Martha Maznevski on Cultural Dimensions in Organizational Behavior and International Management

*Alliances and international organizations should be understood as opportunities for leadership and a means to expand our influence, not as constraints on our power. **Chuck Hagel quotes***

[1,]Alo Liliweri, [2,]Yohanis Landu Praing

[1,]*Professor of Cross-Cultural Communication, University of Nusa Cendana - Kupang, West Timor*
[2,]*Doctoral Student of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Nusa Cendana*

I.   INTRODUCTION

The latest book written by Maznevski (2004) is entitled "A Guide to Managing Complexity" which contains a "guide" to understand the management of complex international organizations. Actually, this book is the result of research that focuses on the dynamics of teamwork - "high team" - or in the context of global complexity. Martha Maznevski also helped develop the Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire (CPQ) as an instrument to measure individual cultural orientation, this instrument has been tested and then widely used as a diagnostic tool in global organizational teams. Before joining IMD, Professor Maznevski taught at the University of Virginia (USA) and the University of Western Ontario (Canada), also as a visiting researcher at the Stockholm School of Economics (Sweden). She earned a bachelor's degree in education from the University of Toronto (Canada), earned a doctorate in anthropology and business administration at the University of Western Ontario.

Theoretical Basis of Cultural Dimensions

Culture and Individuals : In essence, the concept of cultural orientation dimensions built by Maznevski is based on the theoretical framework of Kluckhon and Strodtbeck but is conceptualized and operationalized for analysis at the individual level. For the purposes of the research, Maznevski took several countries, namely; Canada, Mexico, the Netherlands, Taiwan, and the United States. Maznevski emphasized that "the basis of our research still uses the results of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's research but we add some new perspectives that are expressed in critical questions so that we get information about cross-cultural management.

*) Most of this manuscript is adapted from sources: Maznevski, Martha L.; DiStefano; Gomez, Carolina B. Joseph J.; Noorderhaven, Niels G. and Pei-Chuan Wu, (2002). Cultural Dimensions at the Individual Level of Analysis - The Cultural Orientations Framework, SAGE Publications, (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi). The results of discussions between the authors are sourced from the book by Alo Liliweri, Basic Configuration of Intercultural Communication Theories, 2016, Nusa Media Publisher, Jakarta.
We also build theoretical assumptions by including cultural perspectives because we consider culture to be defined as a phenomenon at the group level that greatly influences individual perceptions, values and behavior, especially regarding social interactions carried out by individuals. Now there are many cross-cultural management studies that start with this last basic premise, 'culture affects everything related to the individual".

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research : Martha Maznevski begins her theoretical framework by analyzing various previous studies, including studies by Triandis (1988), Schwartz and Bilsky (1990), Triandis and Schwartz (Schwartz, 1992, 1994), Kim et al. (1994) and Triandis et al., (1995). These studies have shown several main elements of the cultural approach at the individual level, for example the issue of the dimensions of individualism vs. collectivism. According to her, culture includes many other dimensions beyond individualism and collectivism, meaning that there are still many aspects and characteristics of individuals that are outside of their personal values, these elements may be related to psychological and social phenomena even though these connections cannot be captured by the approaches recommended by experts when they conduct research. Maznevski's argument that the cultural orientation framework of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck has continued to experience criticism and development as stated by Parsons and Shils when discussing general system theory and social action theory (Parsons and Shils, 1951), a time span of 10 years from Kluckhohn's cultural orientation theory.

Whatever the argument, according to Maznevski, the cultural orientation framework of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck is very valuable because it has contributed to the study of cultural orientation for the younger generation studying anthropology and society in the future. This is because Kluchohn and Strodtbeck believe that the "traditional" emphasis of anthropological studies on culture is actually like a rather static painting. Therefore, according to Maznevski, only by studying various cultures can researchers understand the very complex cultural changes that of course automatically expand the scope of anthropology.

Maznevski also found that previous researchers had also proposed a set of specific questions to explore information about 'cultural orientation', where each society is expected to answer these questions operationally, effectively and cooperatively, while also answering other questions that are not included in the main question list. This also means that researchers are given the opportunity to add variations to the various questions that have been compiled. One of the important and basic questions asked to all samples from all cultures studied is:

1. How do I think about humans?
2. How do I see the world?
3. How do I relate to others?
4. How do I use my time? (Adler, 1997).

What was put forward by Andrel (1997) is similar to what has been put forward by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck who have identified a set of cultural orientations consisting of six types of value orientations that can be identified after respondents answer the following questions:

1. What are the main human traits: are they good, bad or "gray" (a mixture of good and bad)?
2. How is the relationship between humans and nature: do humans surrender themselves completely to nature, humans are in harmony with nature, or do humans manage nature?
3. How are the relationships between humans? Is it lineal (a position of commanding others in a group), is it a collegial/collateral relationship (a relationship based on the principle of prioritizing common goals - the welfare of the group), or individualistic (prioritizing the individual)?
4. What is the main mode of human activity; orientation being-becoming, doing/reflecting?
5. How do humans view time: do humans direct their focus on the past, present, or future?
6. How do humans think about space: do they prioritize public space, private space, or a mixture of private and public space? This framework is shown in the following table (Adler, 1997; Stefano and Maznevski, 2000; Lane et al, 2000).

II. DIMENSIONS AND CULTURAL ORIENTATIONS ACCORDING TO KLUCKHOHN AND STRODTBECK

Human nature
1. Good/Evil: the basic nature of humans is good (high score) or evil (low score).
2. Changeable/unchangeable: the basic nature of humans changes (higher score) or does not change (lower score).

Relationships between humans
1. Individual: responsible for themselves and their families.
2. Collective: responsible for groups that can be expanded to include society.
3. Hierarchical: power and responsibility are naturally uneven in society; those in higher positions in the hierarchy have greater power and responsibility than those with lower status

Relationships with the environment
1. Humans "master" or "manage" nature: control, manage, and change nature/the environment directly.
2. Humans surrender or submit to nature: humans do not have to change the basic direction of the environment, humans must allow themselves to be influenced by natural or supernatural elements.
3. Harmony with nature: humans try to maintain balance between environmental elements, including maintaining the balance of nature with themselves.

