotheses was supported, our results suggest that culture and institutions are not strong influences on the training practices used by organizations.

However, there are several factors that may have played a role in creating these unexpected results.

First, there was a lot of variation present within the countries evidenced by the large standard deviation of the development practice means. (Refer to Table 2). This means that there was a wide range of use for each of the practices in each country. This may provide an unrealistic picture of the results, as there may have been a few extreme outliers which influenced the mean usages.

Also in looking at the development practice means, one may notice that most hover around 1.00. As the means were derived on a 1-4 usage scale, with 1 meaning little to no usage

and 4 meaning much usage, this would provide inconclusive results, as no development practice had particularly high use in any of the countries

Another factor that may have provided these unexpected results are makeup of the samples of each country, which differed in several respects (Refer to Table A in the Appendix). This is an issue because instead of exploring the culture and institutional effects on training and development decision making as we intended, our results may be reflecting how different company characteristics impact training and development practices.

The differences between the country samples present spanned across many areas. While the companies sampled in Germany and France were predominantly in the private sector, those of the United States were more evenly distributed between the public and private sectors. Regarding where training decisions are made, companies in both France and the United States made these decisions onsite. In Germany however, training decisions were mainly made at the companies' national headquarters. In terms of when companies were established, the samples of Germany and France were largely comprised by relatively young companies. Conversely, the ages of companies in the United States were more evenly distributed. As for company sizes, though all the countries had samples that were over 50% mid-sized, France had barely any small companies in its sample, while Germany had a sizeable percentage of large companies in its sample. Concerning the percentage of managers in each company, France differed from Germany and the United States in that about 20% of its sample (as opposed to less than 2%) was comprised of companies with over 50%. Finally, in regards to the number of companies with a workforce that has over 50% of employees that received higher education, there was the most variation between the samples. Germany had the least, with France in the middle, and the United States with the most companies with a highly educated workforce.

To determine whether the variation in samples affected our results, we performed supplemental analyses that isolated the characteristics of the organizations that participated. Furthermore, in these supplemental analyses we only used high usage responses (3 and 4) to control for the aforementioned issue of prevalent low usage across the training practices.

The results of these supplemental analyses were very similar to our original results (Refer Tables B-I in the Appendix). This implies that our original results were likely influenced by the sample, and did not necessarily reflect the organization's behavior in response to the pressures created by national culture and institutions. Instead our results reflected the organization's behavior due to its characteristics, such as sector or size.

The first supplemental analysis performed pertained to differences in sectors. We chose to use the two largest sectors only: public and private. The public sector saw higher use of formal career planning and mentoring programs, while the private saw higher usage of succession plans and high-flyer programs. The results of this supplemental analysis tie in with our original results in two instances. First is with the United States, which has the most public organizations in its sample, and was found to have the highest use of mentoring programs in our original analysis. Therefore, perhaps the reason why the United States was found to be the greatest user of mentoring programs over Germany, as we originally hypothesized, is its largely public sector sample. Germany on the other hand barely had any public organizations in its sample. A second instance in which the results of this supplemental analysis matched with our original is with France and high-flyer programs. France had the highest number of private organizations in its sample, as opposed to the largely public sector sample of United States who we originally had hypothesized to utilize high-flyer programs. In both of these cases, the organizational

characteristic of sector played a larger role in determining training practices than any cultural and institutions present.

The third supplemental analysis performed was in regards to where training and development is determined. We chose to analyze only organizations that made training decisions at the national headquarters and on site, since these were most common. Those organizations whose national headquarters made training decisions had higher significant usage of succession planning and high-flyer schemes. The results of this supplemental analysis match well with our original results. Germany was the only sample in which a majority of the organizations determined training decisions at national headquarters, and accordingly utilized succession planning most. Because we also originally hypothesized that Germany would have the highest usage of succession planning based on its national culture and institutions, it is difficult to determine whether it was truly these two constructs that yielded these results, as opposed to the organizational characteristic of where training decisions are made.

The fourth supplemental analysis focused on the year the organization was established. We divided each of the organizations into three categories based on when they were established: less than 50 years ago, between 50-100 years ago, and over 100 years ago. There were no significant differences in any of the development practices in relation to the age of the company. Therefore, age may be a weaker influence of on implementation of training practices than the other organizational characteristics.

