

THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURE ON TOP
EXECUTIVES' APPROACH TO STRATEGY
DEVELOPMENT: AN EXPLORATORY
INVESTIGATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL
HOTEL INDUSTRY

By

BAKER MAHMOUD HELAL AYOUN

Bachelor of Business Administration
Mutah University
Karak, Jordan
1996

Master of Business Administration
Yarmouk University
Irbid, Jordan
1999

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University in partial
fulfillment for the requirements of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 2006

THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURE ON TOP
EXECUTIVES' APPROACH TO STRATEGY
DEVELOPMENT: AN EXPLORATORY
INVESTIGATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL
HOTEL INDUSTRY

Dissertation Approved:

Patrick Moreo

Dissertation Adviser

Radesh Palakurthi

Woo Gon Kim

James Hromas

A. Gordon Emslie
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my amazing adviser, Dr. Patrick J. Moreo, for his kind support, guidance, and continuous expressions of belief in my ability to succeed. ‘Pat’ made my doctoral studies a journey in professionalism. It is both a privilege and a pleasure to work with him.

The distinguished committee members of my dissertation, Dr. Radesh Palakurthi, Dr. Woo Kim “Woody”, and Dr. James Hromas, deserve my sincerest appreciations for their care, encouragement, and the remarkable knowledge they shared with me. To Dr. Palakurthi, your help went beyond the call of duty. Your advice on all aspects of this dissertation has been invaluable. Thank you for giving me company, friendship, and support during the last three years.

I am indebted to a number of colleagues and friends who actively assisted me toward achieving my goals and completing this project successfully. Particularly for the translation of the survey instrument and the data collection process, Ahmet Oztork, Wanlanai Saiprasert, Christy Ng, Dr. Cihan Cobanoglu, Birol Ozturk, Volkan Cicek, Ihsan Kara, Ildus Ahmadullin, Dr. Ali Cetinkaya, Dr. Murat Hancer, Yaemdao Narangajavana, Minyen Ku, Dr. Angelo Camillo, Dr. Shahrin Abkarim, Dr. Zulkhairi Amom, and Pimtong Tavitiyaman deserve special thanks. Without your help, this project could not have been completed. I owe special thanks to Dr. Christine Johnson for securing the necessary scholarship funds for this project; and to my friend Don Wood for his gentle encouragements and sincere collegial support.

I must thank the participant hotel managers in the study, without them there would be no study.

Finally, I wish to express my sincere appreciations to Dr. Adel Rasheed, for his passion and enthusiasm for international management. Our heated discussions in the classroom and in his office inspired my scholarship.

Thank you all...

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated with love to
my dad, mom, sisters, and brothers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
The International Hotel Industry	5
Problem Statement	8
Purpose of the Study	10
Research Questions	10
Nature of the Research	11
Significance of the Study	13
Organization of the Dissertation	14
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
The Strategy Construct	15
The Concept of National Culture	26
Research on National Culture and Strategy	35
Potential Influences of National Cultural Dimensions on Business Strategy Development	38
Relevant Research from the Hotel Literature	63
Summary	68
III. METHODOLOGY	71
Sampling	71
Data Collection	74
Instrumentation	77
Statistical Analysis	87
IV. RESULTS	89
Demographic and Professional Characteristics of the Respondents	89
Statistical Testing of the Research Hypotheses	94
Summary	131

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	134
Discussion of Empirical Findings	134
Implications for Practice	153
Limitations	157
Future Research	159
References.....	164
Appendices.....	191