Activity
1. Doing: humans are involved in activities to complete real tasks.
2. Thinking: humans think rationally before taking certain actions.
3. Being: humans carry out activities spontaneously, also carry out all activities according to time.

Time
1.   Past: humans make decisions based on tradition or those guided by the experiences of others in the past.
2.   Present: decision criteria are guided by urgent needs that are in accordance with the situation and short-term needs.
3.   Future: decision criteria are guided by predictions of future, long-term needs.

Space
1. Public: the space around the individual belongs to everyone so that everyone can use the space.
2. Private: the space around the individual belongs to that person so that it cannot be used by others without permission. (Lane et.al.2000) (See the full text of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck in this book).

Maznevski provides some notes on the dimensions of cultural orientation that are sourced from various previous research; **First,** although the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck framework displays six types of cultural orientation with 16 variations, our team only took four dimensions as indicators for our research, namely: the dimensions of human nature orientation, relations between humans, relations between humans and the environment, and the dimensions of activity orientation; while the other two dimensions, namely the dimensions of time and space orientation, were not taken as indicators because they had been measured by Edward T. Hall (Hall, 1966, 1973). This classification also shows that if we want to get more variations in the dimensions of cultural orientation, we should create more varied questions, including choosing more cultures to compare with each other.

Second, previous researchers obtained their data with a psychometric model, this model is only adequate for initial research but not for further research. Maznevski's team found various statistical measurement errors that resulted in a decrease in the validity of the orientation dimension measurement tool. How to overcome this can be done by updating the measuring instrument such as updating the construct validity or content validity (all indicators should contain the structure & elements of the theory to be tested), for example including indicators on cross-cultural equality issues can only be obtained from international management concepts. As Mullen (1995) and Singh (1995) said, the updated construct validity can be said to be equivalent if all questionnaire items submitted to two (or more) cultural samples must "carry" the burden of the same significant factors. Or according to Cheung and Rensvold (1997), although the questionnaire items are different, they must contain the same factors in two (or more) different cultures. This change in validity is easy to do in connection with the development of technology that supports research methodology so that researchers can change better steps when measuring cultural dimensions from more diverse cultures.

Third, to obtain more valid measures, all questionnaire items should be contextualized as much as possible into business situations, meaning that respondents should come from samples that are truly actors or involved in business. Because researchers must connect theoretical dimensions that apply to the wider population with the cultural context in which businesses operate. This sample selection error must be prevented because researchers found "oddities" in the research results on the dimensions of cultural orientation of Dutch people where the samples taken were students who were involved part-time in business so that they had less understanding of the real Dutch business culture context. As a result, the research results on the dimensions of Dutch cultural orientation describe the validity of the construct or content that contains confusion because what was asked to the sample of part-time business students did not understand the orientation of business culture in the context of Dutch culture. Fourth, further research should include or "pull" several other variables such as cultural perceptions, beliefs, values, and cultural behaviors to enrich the construct and content of the dimensions of cultural orientation, thus enriching the validity of the measurement tool of the dimensions themselves. This means that all questionnaires in subsequent research must be more comprehensive, for example, paying attention to the content variations of cultural dimensions that contain all concepts so that they can measure individual responses from all samples from different cultures.

Assumptions for Compiling Cultural Orientation Patterns : Based on the analysis of all procedures and methodological steps from previous research, the Maznevski team proposed several concepts of cultural orientation patterns as follows. **First,** the target of future research must focus on "individuals" because individuals determine "preferences" for all variations or dimensions of defined cultural patterns. This is important because the concept of "individual" can be confused in the analysis of research results considering the range of cross-cultural differences in the concept of individuals between cultures that emphasize individualism and collectivism.

Second, all dimensions of cultural orientation that may be found in all societies must be able to be reorganized so that researchers can use them as conceptual and scientific reasons when analyzing the dynamics of each culture. This is because researchers do not have the "power" to hold back the rate of socio-cultural change because they have to adapt from time to time.

Third, the dimensions of cultural orientation proposed for research must truly be independent concepts. For example, the dimension of relationships-individual orientation must be free from the dimension of activity-being, or relationships-individual must be free from the concept of individual - collective, also activity-doing must be free from activity being. Researchers are advised to explore this independence seriously for the depth of cultural analysis that is so complex that it is almost impossible to analyze by looking at respondents' answers when choosing the framework of orientation dimensions displayed bipolarly in the questionnaire.

This proposed framework is to complement the research framework of Triandis et al. in the conceptualization of individualism vs. collectivism and allocentrism - ideocentrism (Kim et al., 1994; Triandis, 1972, 1988; Triandis et al., 1995), also about values (Schwartz, 1992, 1994).

III.   DISCUSSION ON SOME FINDINGS

Based on several new assumptions that were then incorporated into the questionnaire items, Maznevski's team found two main conclusions. **First,** it appears that the items developed to represent the cultural orientation framework still show reasonable, although not ideal, preferences in following internal consistency steps. **Second,** when we compare findings between one country and another, several new aspects always emerge that must be explained, for example three important aspects emerge: (1) a comparison of the findings of the cultural orientation dimensions of Maznevski's team with previous research; (2) an examination of the observed cultural patterns in the light of the convergence or divergence debate; and (3) an exploration of the cultural transitions obtained from the variation of the research area as reflected in the data. Various findings from Martha Maznevski's team have been published, one of which I (always) quote is the discussion based on country clusters, individualism-collectivism, hierarchy (power distance), and Chinese cultural characteristics.

Clusters by Country. Ronen and Shenkar (1985) identified eight clusters of "country cultures" (nations), based on a meta-analysis of previous attitude and perception studies. Although the Netherlands was not included in the analysis, four other countries were analyzed, namely Canada, the United States, Mexico and Taiwan, with Canada and the United States in the Anglo cluster, Mexico in a cluster with Latin America, and Taiwan representing the Far Eastern cluster. For example, in the spatial analysis it was found that there was a relative similarity in the orientation of "physical proximity" when communicating culture" between Latin American and Eastern Taiwanese cultures even though in terms of geographical location these two cultures are far apart by continents and oceans, this is similar to the cultural similarity in terms of "physical proximity" between Anglo (the United States) and Germany. Meanwhile, the Canadian and American samples showed differences in only one of the 11 dimensions, suggesting that the two countries have "very" similar cultural patterns. The Mexican and Taiwanese samples only differed in three of the 11 variations with relative preferences between them in the orientation of relationships and activity but not the same in the orientation for human relations with the environment. On the other hand, two countries such as Anglo have one difference with Mexico, or differ from Taiwan on nine variations. Correspondence research from Ronen and Shenkar (1985) through the meta-analysis provides some initial support for establishing other validity in the cultural orientation framework.