The fifth supplemental analysis explored the number the employees in each organization. The organizations were divided into three size categories: small (100 employees or less), medium (101-1000 employees), and large (over 1000 employees). Large companies had the highest significant use of formal career planning and succession plans. Both large and medium

sized companies used job rotation and high-flyer programs more significantly than small organizations. These supplemental results mirrored our original results, in two instances. First, was with Germany, whose sample contains the most large organizations, and was also found to utilize succession plans most in our original analysis. As we also previously hypothesized that Germany would utilize succession planning based on culture and institutions, our results may or may not have been influenced by company size. Similarly France, who had the highest percentage of medium and large sized organization combined, was also found have the highest usage of job rotation and high-flyer programs in our original results. In our hypotheses, we originally predicted that the United States would utilize job rotation and high-flyer programs the most. However, the fact that this hypothesis was not supported, coupled with the United States having the most small organizations in its sample, implies that organization size may have a stronger impact on training and development practices than national culture and institutions.

The sixth supplemental analysis focused on the percentage of workers that are managers. Here, we split the organizations into two groups: one that was comprised of predominantly hourly employees (50% or less) and one that was comprised of predominantly managerial (over 50%). The only significant result was with succession planning in which the organizations with predominantly hourly workforce saw more usage. This matched with our original result, as Germany's sample consists the most highly of mostly non-managerial employee organizations, and also utilizes succession planning the most. As mentioned previously, because we used culture and institutions as a basis to hypothesize the highest use of succession planning in Germany, it is difficult to determine whether is the culture and institutions that shaped the results, or if it is the influence of the supervisory makeup of the workforce.

The last supplemental analysis focused on the percentage of workers that received higher education. We split the organizations into two groups, one whose workforce is not highly educated at 50% or less with higher education degrees, and another whose workforce is highly educated with over 50% of employees holding higher education degrees. The only significant result was with succession planning, in which the not highly educated organizations saw higher usage. This corresponded with our original result, as Germany's sample consists of mostly non-highly educated organizations, and also uses succession planning the most. As mentioned earlier, because we used culture and institutions as a basis to hypothesize the highest use of succession planning in Germany, it is difficult to determine whether it is the culture and institutions that shaped the results, or if it is the influence of the educational level of the workforce.

The similarities of the results between these supplemental analyses and our original analysis imply that there exist other factors that we have not taken into consideration that may be influencing our findings. Again this points back to the exploratory nature of this study. Without previous work to compare our results to, it is difficult to pinpoint whether our mixed findings are a result of methodology or area of focus. Nevertheless, this preliminary work provides a base of information on development programs in relation to specific company characteristics, which may be useful in future studies regarding international training and development.

Aside from influence of organizational characteristics, there exist other reasons why we might be seeing a disconnect between the type of training used and the country's culture and institutions. One explanation is that there may be a clash between a country's culture and institutions, in terms of their implications toward training. For example, culturally, Germany scores high in masculinity, which focuses on achievement and material prosperity, and less on relationships. However, regarding institutions, Germany is defined by its Dual System, which

many companies participate in to form relationships with the apprentices as potential future employees. Here there is a conflict between culture and institution which makes it difficult to make a decision as to which construct overrides the other, and consequently which training method would most likely be used. On the same note, when matching each training method to the country with the highest likely use, a best fit method was used. This involved determining which the country had the most cultural and/or institutions that corresponded with the training method even though there may have been elements in both constructs that did not match with the training method. It is the influence of the conflicting constructs that may have led to these unexpected results. Nevertheless, as we are using Institutional Theory as a basis for this study, both coercive and normative isomorphic pressures of institutions and cultural expectations must be accounted for.

Another possibility is the voluntary nature of the survey. It is possible that there exists some kind a common characteristic of those companies that return these surveys, which is not representative of the population. For instance, those organizations that are under established in various human resources areas including training programs, may be more incented to respond to such a survey, because often times, participants are given the results. With these results, those organizations looking to improve their modest human resources programs can attempt to do so with benchmarking.