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Similarities among Cultural Frameworks	34
2 Summary of the Research Hypotheses	70
3 Country Status on Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions	73
4 Response Rates by Country	77
5 Literature Sources Used in the Development of Scales of the Current Study	78
6 Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients of the Scales	84
7 Respondents’ Demographic and Professional Characteristics.....	92
8 Descriptive Statistics of the Dependent Variables.....	97
9 Results for the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses of Factors Predicating the Dependent Variables.....	99
10 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale – Power Distance	101
11 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale – Power Distance	102
12 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Games-Howell Tests for the Content of Strategic Objectives Scale – Power Distance	104
13 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Formality of Strategic Control Scale – Power Distance	105
14 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale - Uncertainty Avoidance	107
15 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance.....	108
16 ANOVA and Levene’s Tests for the Type of Data Used in Strategic Analysis Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance.....	109
17 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Formality of Strategic Control Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance	110
18 ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests for the Strategic Planning Time Horizon Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance.....	112
19 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Focus of Strategic Objectives – Individualism/Collectivism.....	114
20 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale - Individualism/Collectivism.....	115
21 ANOVA, Levene’s, and Tukey Tests for the Formality of Strategic Control Scale - Individualism/Collectivism.....	116

22	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Strategy Evaluation Criteria Scale - Individualism/Collectivism.....	118
23	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Strategy Evaluation Time Horizon Scale - Individualism/Collectivism	119
24	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale - Individualism/Collectivism.....	120
25	ANOVA, Levene's, and Games-Howell Tests for the Content of Strategic Goals Scale - Masculinity/Femininity	122
26	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale - Masculinity/Femininity	123
27	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Rationality of Strategic Analysis Scale - Masculinity/Femininity.....	124
28	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale - Masculinity/Femininity.....	125
29	ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests for the Strategic Planning Time Horizon Scale – Time Orientation	127
30	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale – Time Orientation.....	128
31	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Commitment to Strategic Decisions Scale– Time Orientation	129
32	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change – Time Orientation	130
33	ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Strategy Evaluation Time Horizon Scale – Time Orientation	131
34	Results Summary of Statistical Testing of the Research Hypotheses.....	133

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Strategy is considered to be a powerful managerial activity that can affect the success or failure of organizations. Since its introduction to the business world in the twentieth century, strategic management has received considerable attention by academics, consultants as well as practitioners. Many concepts, tools and techniques have been developed to help managers create and use strategy. Most of the literature, especially during the 1970s and 1980s, has been focused on the analytical, rational and normative aspects of strategic management which facilitate generic competitive strategies (Miller, 1987; Hill, 1988; Bourgeois, 1980; Hofer & Schendel, 1978), and top executives became noticeably absent from writings on strategy (Hambrick, 1989).

In more recent years, however, a growing interest in the strategic management literature has emphasized the importance of behavioral explanations, as opposed to the traditional systematic approaches, to strategy development. In addition to the processes through which the strategy itself develops or emerges, more emphasis has been placed on those who develop strategies. This stream of research has confirmed the influence of

upper-level management (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) on strategy. It has been suggested, for example, that what the top executives view as strategically important is usually reflected in the organizational strategy (Boulton, 1984: 183; Thompson & Strickland, 1999:57). Strategic success of an organization (Buzzell, Gale, & Sultan, 1975; Katz & Kahn, 1978), and its strategic responses and choices (Daft & Weick, 1984; Smircich & Stubbart, 1985) are partially determined by top-level executives' background and characteristics. Different executives will make different decisions in the same situation, based on their individual experiences and values (Klester & Sproul, 1982; Prahalad & Bettis, 1986; Starbuck & Milliken, 1988; Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Due to the difference they make in shaping the future of their organizations, a focus on top executives is believed to strengthen immensely the abilities to understand many corporate phenomena, including models of strategy formulation and selection (Hambrick, 1989).

The awareness of, and attention to, the “soft” aspects of strategic management was particularly heightened by the findings of cross-national studies in social sciences. Studies by Hofstede (1980) and Laurent (1983), for example, revealed a presence of strong national cultural differences among individuals from different countries. Since then, cultural similarities and differences and their effect on values, attitudes, and behaviors have been the focus of considerable research attention in management literature. National culture was found to affect the role executives are expected to take (Peterson, Smith, Akande, & Ayestarom, 1995; Shane, 1995; Torbrion, 1985), their values and attitudes (Ali, Azim, & Krishnan, 1995; Giorgi & Marsh, 1990; Hofstede, 1980; Laurent, 1983; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996; England, 1975), their

behavior (Black & Porter, 1991; Gesteland, 1996; Lane, DiStefano, & Maznevski, 1996; Selmer, Kang, & Wright, 1994), and their philosophy and style (Adler, 1983; Stephen & Greer, 1997; Hofstede, 1983; Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979). ..