Patterns of Individualism - Collectivism. On the issue of individualism – collectivism it seems consistent with previous research from Hofstede (1980) and O'Grady and Lane ((1996), where the data showed that on average respondents from the United States and Canada were in the most individualistic position while respondents from Mexico and Taiwan were in the least individualistic position. Here we can get more information when we separate individualism from collectivism rather than expecting an explanation derived from the conceptualization seen in bipolar choices (cf. Triandis et al., 1995). For example, respondents from Mexico and Taiwan preferred collectivism to individualism, while in other countries both variations were equally preferred by respondents.

In general, the research results show that there is no statistical difference in collectivism orientation across the five countries, this may be due to measurement error or very high variance between individuals. On the other hand, this finding reminds us to be careful when analyzing the answers of respondents from Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States who are pro-individualism as if they have to be anti-collectivism towards respondents from Mexico and Taiwan.

This discrepancy is similar to most domestic management practices where most studies on the United States show their involvement in teams (Cohen and Bailey, 1997), let alone at the international level, all teams studied have performed at world level.

Hierarchy. This dimension is similar to the concept of the power distance (PD) dimension from Hofstede. The results of the study (1980) showed consistency where Canadian and American respondents admitted their power distance at a "low" level when compared to Mexico and Taiwan which had high PD levels. What about the Netherlands? Hofstede's research showed that the Dutch PD score was "very low" when compared to our sample (Maznevski's team) which showed the Dutch score was "very high", this difference in score was apparently caused by our respondents coming from a group of students who were a subculture of new business people in the Netherlands.

East Asian Culture. Most ethnic groups originating from East Asia are often characterized as very different from people in the West (read: "Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) where Eastern culture is certainly strongly influenced by religious and philosophical thoughts of Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism (Chew and Putti, 1995; Redding, 1993). This influence can be seen in the relationship between hierarchy - collectivism, harmony - managing the environment, and the relationship between the model of "thinking" - activity. (Bond and Hwang, 1986; Hwang, 1985; Oh, 1991; Yau, 1988).

So if we observe carefully, it appears that the Taiwanese response is not entirely as expected where Taiwanese respondents interpret collectivism as relationships so that they have the lowest score for hierarchy, but Taiwanese preferences for hierarchy are relatively higher than respondents from Canada and the United States. Meanwhile, Taiwanese respondents also showed a definite and strong preference for harmony rather than mastery of nature, also relying on "thinking" higher than the "activity" mode. Some of the facts explained above are consistent with previous research findings, therefore changes are needed to expand the variety of content from each dimension of cultural orientation so that we can produce findings to improve understanding of the cultural behavior of various nations in the world.

Collaboration and Cultural Intelligence : In the global economy, the principle of "collaboration" is like a high-flying airplane that is highly dependent on the cultural intelligence of the pilot (alw's metaphor). In recent decades, there have been many types of intelligence added to the review of intelligence itself, Maznevski said the "intelligence family" is growing like emotional intelligence (EQ), and cultural intelligence (CQ). Cultural intelligence (CQ) is a development of the previous approach, namely cultural competence, for example, the school of Do's and Taboo's which makes value orientation the basis of national cultural schools. The CQ approach really allows people to understand how culture works or how culture adapts in different cultural contexts. (1)

Professor Martha Maznevski describes CQ as "emotional intelligence that crosses all contexts". Unlike emotional intelligence which is concerned with forming and maintaining positive relationships with different individuals, CQ is concerned with forming and maintaining positive relationships with different social and cultural groups. EQ can be said to be an important prerequisite for CQ.

According to Maznevski, a simple working definition of CQ can be followed through the following story; "CQ is the ability to form and maintain productive intercultural relationships by making adaptations according to differences between cultures. CQ is not only useful for travelers, but also useful for employees in today's workplace because most people work and collaborate across cultures without traveling even across geographical space. New communication technologies allow us to interact with colleagues around the world, and even those who work only domestically need to form productive relationships across cultures.

What are the key elements of CQ?
1. Mindset, is a person's way of looking at things, which; (1) respects different values, beliefs and behaviors, and (2) is open to seeing, thinking and doing different things.
2. Knowledge, the contents of the "head" that begins to understand different perspectives on task-relationship focus or individual-group orientation; how different views affect assumptions, interpretations and behavior.
3. Adaptive skills, the ability to analyze cross-cultural interactions, decide how to adapt, implement the chosen adaptation, what processes occur, and what kinds of adaptations are needed (Maznevski &

Nicholas, and Zander, 2000).

IV.   CULTURAL MAPPING IN INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT

Culture and Management : Maznevski emphasized that it is very important for us to understand culture because many concepts and aspects of management are in culture, both for the sake of understanding the culture of our own country/nation and other countries in multinational positions and cooperation. The cultural background of society turns out to influence their assumptions about how the organization works and how to interact with others in order to perpetuate the cooperation. The influence of culture is indeed felt so deeply, although most are not visible so that we are involved in a scale of conflict that is difficult to understand. On the other hand, there is so much potential for differences in understanding how to communicate between management from different cultures where people do not utilize all of them optimally. (2)

Our research team was quite successful in presenting a lot of information about;

1. Profile of corporate culture operating around the world
2. How cultural similarities and differences have influenced work in organizations, which has an impact on creating higher work effectiveness in multinational teams and global companies
3. How can everyone communicate so that they can better understand others in other cultures

We at IMD have provided a questionnaire to measure cultural orientation, this CPQ has provided a well-tested tool for understanding management behavior and characteristics related to culture. This can be used to diagnose and solve problems, or to identify ways to improve performance. We collected data on collaborations with universities and large global companies, and we also conducted surveys in more than 50 countries in 20 different languages. The results of this data analysis combined with previous research and experience, have enabled us to write a large and important book that can be used as teaching material or that can be used by practitioners. (3)

Issues in Cultural Mapping : The issues discussed here are a guide to making a cultural "map" as has been mentioned in several essays by Maznevski & DiStefano. We simply want to say that with the increasing global activity of domestic and multinational companies, every manager needs to understand cultural differences well. The cultural background of a society turns out to influence their assumptions about how they work and interact with others. Cultural influences, although profound, often come unnoticed. This can lead to deep and difficult conflicts, but it should also be seen as untapped potential.