A final consideration is the institutional approach on which we based our arguments. The alternative concept of Strategic Choice may explain why none of our hypotheses were supported. This theory states that companies choose how they want to operate based on various factors including material concerns, personal values and feelings, and predispositions (Pool, 1986, p. 13). Therefore, although the cultural and institution of each country may suggest the presence of

a certain training method, companies may choose to not conform to these expectations and branch out in a different direction to gain a competitive advantage.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

The way organizations determine which training practices to implement is very complex and can vary by a myriad of organizational characteristics including location, size, industry, and more. On top of this complex decision making process, are more outside pressures such as culture and institutions, which we focused on in this study, using Institutional Theory. And further, on top of culture and institutions there exist even more countless influences including economic climate and company culture, each influence more complex than the previous. Again, as this was very much an exploratory study, results were not conclusive, given the lack of support for the hypotheses. However, our findings provide a basis of information on development practice usage in relationship to a country's culture and institution, with considerations to different organizational contexts. Using these findings as a foundation, we can now better comprehend the nature of the topic and provide direction for further studies.

Researchers wanting to do further study on this topic may want to pursue other datasets with more consistent response rates. This will serve to eliminate extraneous factors which could lead to inconclusive results. Alternatively, the same tests could be run on different countries with more similar response rates. Additionally, since the institutional theory only supported one of our hypotheses in this study, future studies may want to investigate the role of strategic choice in relation to use of training and development practices to see if they have a higher impact. Another possibility may be to explore the interactions and effects of both Institutional and Strategic Choice Theory on training and development practices. In our study, Institutional Theory may have had an impact on training and development practice, however these impacts were not sufficient enough to determine the patterns are therefore were not deterministic. Therefore

perhaps if another theoretical approach were studied in conjunction with the original, there would be more a conclusive pattern to read and interpret. However, as this study was exploratory, our aims were mainly to provide a basis of preliminary information regarding the training practices utilized in relation to a country's culture and institutions. Nevertheless, as only one of our five hypotheses as to which training method would be used most highly in a location based on the countries' culture and institutions were supported, there were certainly drawbacks to our approach that should be considered when designing future studies in this area.

A further limitation of this study that also may have influenced the results, is the disparity in response rates between the countries. The sample size from France was approximately 85% less than that of the United States, which could affect the validity of the means.

Whatever the reason may be, this study demonstrates that the decisions companies make toward deciding which training and development programs to implement are very complex and can differ significantly not only at a country level, but also at a company level.

Therefore, more research should be done in this area to gather more information on how these complex decisions are reached. This would be a valuable contribution to the human resources field, as more and more companies begin to increase investments in their training and development initiatives worldwide.

Appendix:

Table A
Characteristics of Companies Sampled

	<i>Percent Private Sector</i>	<i>Percent of Where Training is Determined</i>	<i>Percent Established less than 50 years ago</i>	<i>Percent Mid-sized</i>	<i>Percent with less than half of Employees as Managers</i>	<i>Percent of over half of Employees with Higher Education</i>
France	98.1	40.5 On site	70.5	80.7	81.8	44.2
Germany	83.1	24.8 Nat'l HQ	44.7	51.7	99.5	22.8
United States	38.8	40.7 On site	37.8	66.5	98	67.1

Table B
Independent T-tests of Mean Scores of Development Practice by Sector

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig</i>	<i>p</i>
Formal Career Planning	830	-2.877	.004*	
public				1.34
private				1.09
Succession planning	392.507	2.558	.011*	
public				1.31
private				1.54
Job Rotation	405.52	0.909	0.364	
public				0.97
private				0.9
High-flyer Programs	493.576	9.082	.000*	
public				0.51
private				1.29
Mentoring	384.829	-3.609	.000*	
public				1.88
private				1.54

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

Table C

Independent T-tests of Mean scores of Development Practice by Where Training and Development Determined

Variable	df	t	sig	p
Formal Career Planning	247	0.952	0.342	
National HQ				1.27
On Site				1.13
Succession Planning	247	2.606	.010*	
National HQ				1.73
On Site				1.32
Job Rotation	243	1.372	0.171	
National HQ				0.97
On Site				0.89
High-flyer Programs	217.242	5.073	.000*	
National HQ				1.56
On Site				0.73
Mentoring	250	1.797	0.074	
National HQ				1.65
On Site				1.36

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

Table D

ANOVA for Mean scores of Development Practice by Year Organization Established

Variable	df	MSE	F	p
Formal Career Planning	2	3.522	2.976	0.051
Succession Planning	2	3.575	2.505	0.082
Job Rotation	2	2.067	1.864	0.156
High-flyer Programs	2	1.467	0.905	0.405
Mentoring	2	4.127	2.859	0.058