Even though some studies failed to find strong cross-national differences (e.g., Lambert, Hamers, & Frasure-Smith, 1979; Minturn & Lambert, 1964), research in general has shown that individuals notice, interpret, and retain information based on their values, assumptions and expectations. Different assumptions and values lead to different ways of looking at the same thing (Sims & Gioia, 1986). The implication is that executives from different cultures may view the same strategic situation in significantly different ways and behave differently in any particular situation based on their beliefs and values.

There is evidence that national cultures vary and that a variety of managerial practices, including strategic decision making (Puffer, 1993) differ by national culture. National cultural value systems influence patterns of thinking, feeling, and acting that may differ from one nation to another (Hofstede, 1980). The particular ways of life, philosophy and value systems of people of particular nation will influence their work behavior (Pongyeela, 1995). These and many other related findings have a strong relevance for strategic management research in particular. The approach taken or the strategy displayed by individual executives is likely to be heavily dependent upon national culture. Indeed, researchers and practitioners have long suspected that national culture influences executives' strategic thought and action. In a conceptual paper,

Schneider (1989) argued that organizations will approach the task of strategy formulation in different ways, reflecting the underlying national cultural assumptions. Therefore, she states, strategy formulation process can not be considered “culture-free”, a view also shared by Hambrick & Brandon (1988). Ross (1999) implied that national culture is a critical variable in the strategy process and should be explicitly examined as a part of the process. Weick (1985) argued that cultural research and strategic management research are opposite sides of the same coin. These and other studies indicate that executives’ cultural values and beliefs, consciously and unconsciously, have important influences on strategy.

Only recently, however, researchers have begun to empirically explore the potential relationship between national culture and strategy (Geletkanycz, 1997), and the results produced were inconclusive. On one hand, Govekar (1994), as cited in Markocsy (2000), failed to find a relationship between the perceived importance of strategic goals and national culture. Similarly, no differences were found between executives studied by Parnell (2004) in terms of the risk attached, top management control, and employee participation in the strategy formulation process. National differences between culturally-different executives, on the other hand, were found in their interpretation and response to strategic issues (Schneider & De Meyer, 1991), the criteria they use in strategic decisions and orientations (Hitt, Dacin, Tyler, & Park, 1997; Geletkanycz, 1997; Chang & Lee, 1989; Kotey & Meredith, 1997; Lodge & Vogel, 1987), the way they categorize strategic issues- opportunities vs. problems (Sullivan & Nonaka, 1988), strategy patterns (Kotha, Dunbar, & Bird, 1995), their strategic aims (Harris & Ghauri, 2000), and their

preferences towards various generic strategies (Kotha , Dunbar, & Bird, 1995). Although strategic philosophies of executives in different countries have frequently been studied and comparisons have been made, cultural explanations and influences have not been critically examined. In the majority of these comparative studies, national culture has not been introduced as an explanatory factor for these differences.

Overall, the results of those comparative studies of selected aspects of strategic management show that some variations can be explained by national cultural differences. They promote sensitivity to the differences in approaches to strategic management that distinguish executives from different cultures; and also indicate that the role national culture plays in determining approaches to strategy development is not fully appreciated.

The International Hotel Industry

The internationalization of hotel business has accelerated at an unprecedented rate over the last few decades. Driven primarily by increased market opportunities outside national borders, many hotel organizations operate internationally to fuel their growth. Major players in the field have been shifting their interest from the mature markets of the U.S.A and Western Europe to the rapidly developing countries around the world (Wu, Costa, & Teare, 1998). Many of these companies engage in networks of business relationships. There is now a record number of mergers and acquisitions among hotel chains (Malley, 1997; Withiam, 1997), and this trend is expected to accelerate even more

in the future (Hall, 1998; Malley, 1997). International strategic alliances have also become an increasing phenomenon in the hotel industry (Olsen, 2004). As hotels increasingly view the world as their market, they tend to attract and hire managers from around the world, and many of the international hotel companies still have strong vertical links with international airlines and tour operators that are managed by managers belonging to different cultures.