What is Culture? : Culture is a system of values, beliefs, assumptions and norms, shared among a group of people, which may be a country, region, religion, profession, organization, even a generation or a social club such as a sport. The cultural system of the group is a general agreement among its members about what is important and how they will do things. The more fundamental a grouping, the more fundamental its culture, and the greater its influence on the values and beliefs of its members; in fact, it seems that the fewer members are aware of the influence of culture. (Note: for this theme read: Maznevski, Martha L.; DiStefano, Yoseph; 2003).

Religious and state cultures, for example, are learned early in life, with extensive reinforcement from the family, the media, and the educational, political and legal systems. When learning culture fundamentally, most people have little awareness of other cultures. Like fish in water, that is the relationship between culture and humans, we do not distinguish our own environment from others. We usually become aware of our own culture only when we travel to other places, forcing us to see our own culture differently.

Culture serves two purposes when it comes to global management. **First,** culture provides the software for people to interact within a group; it is like the oil or grease of a society. A shared cultural system allows members to interact with each other efficiently without questioning every motive or action, and with the flow of interaction, everything goes smoothly. Culture provides a guide in the form of basic criteria that do not need to be discussed at length in order to make decisions. Culture also provides a script for each person's behavior so that people know what to expect from each other and how to respond to that behavior, even in terms of how to express and resolve conflict even though it is available in the culture we are studying. Managers should (if not to say should) learn culture because it is from culture that they will gain knowledge so that they will be able to resolve internal cultural differences more easily before they deal with other cultures.

Second, culture provides us with a source of identity for each and every person in a culture. This identity often appears when people describe who they really are; "I am French" or "I am American", "I am Jewish", "I am Arab". Here we can see that identity becomes more important when we feel threatened or uncomfortable in the company of people from other cultures. Every cultural identity provides a kind of "boundary" to draw others into our culture to "be" together, and to push us together with others, culture as an identity protects us from outsiders. This function of culture is a source of motivation to facilitate or thwart cooperation with people from other cultures.

We will describe culture as a medium or way of "sharing" information about anything across cultures, although it must be acknowledged that not every culture fully provides this way, but most cultural systems regulate how information is shared. If culture does not provide a way for us to share together then it can influence us to be not open to change, we become closed people, and unable to adapt to the changing environment. Many Aboriginal cultural items almost died out in this way.

Soviet communism (as opposed to Chinese communism) and IBM in the 1980s provide examples of the dissolution of governments and organizations. On the other hand, if the cultural system is not sufficiently shared, or does not function well as software or as identity, then everyone will interact together in chaos with some subgroups and will continue to develop into a situation of mutual destruction, such chaos is characterized by cultural productivity. Note that most societies or organizations that go through a process of transition will go through the merger path because they have this characteristic.

Four Cross-Cultural Arenas in International Management

	One Way	**Many Ways**
Individual Level	**Arena 1 - Expatriates** Managers as individuals to other countries to manage a business unit or work in a particular area of specialization.	**Arena 2 - Multicultural Teams** Groups from several countries who often work cross-functionally, managing activity units or working on projects in several countries.
Organizational Level	**Arena 3 - Export Systems** Managers manage human resources, information systems, activities or strategies from one country to another.	**Arena 4 - Global Systems** Managers develop human resource systems, organizational structures, organizational strategies to be implemented in several countries.

The table above shows four types of situations in which a manager needs to know about his or her own culture and the cultural differences with others. In such situations, decisions must be made and implemented across cultural boundaries. At the individual level (Arenas 1 and 2), managers must interact effectively with individuals from other cultures.

People from different cultures will bring their different expectations to their interactions with managers, and the effectiveness of decisions depends largely on how managers understand and build decisions based on these differences.

At the organizational level (Arenas 3 and 4), managers must design interaction systems that guide coordinated behavior across multiple people. It is important for managers to know whether these systems will be consistent with or in conflict with the local cultural system. In one-way transactions (Arenas 1 and 3), managers need to take something that has been developed in one culture and incorporate it into another culture. This will be successful if managers understand how cultural issues can be interpreted in new contexts. Meanwhile in multi-way transactions (Arena 2 and 4), managers must take into account many cultural systems at the same time, this situation illustrates that if managers do not (lack) understanding of intercultural differences, it will push the organization into a situation of conflict and disunity.

Cultural Orientation : Mazneski and DiStefano have developed The Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire (CPQ) - a kind of survey method that measures cultural orientation, about: relationships with the environment,

relationships between people, ways of doing things, human nature, concepts of time past, present and future. This profile of individual and group cultural orientations can be applied to improve understanding in four cross-cultural arenas. The best way to understand and predict how one culture differs from another is to create a framework that compares several important dimensions. The cultural orientation framework identifies six basic issues that all groups must address and resolve in order for management to function effectively. The six issues are;

1. Relationships with the environment.
2. Relationships between people.
3. Mode of activity.
4. Human nature.
5. Time.
6. Space.

Everyone in society always handles this problem in different ways based on their respective cultural system patterns. The cultural arena that can be built then is by identifying the combination. We will describe the dimensions and give examples of some impacts on it.

Relationships with the Environment : What kinds of relationships do we have with the world around us? How do we see ourselves in relation to the environment, and what is our role in relation to it? There are three common ways of viewing these relationships: harmony with nature, mastery of nature, and submission to nature. In harmony cultures, such as the Japanese, people do not see themselves as separate from the natural environment but as part of a unified, holistic system of nature-the cosmos. The role of humans here is to help maintain the balance of the system.