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

Table E
Mean Score Differences of Development Responses by Year Organization Established

Dependent Variable			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Formal career planning	100 Years or more	50-100 Years	.254*	0.106	0.044
		50 Years or Less	0.096	0.089	0.532
	50-100 Years	100 Years or more	-.254*	0.106	0.044
		50 Years or Less	-0.158	0.089	0.177
	50 Years or Less	100 Years or more	-0.096	0.089	0.532
		50-100 Years	0.158	0.089	0.177
Succession planning	100 Years or more	50-100 Years	0.161	0.116	0.349
		50 Years or Less	0.22	0.098	0.066
	50-100 Years	100 Years or more	-0.161	0.116	0.349
		50 Years or Less	0.059	0.097	0.817
	50 Years or Less	100 Years or more	-0.22	0.098	0.066
		50-100 Years	-0.059	0.097	0.817
Job rotation	100 Years or more	50-100 Years	0.079	0.103	0.72
		50 Years or Less	-0.083	0.087	0.6
	50-100 Years	100 Years or more	-0.079	0.103	0.72
		50 Years or Less	-0.163	0.086	0.144
	50 Years or Less	100 Years or more	0.083	0.087	0.6
		50-100 Years	0.163	0.086	0.144
High-flyer programs	100 Years or more	50-100 Years	0.166	0.124	0.373
		50 Years or Less	0.093	0.105	0.65
	50-100 Years	100 Years or more	-0.166	0.124	0.373
		50 Years or Less	-0.073	0.105	0.762
	50 Years or Less	100 Years or more	-0.093	0.105	0.65
		50-100 Years	0.073	0.105	0.762
Mentoring	100 Years or more	50-100 Years	.279*	0.117	0.045
		50 Years or Less	0.148	0.099	0.289
	50-100 Years	100 Years or more	-.279*	0.117	0.045
		50 Years or Less	-0.13	0.098	0.379
	50 Years or Less	100 Years or more	-0.148	0.099	0.289
		50-100 Years	0.13	0.098	0.379

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

Table F
ANOVA table for Mean scores of Development Practice by Total Number of Employees

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>MSE</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Formal Career Planning	2	8.663	7.363	.001*
Succession planning	2	21.731	15.493	.000*
Job Rotation	2	6.799	6.099	.002*
High-flyer Programs	2	45.231	29.223	.000*
Mentoring	2	7.283	5.095	0.006

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

Table G
Mean Score Differences of Development Responses by Total Number of Employees
Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable			<i>Mean Difference (I- J)</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Formal Career Planning	100 or Less	101-1000	0.081	0.104	0.715
		Over 1000	-0.215	0.109	0.12
	101-1000	100 or Less	-0.081	0.104	0.715
		Over 1000	-.295*	0.077	0
	Over 1000	100 or Less	0.215	0.109	0.12
		101-1000	.295*	0.077	0
Succession Planning	100 or Less	101-1000	-.375*	0.112	0.003
		Over 1000	-.648*	0.118	0
	101-1000	100 or Less	.375*	0.112	0.003
		Over 1000	-.273*	0.085	0.004
	Over 1000	100 or Less	.648*	0.118	0
		101-1000	.273*	0.085	0.004
Job Rotation	100 or Less	101-1000	-0.169	0.101	0.215
		Over 1000	-.351*	0.106	0.003
	101-1000	100 or Less	0.169	0.101	0.215
		Over 1000	-.182*	0.076	0.044
	Over 1000	100 or Less	.351*	0.106	0.003
		101-1000	.182*	0.076	0.044
High-flyer Programs	100 or Less	101-1000	-.760*	0.12	0
		Over 1000	-.949*	0.126	0
	101-1000	100 or Less	.760*	0.12	0
		Over 1000	-0.189	0.089	0.087
	Over 1000	100 or Less	.949*	0.126	0
		101-1000	0.189	0.089	0.087
Mentoring	100 or Less	101-1000	.291*	0.114	0.03
		Over 1000	0.069	0.12	0.835
	101-1000	100 or Less	-.291*	0.114	0.03
		Over 1000	-.222*	0.085	0.025
	Over 1000	100 or Less	-0.069	0.12	0.835
		101-1000	.222*	0.085	0.025

Note. The mean difference is significant at the < 0.05 level

* denotes significant levels.