This surge of hotels border-crossing has brought challenges to those involved. As the composition of these hotels becomes more international, their effectiveness will increasingly depend on how well they understand the many issues associated with global expansion. This has made understanding the particular challenges involved with international hotel strategies imperative. Culturally different hotel executives have different views about the future of their industry (Moutinho, McDough, Peris, & Bigne, 1995), which in turn will affect their future strategic course of action. As senior managers are held responsible for developing strategy, it is imperative that hotel companies with alliances, joint ventures, mergers, acquisitions, and other forms of consolidation learn about how other executives develop their business strategy. Salient differences in strategic orientations exhibited by culturally varied hotel executives may be identified as a function of their national cultural background. Indeed, national culture was empirically reported as having a greater effect on hotel managerial behavior, more than the long-argued influence of industry culture (Pizam, Pine, Mok, & Shin, 1997).

Inspired by the growing international activities of hotel organizations, researchers have increasingly paid academic attention to the dynamic growth and the contemporary landscape of the industry. Studies addressing the internationalization of hotels abound (e.g., Beattie, 1991; Mountinho, McDough, Peris, & Bigne, 1995; Mathews, 2000; Littlejohn, 1997). Researchers in the field have long indicated that there are many complex issues associated with global expansion by hotel companies (Hoffman & Schneiderjans, 1990). However, very few of these studies addressed the role of cultural heritage and its potential effects on managerial and organizational practices of these companies. Many issues about the cultural influences in the hotel industry remain unclear and unrepresented. Theoretical knowledge about hotels in international settings (Burgers, Hampton, Price, & Roger, 1995) and strategic management (Olsen, 2004) is still needed.

Dramatic changes in the contemporary landscape of the international hotel business have created conditions that offer compelling reasons for a study that explores the relationship between national culture and the development of hotel strategy that this dissertation study addressed. As the horizon for their internationalization continues to expand, hotel organizations will increasingly need to understand how strategies are being developed around the globe. It was hoped that the present study, as it explored deeper thoughts, will provide insight into the process and, potentially, directions for the progression of the research stream dealing with the behavioral aspects of the strategic management of hotel organizations.

Problem Statement

Given that a logical connection can be reasonably drawn between national culture and strategy, one could expect strategic management researchers to have already explored this relationship. However, only toward the end of the 1980s did academic research in the area of strategy implications of cultural heritage emerge (e.g., Schneider, 1989; Schneider & De Meyer, 1991; Geletkanycz, 1997; Hitt, Dancin, Tyler, & Park, 1997; Harris & Ghauri, 2000; Parnell, 2004). Relative to other strategic management topics, research on the links between national culture and strategy development has been, at best, fragmented. Several researchers have noted the pressing need for empirical studies on cross-cultural issues in strategic management

The problem is that despite the calls for empirical studies in the area, few efforts have been made to fill this academic void. Moreover, studies conducted on the topic so far are not exempt of critique. Most studies examining international business management, Sekaran (1983) and Adler (1983) noted, have been both unicultural and North American. Their main concentration has been upon the process of decision-making, as opposed to the decision-makers themselves (Norburn, 1987). In addition to these general observations, research specifically addressing the influence of national culture on strategy tended to be qualitative, based on a few case studies (e.g., Harris & Ghauri, 2000). These studies examined a number of strategic management aspects (e.g., strategic aims, strategy content, strategic interpretations, etc.) without integrating their coherence. There is also a tendency to examine companies in various industries, ignoring

the potential impact of industry type on strategy. A general recommendation of these studies for future research is to compare top-level executives' characteristics across a broader range of national boundaries (Harris & Ghauri, 2000), focusing on specific industries, as opposed to the cross-industry approach (Parnell, 2004). Studies theoretically addressing the connection between culture and strategy tended to focus on the influence of national culture on the organization strategy, more than the influence of culture on managers themselves (e.g., Schneider, 1989; Sweeney & Hardaker, 1994).

