

r
by Z Z

Submission date: 24-Nov-2020 06:01PM (UTC+0500)

Submission ID: 1456027763

File name: Country_Comparison_1.docx (21.01K)

Word count: 1090

Character count: 6162

Country Comparison

Name

Institution

Instructor

Course

Date

Country Comparison

1

Country Comparison Value: The America Compared to China and Australia			
	United States	China	Australia
Power Distance	40	80	38
Individualism	91	20	90
Masculinity	62	66	61
Uncertainty Avoidance	46	30	51
Long Term Orientation	26	87	21
Indulgence	68	24	71

Power distance defines how far less powerful individuals of a foundation and establishment in the country anticipate and welcome the fact that the distribution of power is unequal. China has the highest power distance meaning it believes that the imbalances amid people are tolerable. Whereas, the United States and Australia deem them unallowable. Individualism is the extent of mutuality the community keeps between its members. Australia and the United States are at a higher value in regards to this dimension. This means that in China people act while minding the group's interest but not theirs as compared to US and Australia where a majority of the members act for their benefits (Hofstede Insights, 2018).

Masculinity is the type of motivation people need for them to become the best at what they do. China, US and Australia's 66, 62 and 61 values respectively, in this dimension indicates that most of their members are either success, achievement or competition motivated. This dimension seems to be even across all three countries. Uncertainty avoidance is the level at which society members experience intimidation by questionable or not known circumstances and

have come up with an establishment and beliefs for the avoidance of these circumstances. At 46, US tends to be threatened by the unknown and ambiguous circumstances more than China but less than Australia. Besides, long term orientation narrates how the community has to be in contact with its past to cope with present or future difficulties. China has the highest value in this dimension which is 87 indicating that they are heavily dependent on the past to solve the present and the future as compared to the low values of US and Australia at 26 and 21 respectively (Hofstede Insights, 2018). Last but not least, indulgence, which is the length to which members of a community try controlling their wants. In this case, US has higher indulgence than China but lower than Australia's.

Human Resource Application

Four aspects contrast among these nations which are indulgence, individualism, power distance and long-term orientation. US and Australia have lower values in power distance as compared to China indicating that they do not believe that inequality is acceptable. In individualism, US and Australia lead in the values by 91 and 90 respectively while China is way below with 20 showing that most of the society members in US and Australia act without considering others (Hofstede Insights, 2018). On the other hand, in long-term orientation and indulgence, US and Australia have low values as compared to China and high values as compared to China respectively.

These differences may positively or negatively affect workforce relationships and efficiency. One unhealthy effect of these differences is that there will be an increased interpersonal conflict amongst organizational personnel. Differences in opinion, beliefs, thoughts, trends, values, traditions, norms and customs may be the root cause of these conflicts. The other dimensions such as religion, culture and politics pop up as time goes by. Normally, the

critical part of a person's identity makes up the ordinal dimensions. The deeply hidden qualities put forward the real nature of diversity. It is usually hard to develop unity among individuals who are culturally diverse and are placed together to attain a certain target with mutual collaboration and effort because of opinion differences and other variables. Effects of profound similarity on group solidarity are positive, whereas, that of deep-level disparity on group togetherness is negative (Pheko et al., 2017). Hence, indulgence in conflict may result from reasons related to or not related to the job at all.

A constructive effect of these differences is that the workers from different cultures normally have alternating ways of thinking. Therefore, if presented with a problem, there will be a variety of views when it comes to solutions. This is difficult to attain if the entire workforce is from a similar cultural background. There are a variety of experiences spread across a workforce that is culturally diversified which provides an organization with a wider knowledge base. Mostly, group work with culturally varied individuals assists in overcoming cultural variance through experience sharing when working with a team. Another positive effect is the increase in the tendency to get the better of culture shock by organizational personnel as the firm expands to other nations intending to become international (Chapter 12, n.d). This is a critical benefit because several modern firms have global extensions on their corporate plan. Notably, when an organization intends to diversify, there is a range of barriers including collecting information with regards to the local customs and regulations in the remote nation, examining the risks and coming up with plans to subdue those risks (Chernyak-Hai & Rabenu, 2018). Therefore, if a company is culturally diverse, they will not go through the huddle of outsourcing for this information, rather, they will use knowledge and information provided by their diverse workforce.

There are several ways in which a company can take advantage of these divergence to nourish its universal labor force. Firstly, promoting cross-administrative focus groupings and facilitate fluid and candid interchange of concepts, experiences and ideas between workers who would not interconnect with each other (Chernyak-Hai & Rabenu, 2018). Secondly, perform an employee survey to master their preferences regarding the style of working, working conditions and schedule and how managers and supervisors give responses. Analyzing employees' responses will give the employer what demotivates and motivates their employees. Lastly, asking workers for their contribution to the ways the organization can create an exceptional workroom culture. Appreciation of the difference among a variety of cultures in the organization is commendable (Chapter 12, n.d). However, every business leader is obligated to nature a firm culture where every employee belongs to a single group; an organizational team.

References

- Chapter 12: *Winning Through Effective, Global Talent Management*. (n.d.). In International Business. (pp. 545-599). https://saylordotorg.github.io/text_international-business/.
Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 3.0.
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Rabenu, E. (2018). *The New Era Workplace Relationships: Is Social Exchange Theory Still Relevant?* Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 11(3), 456-481.
- Hofstede Insights. (2018). *Country Comparison - Hofstede Insights*. <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/australia,china,the-usa/>
- Pheko, M. M., Monteiro, N. M., & Segopolo, M. T. (2017). *When Work Hurts: A Conceptual Framework Explaining How Organizational Culture May Perpetuate Workplace Bullying*. Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 27(6), 571-588.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Submitted to Trident University International

Student Paper

4%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off