Table H
Independent T-tests of Mean scores of Development Practice by Percentage of Workers that are Managers

Variable	df	t	sig	p
Formal Career Planning	862	1.551	0.121	
50% or less Managers				1.15
Over 50% Managers				0.85
Succession Planning	38.212	2.445	.019*	
50% or less Managers				1.46
Over 50% Managers				1.03
Job Rotation	854	0.377	0.706	
50% or less Managers				0.93
Over 50% Managers				0.86
High-flyer programs	853	0.069	0.945	
50% or less Managers				1.04
Over 50% Managers				1.03
Mentoring	863	1.195	0.232	
50% or less Managers				1.62
Over 50% Managers				1.37

Note. The mean difference is significant at the <0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

Table I
Independent T-tests of Mean scores of Development Practice by Percentage of Workforce with Higher Education/University Qualification

Variable	df	t	sig	p
Career development planning	575.977	-3.536	.000*	
50% or less with higher education				0.99
Over 50% with Higher Education				1.3
Succession planning	672	2.558	.011*	
50% or less with higher education				1.58
Over 50% with Higher Education				1.34
Job Rotation	670	0.474	0.636	
50% or less with higher education				0.94
Over 50% with Higher Education				0.9
High-flyer program	634.618	3.623	.000*	
50% or less with higher education				1.21
Over 50% with Higher Education				0.86
Mentoring	671	-5.089	.000*	
50% or less with higher education				1.43
Over 50% with Higher Education				1.9

Note. The mean difference is significant at the <0.05 level.

* denotes significant levels.

References

- Almanac of Policy Issues. (2001, June 1). Job Training and Vocational Education.
Retrieved from http://www.policyalmanac.org/economic/job_training.shtml
- Arya, A., & Mittendorf, B. (2004). Using Job Rotation to Extract Employee Information. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 20 (2), 400-414.
- Attwell, G., & Rauner F. (1999). Training and Development in Germany. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 3 (3), 227-233.
- Bassi, L. J., & Russ-eft D. (1997) *What Works: Training and development practices*. Alexandria, Virginia: American Society for Training and Development.
- Bennett, B. (2003). Job rotation. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 17(4), 7-9.
- Brewster, C., & Hegewisch A., eds. (1994). *Policy and Practice in European Human Resource Management: The Price Waterhouse Cranfield Survey*. London, England: Thomson Learning.
- Brewster, C., Sparrow, P, Vernon, G. (2007). *International Human Resource Management* (2nd ed.). London, England: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Campion, M. A., Cheraskin, L., & Stevens, M. J. (1994). Career-Related Antecedents and Outcomes of Job Rotation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1518-1542.
- Cerdin, J., & Peretti, J. (2001). Trends and emerging values in human resource management in France. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(3), 216-225.
- Charney, C, & Conway K. (2005). *The trainer's toolkit*. New York: Amacom.
- Clardy, A. (2008). Policies for managing the training and development function: Lessons from the federal government. *Public Personnel Management*, 37(1), 27-54.

- Circé. (1995). *Vocational education and training in France*. Thessaloniki, Greece: European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training.
- Cranet (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.cranet.org/home/Pages/default.aspx>
- Dehen, P. (1927) *Die deutschen Industriewekschlen*. München: A. Huber.
- Deissinger, T., & Hellwig, S. (2005). Apprenticeships in Germany: Modernising the dual system. *Education & Training*, 47(4), 312-324.f
- Derr, C. B. (1987). Managing high potentials in Europe: Some cross-cultural findings. *European Management Journal*, 5(2), 72-80.
- Ducha, S. & Graves, W. L. (1999). *State financed and customized training program: Research and evaluations report series 99-4*. Washington, DC: US Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration.
- Eriksson, T., & Ortega, J. (2006). The Adoption of Job Rotation: Testing the Theories. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 59(4), 653-666.
- Fang, T. (2010). Asian management research needs more self-confidence: Reflection on Hofstede (2007) and beyond. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(1), 155-170.
- Frumkin, P. & Gelaskiewicz, J. (2004). Institutional Isomorphism and Public Sector Organizations. *Journal Of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 14(3), 283-307.
- German Trade Union Federation. (2012). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/230996/German-Trade-Union-Federation>
- Gilley, J. W., Egglund, S. A., & Gilley, A. M. (2002). *Principles of human resource development*. Cambridge: Perseus Books.

- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism *The Academy of Management Review* , 21(4), 1022-1054.
- Grensing-Pophal, L. (2005). Job rotation. *Credit Union Management*, 28(7), 50-53.
- Hansen, C. D., Lee, Y. (2009). *The Cultural context of human resource development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harris, S. G., & Feild, H. S. (1992). Realizing the "potential" of "high-potential" management development programmes. *The Journal of Management Development*, 11(1), 61-70.
- Herr, E. L. (2001). Formal career plans and its practice: A historical perspective. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 49(3), 196-211.
- Hezlett, S. A., & Gibson, S. K. (2005). Mentoring and Human Resource Development: Where we are and where we need to go. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(4), 446-469.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural Dimensions in Management and Planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 1(2), 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations. (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Research & VSM. Retrieved from <http://www.geerthofstede.nl/research--vsm>
- How job rotation can enhance training effectiveness. (2008) *Accounting Office Management & Administration Report*, 08(8), 2-4. Retrieved from .
- Huang, T. (2001). Succession management systems and human resource outcomes.

- International Journal of Manpower*, 22(7), 736-747.
- Hunter, R. P. (1999). *Michigan Labor Law: What Every Citizen Should Know*. Mackinac Centre for Public Policy, Michigan. Retrieved from <http://www.mackinac.org/archives/1999/s1999-05.pdf>
- Jung, L. (2011) National Labour Law Profile: Federal Republic of Germany http://www.ilo.org/ifpdial/information-resources/national-labour-law-profiles/WCMS_158899/lang--en/index.htm
- Jones, M. L. (2007). Hofstede- Culturally questionable? *Oxford Business & Economics Conference*. 1-9.
- Laird, D. (1985). *Approaches to training and development*. Cambridge, MA. Perseus Books Group, LLC.
- Larsen, H., London, M., Weinstein, M., & Raghuram, S. (1998). High-Flyer Management-Development Programs. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 28(1), 64-90.
- Leather, S. (2001). Training across cultures: content, process, and dialogue. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 228-237.
- Maginn M. (2008). Whos next? Succession Planning. *Management Quarterly*, 49(2), 40-46.
- Marquardt, M., Nissley, N., Ozag, R., Taylor, T. L .J (2000). International Briefing 6: Training and Development in the United States. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 4(2), 138-149.
- Martin, S. (2005). HR and succession planning. *Canadian HR Reporter*, 18(17), 8.
- McCauley, C.D. (2005). The Mentoring Tool. *Advances in Developing Human*

- Resources*, 7(4), 443-445.
- McDonald, K. S., & Hite, L. M. (2005). Reviving the Relevance of Formal career plans in Human Resource Development. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(4), 418-439.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith - a Failure of Analysis. *Human Relations January* 55(1), 89-118.
- Méhaut, P. (2005). Reforming the training system in France. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 36(4), 303-317.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Münch, J. (1991). *Vocational training in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Berlin, Germany: European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training.
- The National Labor College. (2006). Mandatory Subjects of Bargaining. Retrieved from http://www.nlc.edu/cait/olc/Collective_Bargaining/html/c-chapter1.html
- O'Leary, C. J., Straits, R.A., & Wandner, S.A. (2004). *Job Training Policy in the United States*, Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute.
- Ortega, J. (2001). Job Rotation as a Learning Mechanism. *Management Science*, 47(10), 1361-1370.
- Paauwe, J. (2004). *HRM and Performance: Achieving Long-Term Viability*. Oxford University Press.
- Saks, A. M., Tamkin, P., and Lewis, P. (2011) Management training and development. *International Journal of Training and Development*: 15(3), 179-183.