With specific regard to the hotel industry, and while there has been a fair amount of research on foreign managerial jobs and the adjustments needed by expatriate managers (e.g., Kaye & Taylor, 1997; Jayawardena & Haywood, 2003; D'Annunzio-Green, 1997; 2002; Pang, Roberts, & Sutton, 1998), researchers have not yet systematically examined the relation between national culture and the strategic behavior and philosophy of hotel managers.

In summary, although several theoretical links can identify the potential influence the national culture may have on strategy development, unfortunately very few empirical studies have tried to study these relationships. Research into knowledge of the approaches toward strategy development of companies' top-level executives is minimal. Building on the existing literature, the current study integrated and extended the scope of the literature by establishing and testing more potential connections between national culture and business strategy development.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to empirically explore the influence of national culture on the approaches to business strategy development, comparing hotel executives belonging to different national cultures. The study reviewed literature that has addressed the connection of national culture to strategic management and investigated whether differences existed among hotel executives' approach to strategy development in a cross-national setting.

Research Question

This study was based upon the following research question designed to provide a better understanding of the national culture's influence on the development of hotel business strategy: *Are there national differences in how hotel top executives of differing national cultures approach the task of business strategy development?*

To answer the research question, a set of hypotheses were developed based on previous studies and relevant literature. The hypotheses described the potential effects of national cultural dimensions on executives' approach to business strategy development. The pages 38-63 in Chapter 2 presented the hypotheses in addition to the discussion that led to their development.

Nature of the Research

This survey-based study investigated the differences in approaches to business strategy development as expressed by hotel top executives different in their national cultures. The study drew upon the theoretical foundation laid by scholars of national culture and strategic management to examine executives' approach to hotel business strategy across nations. In so doing, the study attempted to contribute to the theory development of the behavioral side of strategic management process. The study:

- Represented a replication of prior research. It replicated relationships previously tested with inconclusive results.
- Empirically examined previously hypothesized, but not tested, cross-national differences in approaches to strategy development.
- Using existing literature, extended the extant literature by making clear connections between national cultural dimensions and approaches to business strategy development, and hypothesized and tested connections that have not been developed by prior related research.

The process of business strategy development has long been acknowledged, described, and researched. Despite debate about the exact number of tasks involved, their details, and the degree to which they overlap, there was agreement that when developing business strategy, executives engage in identifying future direction, and strategic choice, implementation, control and evaluation. Eleven different aspects of this process have been proposed by the current study as relating to, and can be influenced by, national

culture. These national culture-strategy development linkages are grounded in both theory and empirical evidence. Chapter 2 reviewed the constructs and relationships investigated.

Given the lack of solid theoretical knowledge and the limited comparative empirical research of national culture's influences on strategy, it is important to note that this study was exploratory in nature. The approach followed in the study consisted of first specifying theoretical linkages between national culture and approach to strategy development based on previous research studies and existing literature. Hypotheses regarding these relationships were then developed, and later verified using evidence collected through appropriate quantitative research design and data collection methods.

For this study, the survey method was considered to be more appropriate for several reasons. First, since the study measured latent and subjective constructs such as culture and aspects of strategy development, personal biases will be difficult to isolate if interviews were utilized. Language barriers rendered interviews quite difficult, as they produce noise, artificiality and an absence of tempo in the conversation (Usunier, 1998:92). Second, since the study required questioning about approaches caused by cultural differences, a greater feeling of anonymity was considered to encourage more open responses and greater participation (Kidder & Judd, 1986). It should be noted that several studies on cultural research have made use of a survey approach to collect their data, including, among other researchers, Hofstede (1980; 1991) and Trompenaars (1994).

Significance of the Study

The current study sought to identify specific relationships between national culture and top executives' approach to business strategy development. It was hoped that this study will begin to fill in the gap in the literature identified by previous researchers by providing empirical support for propositions about the influence of national culture on strategic management.

The knowledge identified should have practical significance for managers, particularly in the hotel business. Firstly, examining the influence of culture on business strategy would help hotel executives to comprehend how approaches to strategy development and implementation are bound to differ from nation to another as a function of differences in shared norms and beliefs among individuals within each culture. This is especially true for hotel executives engaged in international business networks, as such understanding will enable them to minimize misconceptions, misinterpretations, and frustrations, while increasing tolerance for deviations in strategic behavior.