In mastery cultures, such as the US, people see themselves as having to dominate the environment. It is considered normal and good to shape the environment - including work and life - according to one's own needs or desires. In subjugation cultures, such as most Muslims, people have a strong belief that the environment or supernatural beings determine the outcome of people or events (in Arabic this is expressed as "insya'Allah" or "Allah-willing"). One may not believe that this style is subject to nature, that nature controls every detail of human life, but one does believe that it directs the major patterns and events in which people act in accordance with their lives with nature. We have used three examples (Japan, the United States, and Islam) of cultures that have elements in their way of relating to the environment. It is important to remember that all variations in all cultures can occur at all times or at all times; however, each culture has a clear pattern that stems from its own pattern of cultural preferences, which we call "cultural orientation."

For example, the cultures of the United States and Japan have all three elements in them harmony, mastery, and submission to nature. However, while Americans prefer mastery to harmony (the Americans say: "We can fix the problems we have created by planting trees by getting rid of trash more efficiently"), the Japanese prefer harmony to mastery (the Japanese say: "The way to fix this system is to plant trees to get more things in balance"). These differences, in relation to the environment, influence which projects and objectives are prioritized, as well as what causes are related to problems, undesirable outcomes that may arise as shown in the following table.

Interhuman Relations with the Environment, Impact on Organizations

	Harmony with Nature	**Managing Nature**	**Submitting to Nature**
Priority	Maintaining the entire system, focusing on the connections between parts	Monitoring certain parts, focusing on established problems	Understanding the highest goal, focusing on implementation according to God's will

Tracking the source of the problem	The entire system that is not taken into account or is out of balance	Elements in the environment that are not close to being controlled	There are no unwanted problems, God knows all about what is happening

Relationships with People: What kinds of relationships between or with other people are considered most natural or effective? To whom are we accountable, to whom should we look out for, and to whom should we obey? There are three general patterns of relationships between people: collective, individualistic, and hierarchical.

In collectivistic cultures, such as Latin Americans, all members of the group care for each other, maintain, and enhance the welfare of the group as a whole. The group may be a family, with many generations and lateral relationships, or it may be an entire society or peer group. In individualistic cultures, such as Australians, people are responsible primarily for themselves and their families. Parents are responsible for children, but only until they reach adulthood. Finally, in hierarchical cultures, such as Indians, those at the top of the hierarchy have dual responsibility and authority over those below them. The hierarchy may be individual or group, but the principles for organizing the hierarchy (e.g., age, caste, gender, wealth) remain stable over time.

Harmony vs. Control. How do Americans value "purpose"? Americans, emphasize control and mastery, while Chinese are most concerned with maintaining balance so as to ensure the overall system is harmonious. If you want to know how Americans value "goals," then a "meeting" is the best forum for decision making, because it is the most formal forum for developing all the relevant arguments, both spoken and written.

If you do not speak up in a meeting, you are considered to have made no contribution to the decision, and you are viewed negatively. On the other hand, if you disagree with the boss – because you are right – then you must show courage and help the boss reach a decision. What constitutes a "meeting" is very different from what is happening in Asia in general. In most cases, the participants are familiar with each other, including the subject matter of the decision-making process. If you disagree with the boss (all leaders are considered seniors) it is considered inappropriate, the most important thing in a meeting is to create a harmonious atmosphere.

Individuality vs. Collectivity. There are differences between cultures in how they treat teams. In all collective cultures, such as India or China, the role of the team is very important because the presence of the team is like a lubricant that smooths the way towards cooperation and decision making. If they have to accept gifts from the organization, they prefer gifts to be given to the group/team because they consider gifts to individuals as if they make that person a golden child.

On the other hand, in individualistic cultures, they do not place much importance on the role of the team because each individual thinks rationally, is confident to work alone, for example the US, England. Meanwhile, in mixed cultures, such as Germany, Russia, Italy or Brazil, role preferences are balanced in certain cases, meaning working with rational and individual considerations but still accommodating cooperation with the group. Mixed cultures require all roles to be clearly divided so that they are carried out firmly so that each individual can contribute to the organization, communication takes place feedback from superiors to subordinates and vice versa.

Hierarchy. Why is an individual "title" or job title something that is very valuable to Germans or Italians? Many non-Germans experience how Germans are very hierarchical because they emphasize individual titles (such as bachelor's degree, profession, expertise, etc.) and individual job titles (such as chief, chairman, commander, police or military job titles, etc.). Basically, a title is something formal that should be respected. This is because often a person's status and position are determined/or at least indicated by a title.

Managers from other countries when working with Germans very often make this mistake, and find that their authority is not recognized because they cannot prove their expertise. The same thing happens in Italy, but in Italy, all forms of authority are always automatically equipped with formal power that has certain job titles. There is even a relationship between hierarchy and individual orientation and collectivism. For example, in many Latin, Arab and Chinese cultures, the values of protecting the group (collectivism) or the individual (individualism) are determined by one's position or standing in the system (hierarchy). The following chart

shows the cultural orientation towards human relations that is associated with leadership and team preferences.

Interhuman Relations, Impact on Organizations

	Kolektivisme	**Individu**	**Hirarki**
Leadership	A leader who is liked is one who displays a personality that is attentive and cares about subordinates.	The leader empowers subordinates to make decisions.	The leader gives orders to subordinates and continues to direct the members of the community.
Tiem	Working towards a common goal, all roles become fluid, rewarding the group	Identifying individual roles to contribute or reward those who excel both individually and as a group	Leaders assign roles, and determine team structure.

Activity Mode

Analysis vs. Action. The budgeting process takes a long time for Brazilians. Of course, all managers analyze and take action, but the emphasis varies from country to country. Note that Indian and Brazilian managers of global companies are often frustrated when dealing with Russians when they are late in submitting their projections, and then fail to fully comply with the established parameters. Americans and Western Europeans tend to see this delay as laziness, or at least a lack of awareness. But for CFOs in these places, budgeting has a different purpose - it is an opportunity to take a closer look at the current business situation. They are less interested in deadlines and budget control. For Americans, Italians and Germans, on the other hand, the approved budget defines the company's obligations for the coming year.