- Schramm, J. (2011). Beyond mentoring. *HRMagazine*, 56(11), 96-96.
- Singh, H. (2000, May 20). Culture to strengthen training. *New Straits Times*. Retrieved From <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1309&dat=20000520&id=XFNIAAAAIBA&sjid=bRQEAAAAIBA&pg=6899,5896370>
- Signorini, P., Wiesemes, R., & Murphy, R. (2009). "Developing alternative frameworks for exploring intercultural learning: a critique of Hofstede's cultural difference model". *Teaching in higher education*, 14(3), p. 253-264.
- Stirling, J., & Miller, D. (1998). Training European trade unionists. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 2(2), 108-118.
- The Economist. (2010, June 17). Too narrow, too soon? *The Economist Newspaper Limited*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/16380980>
- Thelen, K. (2004). *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:
- Tracey, W. R. (1992). *Designing training and development systems*. New York: Amacom.
- Triggs, D. D., & King, P. M. (2000). Job rotation. *Professional Safety*, 45(2), 32-34.
- US Department of Education. (2012, January 24). "Office of Vocational and Adult Education" Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/index.html>
- US Department of Labor (2007). *Legislative Information*. Washington, DC: Department of Labor. Retrieved from http://www.doleta.gov/reports/dpld_legislative.cfm
- US Department of Labor. (2012a, January 22). " Union Members Summary" Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm>

US Department of Labor. (2012b, February 6). "What Can Job Corps Do for Me?"

Retrieved from <http://www.jobcorps.gov/Youth.aspx>

Visser, J. (2007). Trade Union Decline and what next. Is Germany a Special

Case?*/Gewerkschaftlicher Niedergang und was dann? ist Deutschland ein besonderer Fall? *Industrielle Beziehungen*, 14(2), 97-117.

Visser, J. (2006). Union membership statistics in 24 countries. *Monthly Labor Review*, 38-

49. <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2006/01/art3full.pdf>

von Behr, M. (1981). *Die Entstehung der industriellen Lehrwerkstatt*. Frankfurt/Main: Campus.

Weltz, G. Case Study USA-Youth Vocational Education and Training in the United

States. 23-31. Retrieved from

<http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/file.aspx?id=1524>

Wiedemann, H. (1980). Codetermination by Workers in German Enterprises. *The*

American Journal of Comparative Law, 28(1), 79-92.

Wise III, J. B., & Barger, S. (2006). Apprenticeship Training: The German Dual

Vocational Model. *Benefits & Compensation Digest*, 43(10), 38-43.

Andrea Chung

320 Vairo Blvd. Apt C • State College, PA 16803 • (914) 204-2010 • aic5056@psu.edu

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Bachelor of Arts, Labor Studies and Employment Relations
Schreyer Honor Scholar
Graduation: May 2012

EXPERIENCE

Penn State Career Services, University Park, PA, 1/11-present

Mock Interview Intern

- Conduct weekly mock interviews with undergraduate students
- Plan and create interview questions based on interviewee's desired position
- Provide feedback to interviewees, highlighting strengths and suggesting areas for improvement

Geospatial Data Analysis Corporation, State College, PA, 8/10-present

Office Manager

- Recruit and conduct interviews for intern and employee positions
- Write job descriptions and ads for intern and employee positions
- Administer new hire on-boarding activities
- Track and report employee hours for payroll

Energizer, Madrid, Spain, 6/11-7/11

Human Resources Intern

- Recruited and conducted interviews for a sales intern position in Spanish
- Conducted research and created a presentation on current compensation and benefit trends in Spain
- Created career progression maps for employees with high potential for advancement

Penn State Human Resource Development Center, University Park, PA, 9/10-12/10

Training and Development Intern

- Researched potential topics and guest speakers for a leadership conference attended by 500 professionals
- Created resume, interview, and cover letter guidelines for a professional development program designed for technical employees

Geospatial Data Analysis Corporation, State College, PA, 5/10-8/10

Human Resources Intern

- Spearheaded the development of a comprehensive company employee manual
- Prepared new hire packets
- Hired as Office Manager

LEADERSHIP, VOLUNTEER WORK, & ACTIVITIES

Society for Human Resource Management (Penn State Student Chapter)- *THON Chair*

Asian American Students In Action (AASIA) Program- *Mentor to a freshman student*

2011 Starfinder Program- *Mentor to underprivileged high school students*

Mid-State Literacy Council- *Adult ESL Class Teacher; Adult Work Skills Class Teacher; Adult Literacy Tutor*

Penn State Community Garden- *Member*

ACADEMIC HONORS

2012 Student Marshal- Penn State Department of Labor Studies and Employment Relations (LSER)

2010 LSER Dilip and Bharati Shah Award- awarded to LSER Junior with the highest GPA

2010 Tracy Winfree McCourtney Scholarship- Penn State College of the Liberal Arts

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society- Member

Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society-Member

LANGUAGES

Conversational in Spanish