Secondly, with an increasing participation of hotel companies from multiple countries in international markets and the growing number of international hotel alliances, knowledge gained from understating the strategic approaches of international alliance partners may be critical to the hotel companies' success in these ventures. Thirdly, a knowledge of potential national cultures' influences should provide companies with insights into competitors' moves and reactions (Schneider, 1989), as it is useful

knowledge for predicting differences about how culturally-different hotel executives might behave strategically.

Finally, many hotel companies around the world are evolving into almost stateless organizations, where management teams are composed of executives belonging to diverse cultures. The results of this study should enable these hotel companies not only to make careful decisions for the recruitment, selection and placement of managers, but also to help acknowledging differences in executives' strategic philosophies and, eventually , utilizing them to the advantage of the company.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation consisted of five chapters. While the first chapter has introduced the topic of the study, Chapter 2 reviewed the relevant literature on national culture and business strategy development, as well as their connections. The chapter also revisited relevant studies from hotel literature. Chapter 3 described the research methods, including the research design and sample, data collection, instrumentation, and rationale for the analyses of the data. Chapter 4 presented the results of the data analyses; and Chapter 5 discussed the findings, summarized the implications for hotel industry practice, and provided suggestions for future studies.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review that spans the theories of strategic management and culture is useful for studying the influence of national culture on the business strategy development. The review of literature provided here was divided into five parts. The first part examined strategy theory; the second part examined national culture theory. The third part reviewed research on national culture and strategy. The fourth part explored national culture-strategy development linkages. The last part addressed relevant research in the hotel industry.

The Strategy Construct

Strategy as a thought process has been practiced for centuries. Although originally developed within military contexts, the term strategy has more frequently been employed with business (Clampitt, Dekoch, & Cashman, 2000). The practice of formal strategy

development as it relates to organizations has had a relatively brief history. No serious research on strategy was evident until the 1950s or 1960s (Porter, 1997). The relatively young, yet intellectually stimulating history of strategy has generated both controversy and understanding (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 1998). Still, many of the constructs that are in use today can be found in the key writings and definitions presented in the 1960s (Schendel, 1995).

There is little agreement on defining strategy, regardless of decades of academic research on the topic (Markides, 1999; Chaffee, 1985). Strategy has come to mean different things to different writers. Ansoff (1965) emphasized the managerial selection of products and markets as a key component of organizational strategy. Chandler (1962) defined strategy as “the determination of the basic long-term goals and objectives of an enterprise, and the adoption of courses of action and the allocation of resources necessary for carrying out the goals.” He focused on the executive activities that support strategies. Porter (1980; 1985) defined strategy as the means by which a firm competes for business, or positions itself in the marketplace.

Andrew (1971) discussed strategy in terms of its formulation and implementation. The formulation phase consisted of identifying environmental opportunities and risks, distinguishing corporate competencies, recognizing personal values and aspirations, and considering obligations to society. The implementation phase focused on the organizational structure and relationships, and also establishing appropriate organizational processes and behaviors. Top management teams act as the architect of

strategy. Child (1972) saw strategy as the opportunity for managers to select from alternatives within their choice sets.

Mintzberg (1987) suggested five contexts in which the term strategy may be applied. Strategy serves as plan, a consciously intended course of action made in advance of the actions to which they apply, stated explicitly in formal documents known as plans. Strategy can function as ploy, which is a specific maneuver intended to outwit an opponent or competitor. Strategy can work as a position, which indicates an action or set of actions an organization takes to achieve an objective. Strategy can be described as a pattern, showing a stream of actions or results with consistency in behavior, whether or not intended. And, strategy can be defined as perspective, a shared viewpoint that creates commitments to a way of acting and responding.

From these definitions, it appears that strategy as a process contains decisions that have paramount effect on the organization and its future direction and resources. Besides the influences of external and internal factors on strategy, these authors have from the beginning of this area topic emphasized the importance of the role managers play in the development of strategy.