Switzerland - The ideal mixed culture? If we look at all the cultural orientation research graphs about Switzerland, it shows that most orientations are close to zero. In other words, Swiss managers, significantly more than managers from other countries in the world, have a balanced perspective on all questions of cultural orientation. Many see this as a consequence of Switzerland's cultural diversity.

Our research shows that attitudes on these issues are quite similar across Switzerland, including the issue of the value of balance among business people. They ask a lot of questions about the situation and the context before formulating their response, not only that, Switzerland has always shown a politically neutral attitude, we can also say that it is a neutral culture (but not without culture!). Perhaps this is why Switzerland has the best banks in the world, it is not surprising that many wealthy people around the world, global and multinational companies keep their money in Switzerland, especially supported by tax regulations that are very favorable to foreign investors. This statement about the mixed culture of the Swiss is not entirely accepted by Swiss business people working in other countries, this is certainly related to the cultural configuration.

What mode of activity is best and appropriate in cultural interaction? How should we engage in activities, how should we rely on others to act? There are three variations, namely; "being", "doing" and "thinking". In the "being culture" like most Latinos, they emphasize activities that are carried out spontaneously, all the time. In this culture, "work as part of life, we do not live to work!" (one works to live, one does not live to work). All our work is done, but not necessarily prioritized over other things; people who work a lot do it because they want to do it, not because they think they have to. In some cultures, work is to express all emotions freely, they work as something that is accepted and expected.

In a "doing culture" such as Canada or the US, work is a person's struggle to achieve, to achieve a certain orientation. In this "doing" culture, people tend to see tasks and activities related to work as the center of their existence, and even work as their identity. Meanwhile, in a "thinking culture" such as Germany or France, it emphasizes that all human actions must actually be based on strong rational thinking, so there is planning before action. With a strong "thinking" orientation, that is what controls activities. People do not have to act impulsively because they are driven or controlled by feelings, or compulsively by some hidden power of need.

Activity Model, Its Impact on Organizations

	Being	**Doing**	**Thinking**
Goals and Priorities	Priority on activities to build and maintain relationships & trust to address business objectives	All activities must be done efficiently and effectively	All activities to be done are always planned.
Schedule & Deadlines	All activities are arranged according to a schedule, the schedule can change according to conditions	All activities must be achieved, if necessary the results achieved exceed what was planned, failure can occur if no results are achieved.	All activities must be carried out rationally, thinking in detail, working hard according to the plan that has been prepared.

Human Nature : This value involves how we think about the basic nature of human beings. It is not a belief about how an individual will behave, but what the underlying nature of all of us as human beings is. One clue is what we think about our nature when we are born, before we are subject to the influence of other people and society. In some cultures, people believe that basic human nature is not determined, but is actually written on a "blank slate."

Human nature is believed to be entirely determined by the environment and events of each person's life. Many modern Western cultures fall into this category. In these cultures, there is a strong focus on training and socialization, and the rehabilitation or training of people who have behaved badly. In some cultures it is assumed that we start out basically good, and that if people do bad things in their lives it is an anomaly or because something in their experiences and environment has made them bad. Muslims believe this. In such cultures, people tend to trust others before there is any evidence that they are untrustworthy, as they often punish people harshly or go against nature and harm others. There are also other cultures that assume that everyone starts out bad (e.g., the idea of original sin in Christianity), and that we should always be on guard against giving in to our evil natures. People in these cultures tend to protect themselves and monitor others, and they also respect others who live their lives their way, or respect others who do exceptionally good things.

Human Nature and Its Impact on Organizations

	Baik	**Campuran Baik/ Buruk (Hampa)**	**Buruk**
Controll	Control over activities is "low", this style is preferred and expected to be applied to others or to oneself.	All activities are monitored because they are related to the situation	Control over activities is "very high", this style is preferred and expected to be applied to others or to oneself.
Trust	"High" degree of confidence - it is assumed that the individual is very confident in carrying out the activity, unless there is other evidence that could undermine the confidence	Confidence in the activity to be carried out is very dependent on the characteristics of the individual, the organization and the situation.	"Low" degree of confidence - it is assumed that the individual is less confident in carrying out all activities, unless there is evidence to the contrary.

Time : The idea of time is very complex. Some cultures think of "linear time", time is like a scale so that time systematically moves from the past to the present and then to the future. The concept of time is called monochronic, which explains that time can be detailed (or broken down) into segments of relatively equal size (old-new, long-short, fast-slow etc.). Most industrial cultures view time in this way, they measure, record and plan all events according to these segments. Things that are done must be based on time units. Cultural orientation towards time greatly influences the way people think and work. Cultures with a past orientation tend to see past experiences as the answer to solving current dilemmas, they highly value tradition and ancestors. Cultures with a current time orientation always think about urgent needs at the moment,

If there is an orientation then the orientation is short-term, focused on maintaining the situation with the modern era that is being enjoyed. Meanwhile, future-oriented cultures always prioritize long-term plans, often sacrificing anything today for security or success far into the future. There are also cultures that see time as "parallel time", we call them polychronic cultures. In polychronic cultures, people think of time as abundant and flexible. Such people are naturally involved in several activities at once, and see time and activities as moving smoothly, they say…. Time will come back, there is always tomorrow etc. Clocks and calendars are seen only as guidelines and estimates, not to be obeyed as something real. The impact of different cultural views, between linear time orientation and partial time orientation can be followed in the following chart.

Time, Impact on Organization

Monochronic	Polychronic	
Time moves linearly Accustomed to doing several activities sequentially based on time sequences Measurable time, very strict in calculating time in seconds, minutes, hours, days, etc. Based on schedules and calendars	Time moves like a circle, flexible – time will come back again Can do several activities at the same time (parallel) Doesn't mind changes to scheduled times	
Past	**Present**	**Future**
Based on the past, prioritizing tradition Doing something very practical based on past experiences	Prioritize important activities, must be done now Move quickly to face opportunities and challenges Think and work in the short term.	Prioritize activities that benefit the future, sacrificing anything in the present. Think and work in the long term Collaborate through planning and analysis

Space : Spatial orientation relates to a person's sense of ownership of space, or ownership of what is in a particular area. Public orientation to space suggests that space is shared or intended for everyone, whereas private orientation to space implies that space is only intended for a particular individual or group. In the context of work, even small things you should pay attention to, such as closing doors, personal workspaces, table and chair arrangements, meeting room arrangements, all indicate areas that reflect an individual's cultural orientation to space or your distance from an object.