Hofer & Schendel (1978) reviewed a broad range of strategy definitions in previous literature and found that there were major disagreement among scholars in the areas of the breadth of the concept of strategy, its classifications, and components. The literature was consistent, however, regarding such aspects of strategy as its complexity,

levels, significance, and concerns as to the internal and external environments (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampet, 1998).

There were two perspectives that consistently recurred in the strategic management literature and that formed the foundation of the research into strategy development processes. The first, the deliberate perspective, is based on an early view of strategic management (Andrews, 1971; Ansoff, 1965; Porter, 1980), and has heavily favored the formulation of strategy and the primacy of planning (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampet, 1998). This systematic, analytical approach to strategy formulation is based on principles of rational decision making and is heavily driven by formal structure and planning systems (Hart & Banbury, 1994). The perspective assumed that purposes and integration are essential for a firm's long term success (Frederickson, 1983). In contrast, the emergent perspective suggested that organizations rarely write down their complete strategy. Instead, strategies emerge over time in response to the environment, through processes which are fragmented, evolutionary, and largely intuitive (Mintzberg, 1973; Lindblom, 1995; Mintzberg & Waters, 1985). Quinn (1980:58) argued that most strategies tend to emerge step by step from an iterative process in which the organization probes the future, experiments, and learns from a series of partial (incremental) commitments rather than through global formulations of strategies. However, this view utilizes the analyses inherent in the deliberate approach.

Later writings, however, suggest that strategy itself involves both intended plan and the actual patterns of behaviors that emerge over time (Mintzberg, 1987; Brew &

Hunt, 1999). Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampet (1998) presented the notion that there are strategies that serve as plans, and strategic action patterns that emerge overtime.

Therefore, a strategy continuum exists ranging from deliberate to emergent. Within this continuum, they identified ten approaches or schools of strategy. Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampet (1998) also suggested that although there is no agreed-upon definition of strategy or strategic approaches, there is general agreement about the nature of strategy. Strategy sets direction, focuses effort, defines the organization, and provides consistency.

Studies addressing the debate between the two perspectives are lacking and seem to have created more questions than answers (Boyd, 1991; Brew & Hunt, 1991). Boyd & Reuning-Elliott (1998) have noticed also that most of the studies have focused on the strategic planning construct rather than the whole construct of the strategy development process. Examples of studies that have exclusively focused on measuring deliberate strategies include Fredrickson (1984), Krager & Malik (1975), Robinson & Pearce (1983), and, Ryne (1985).

Deliberate/emergent discussions are usually focused on the process of strategy making, more than the content of the strategy (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand & Lampet, 1998; Mintzberg & McHugh, 1985; Mintzberg & Waters, 1985). Recognizing that each of these two perspectives, along with other schools of strategy thought, contribute to an understanding of the role strategy plays in organizations, both in theory and in practice, this dissertation study addressed the general nature of the task of strategy development.

Three levels of strategy have been identified in the literature; namely, corporate, business, and functional (Andrews, 1987; Porter, 1985; Rothwell & Kanas, 1994; Schendel & Hofer, 1979; Gupta, 1995). Such classification of strategy into these distinctive levels helps in identifying the components of strategy and its formulation (Schendel & Hofer, 1979). At the corporate level, strategy is primarily focused on what business the organization is in (Hofer & Schendel, 1978). It looks at whether the firm is a single or diversified business. Corporate strategies also address how resources will be allocated among multi-businesses (Byars, 1984). At the business level, strategy is primarily focused on the question: “How are we going to compete?” (Hofer & Schendel, 1978); that is, how should the firm position itself among its rivals in order to reach its goals? Some scholars call this a competitive strategy (Porter, 1985; Jackson & Schuler, 1995). Decisions regarding overall business strategy at this level are primarily made by the business unit managers. Various authors have developed different typologies for this level of strategy (e.g., Miles & Snow, 1994; Porter, 1985; Schuler & Jackson, 1987).

At the functional level, strategy addresses the issue of integration of various sub-functional activities in the firm (e.g., marketing, finance, human resource). It is designed to relate various area policies with changes in the functional area environment (Schendel & Hofer, 1979). In this dissertation study, the focus of analysis will be on the business level strategy.