The concept of the "open door", in principle as the idea of openness in sharing information, or opening contact to bring employees closer to managers so that information spaces are generally informal in order to reflect a more general cultural orientation. Currently in organizations, information is an important aspect of this dimension. In cultures with an open-oriented society, people assume that information should be shared openly, whereas in private cultures you will see that the orientation to information is as something "owned", as a result people with this culture do not expect others to share information openly.

Summary of All Cultural Orientations : The cultural orientation framework provides a valuable tool for comparing one culture with another, essentially highlighting similarities and differences across cultures, and also suggesting implications for management. This information is critical to implementing cross-cultural strategies in international organizations. Managers who are aware of their own cultural systems can predict areas of conflict and learning when working with people from other cultures. International organizational strategy and system designers can take these differences into account, through practice after practice! This can create a more synergistic approach to managing cultural diversity. The following chart summarizes all dimensions of the cultural orientation framework, and you can use this framework to characterize your own cultural system and interact with other cultures.

Space: Impact on Organizations

	Private	Public
Official	Formal and highly individual The office door is always closed Office accessories become "property" that is only used by the person themselves	Less formal and very open. Workspace is always open Office accessories become public property, everyone can use them
Information	Belongs to individuals or groups. Information can be shared if permitted	Public information Information can be shared openly with anyone

One final reminder - no culture is static or completely homogeneous. Cultures change, and individuals within cultures differ from one another. Cultural knowledge is essential so that we can treat cultural analysis as a tentative guide to interacting and communicating with others at first, and when faced with new information. If you are visiting Japan for the first time, you may be greeted by a Japanese manager.... He shakes hands and bows.... note this dimension. Or your guest may be more like your own culture, all of which you need to anticipate. On your first visit to Russia, you may be working with managers who are from the "old organization" culture or with those who are being exposed to the "new" culture. In each of these cases, however, the cultural orientation framework provides a way for us to identify the shared systems of values, beliefs, assumptions and norms that guide our priorities and expectations within the culture.

Recapitulation of Cultural Orientation Framework

ORIENTATION	VARIATION		
Relationship with the environment	**Harmony**	**Managing and Conserving Nature (Mastery)**	**Submitting / submitting to nature (Subjugation)**
	In essence, the role and purpose of human life is to maintain balance between all elements of the natural environment, including ourselves.	In essence, the role and purpose of human life is to control the environment and nature around it.	In essence, human ideals, goals, and roles are left to nature, all life plans depend on nature and supernatural powers.
Interpersonal relations	**Collectivism**	**Individualism**	**Hierarchy**
	Individuals are responsible to the group	Individuals are responsible to themselves and their immediate family.	Hierarchy is normal, it is good if power and responsibility are distributed equally in society.
Form of activity	**Being**	**Doing**	**Thinking**
	Individuals naturally prefer to do things on time.	Individuals naturally prefer to do things that have visible and felt results.	Individuals' activity modes are naturally oriented towards good results, therefore think rationally and plan every job carried out.
Human nature	**Bad**	**Mix of good & bad**	**Good**
	In essence, human nature is bad, becoming a good person requires effort.	In essence, human nature is a mixture of good and evil, in certain situations people are good and in other situations people become evil, it all depends on the environment.	In essence, human nature is good, it all depends on the assessment of the environment.

Variety Gives Power

ORIENTATION	VARIATION		
Time	Monochronic		Polychronic
	Linear time, time can be divided into more detailed sequences or units		Time is not linear/parallel
	Past	**Present**	**Future**
	Business decisions made today are always based on tradition, experience or past precedent.	Business decisions made today must be based on facts and pressing needs.	Business decisions made today are always based on long-term plans and anticipation.
Space	**Public**		**Private**
	All spaces are open and can be used by everyone		Spaces are owned by individuals or groups.

A final example to illustrate this point. A global chemical company asked me for help, a project team had been assembled to solve a pressing quality control problem. The team consisted of three people, one each from the United States, China and Switzerland - and their efforts were failing miserably. The American wanted to tackle the problem with his rational brain, the Chinese wanted to start by analyzing the entire system, and the Swiss wanted to find a balance between the two approaches. Worst of all, each of them was convinced that his solution was the only correct one. The end result was - no progress in solving the problem.

The cultural perspective questionnaire we created was intended to show, in a non-judgmental way, the differences in the way people work. If we are aware of the differences, we will be able to harness the strengths that come from each culture. Efficiency, for example, requires a "tall organization" while a "flat organization" requires innovation. If every culture had the same set of values, we would surely lose variety, in other words, variety actually gives us the power to adapt to new situations and to find entirely new solutions.***

Daftar Pustaka

- Adler, N.J. (1997) International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior, 3rd edn. Cincinnatti: South-Western.
- Alduncin, Abatia, E. (1993) Los Valores de los Mexicanos: En Busca de una Esencia. Mexico: Fomento Cultural Banamex.
- Bond, M.H. and Hwang, K.-K. (1986) 'The Social Psychology of Chinese People', in M.H. Bond (ed.) The Psychology of the Chinese People, pp. 213–66. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Brislin, R.W. (1980) 'Translation and Content Analysis of Oral and Written Materials', in H.C. Triandis and J.W. Berry (eds) Handbook of Cross-cultural Psychology, vol 2 (Methodology), pp. 389–444. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M.J., Francesco, A.M., Chen, Z.X, Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gómez, C., Kirkman, B.L. and Shapiro, D.L. (2001) 'Culture and Procedural Justice: The Moderating Influence of Power Distance on Reactions to Voice', Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 37: 300–15.
- Burns, T. and Stalker, G.M. (1961) The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Chew, I.K.H. and Putti, J. (1995) 'Relationship of Work-related Values of Singaporean and Japanese Managers in Singapore', Human Relations 48(10): 1149–70.
- Chinese Culture Connection (1987) 'Chinese Values and the Search for Culture-free Dimensions of Culture', Journal of CrossCultural Psychology 18(2): 143–64.
- Cohen, S.G. and Bailey, D.E. (1997) 'What Makes Teams Work: Group Effectiveness Research from the Shop Floor to the Executive Suite', Journal of Managemen t23(3): 239–90.
- DiStefano, J.J. and Maznevski, M.L. (2000). 'Creating Value with Diverse Teams in Global Management', Organizational Dynamics 29 (1): 45–63.
- Hall, E. T. (1973,1976). Beyond Culture, [New York: Doubleday] Hall, E.T. (1966). The Hidden Dimension, New York: Doubleday

- Henry W. Lane, Martha Maznevski, Mark E. Mendenhall, Jeanne McNett Wiley,(2004). Blackwell Handbook of Global Management. A Guide to Managing Complexity (Blackwell Handbooks in Management).Published Blackwell Publishing Limited .
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related values.Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. and M.H. Bond (1984), "Hofstede's Culture Dimensions: An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Survey", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15, 417-433.
- Hwang, K.-K. (1985) 'Face and Favour: The Chinese Power Game', American Journal of Sociology 92: 944–74.
- Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S.-C. and Yoon, G. (eds) (1994) Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kroeber, A. and Kluckhohn, C. (1985), Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. New York: Random House.
- Lane, H.W., DiStefano, J.J. and Maznevski, M.L. (2000) International Management Behavior, 4th edn. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- Maznevski, M.L. and Peterson, M.F. (1997) 'Societal Values, Social Interpretation, and Multinational Teams', in C.S. Granrose and S. Oskamp (eds) Cross-cultural Work Groups, pp. 61–89. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Maznevski, M.L., DiStefano, J.J., Gomez, C.B., Noorderhaven, N.G. and Wu, P. (1997) 'The Cultural Orientations Framework and International Management Research', Paper Presented at Academy of International Business Annual Meeting.
- Maznevski, Martha L, (1995). Process And Performance In Multicultural Team. Western Business School, University of Western Ontario in London, Canada .
- Maznevski, Martha L. and DiStefano, Joseph J. (1996). Measuring Culture in Intenational Management The Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire. University of Western Ontario, Western Business School in London, Canada.
- Maznevski, Martha L.; DiStefano, Yosepg; (2003). Culture in International Management: Mapping the Impact, IMD – Perspectives for Manager, No. 105, November 2003.
- Maznevski, Martha L.; DiStefano; Gomez, Carolina B. Joseph J.; Noorderhaven, Niels G. and Pei-Chuan Wu, (2002). Cultural Dimensions at the Individual Level of Analysis - The Cultural Orientations Framework, SAGE Publications, (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi)
- Maznevski, Martha L; Athanassiou, Nicholas A. and Zander, Lena; (2000), GLOBAL Teams in a Multinational Enterprise: A Social Capital and Social Networks Perspective, Work In Progress to be Presented at Organization Science Winter Conference, Colorado.
- Mullen, M.R. (1995) 'Diagnosing Measurement Equivalence in Cross-national Research', Journal of International Business Studies 26(3): 573–96.
- O'Grady, S. and Lane, H.W. (1996) 'The Psychic Distance Paradox', Journal of International Business Studies 27(2): 309–33
- Oh, T.K. (1991) 'Understanding Managerial Values and Behaviour among the Gang of Four: South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong', Journal of Management Development 10(2): 46–56.
- Parsons, Talcott, (1951), The Social System, New York, Free Press.
- Redding, S.G. (1980), "Cognition as an Aspect of Culture and its Relation to Management Practices: An Explanatory View of the Chinese Case", Journal of Management Studies. 17, 127-148.
- Redding, S.G. (1993) The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism. New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Ronen, S. and Shenkar, O. (1985) 'Clustering Countries on Attitudinal Dimensions: A Review of and Synthesis', Academy of Management Review 10(3): 435–54.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1992) 'Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries', Advances in Experimental Social Psychology 25: 1–65.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1994) 'Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values', in U. Kim, H.C.
- Schwartz, S.H. and Bilsky, W. (1990) 'Toward a Theory of the Universal Content and Structure of Values: Extensions and Crosscultural Replications', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 58(5): 878–91.
- Schwartz, S.H. and N. Struch (1989), "Values, Stereotypes, and Intergroup Antagonism", in Bar-Tal, D., C.F. Graumann, A.W. Kruglanski, and W. Stroeb (Eds.), Stereotyping and Prejudice: Changing

Conceptions, New York: Springer- Verlag.

- Schwartz, S.H. and W. Bilsky (1987), "Toward a Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53 (3), 550-560.
- Schwartz, S.H. and W. Bilsky (1990), "Toward a Theory of the Universal Content and Structure of Values: Extensions and Cross-Cultural Replications", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58(5), 878-891.
- Singh, J. (1995) 'Measurement Issues in Crossnational Research', Journal of International Business Studies 26(3): 597–619.
- Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi and G. Yoon (eds). (1995). Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Triandis, H.C. (1972) Analysis of Subjective Culture. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H.C. (1988) 'Collectivism v. Individualism: A Reconceptualisation of a Basic Concept in Cross-cultural Social Psychology', in G.K. Verma and C. Bagley (eds) Cross-cultural Studies of Personality, Attitudes, and Cognition. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Trompenaars, Fons and Asser, Maarten Nijhoff; (2010). Mastering M and A: Cross- cultural Dimensions of Mergers and Acquisitions, Infinite Ideas United Kingdom
- Turner, Charles Hampden and Trompenaars, Fons; (1998). Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business, McGraw Hill United States
- Turner, Charles Hampden and Trompenaars, Fons; (2004). Managing People Across Cultures. Capstone United States
- Yau, O.H.M. (1988), "Chinese Cultural Values: Their Dimensions and Marketing Implications", European Journal of Marketing, 22(5), 44-57.

Sumber Internet
- http://www.tmaworld.com/news-insights/blognews/for-collaboration-to- take-flight-cultural-intelligence/
- Diakses pada tanggal 4 Oktober 2014
- http://www.imd.org/research/projects/CPQ.cfm
- Diakses pada tanggal 4 Oktober 2014
- http://www.imd.org/research/projects/CPQ.cfm
- Diakses pada tanggal 4 Oktober 2014