Fundamental Aspects of Business Strategy Development

The literature was not homogeneous in what constituted strategy. Different researchers have identified different aspects of the strategy construct (Kerin, Mahajan, & Varadarajan, 1990), making the topic broad, having multiple approaches, and struggling with multiple and complex issues with no single approach surfaces as being universally preferential. Despite the wide variation in its components, and whether the organization uses an analytical or incremental approach to it, strategy development includes certain basic elements. Several aspects of strategy development that have been frequently discussed lend themselves to be examined and meaningfully discussed in the context of cultural differences. Executives set the future direction, examine strategic alternatives and choose from among those alternatives, implement choices, and make strategic assessment.

Identifiable Future Direction: Organizations identify, understand, and work toward future directions. The vision summarizes a company's broad strategic focus for the future. Having a vision of the future often contributes to developing a good business strategy and motivates employees to achieve it. The mission statement documents the purpose for the existence of organizations, and often contains a code of corporate conduct to guide management in implementation (DeKluyver & Pearce II, 2003:7). To convert strategic vision and business mission into specific performance targets, objectives are set. Financial objectives signal commitment to such outcomes as earnings growth, an acceptable return on investment, dividend growth, etc. Strategic objectives direct efforts

toward such outcomes as winning additional market share, overtaking key competitors on product quality or customer service or product innovation, boosting the company's reputation with customers and gaining a sustainable competitive advantage (Thompson & Strickland, 1999:7). Whether based on specific and measurable criteria or subjective measurements, objectives are associated with a time frame. Short-term objectives focus organizational attention on the need for immediate performance improvements and outcomes. Large-range objectives serve prompting managers to consider what to do now to put the company in position to perform well over the longer term. A sense of future direction for an organization allows synergy, establishes priorities, minimizes conflicts, stimulates exerting and aids in the allocation of resources, among other benefits.

Strategic Choice: Strategic analysis and choice seeks to determine alternative courses of action that could best enable the firm to achieve its mission and objectives. The organization's present strategies, objectives, and mission, coupled with the external and internal analysis, provide a basis for generating and evaluating feasible alternative strategies (David, 1995:195). Managers choose among alternative strategies that will benefit the firm most, and signal organizational commitment to particular markets, competitive approaches, and a way of operating the organization (Thompson & Strickland, 199:8).

Strategic Implementation and Control: Managers assess what it will take to make the chosen strategy work and figure out what to do to put the strategy in place, execute it proficiently, and produce good results. Their aim is to create strong fits between the way

things are done internally to try to execute the strategy and what it will take for the strategy to succeed. Fitting the ways the organization does things internally to what is needed for strategic success helps unite the organization behind the accomplishment of strategy (Thompson & Strickland, 1999:16). Implementing strategy is an art and science. It depends on doing a good job of leading, working with and through others, allocating resources, building and strengthening competitive capabilities, installing strategy-supportive policies, and matching how the organization performs its core business activities to the requirements for good strategy execution. Managers can employ any of several leadership styles in pushing the implementation process along. They can make decisions authoritatively or on the basis of consensus; delegate much or little; proceed swiftly or deliberately (Thompson & Strickland, 1999: 271).

Strategic Evaluation and Assessment: Managers have the duty to stay on top of the organization's situation, deciding whether things are going well internally, and monitoring outside developments closely. In doing so, managers focus on the competitiveness of the organization, the appropriateness of its long-term objectives, and whether its strategies are likely to produce a sustainable competitive advantage. Long-term direction may need to be altered, the business redefined, and management's vision of the organization's future course narrowed or broadened or radically raised. Performance targets may need raising or lowering in light of past experience and future prospects (Thompson & Strickland, 1999:16). Companies may also directly monitor the behavior of executives. The assessment also considers the quality of the information process, and the effectiveness of the decision process. Such assessment provides

incremental information that can become an important input in the information process for decision making process in the future (McGlashan & Singleton, 1987:183). Many managers use a mix of approaches to deal with the issue of strategy evaluation. Some are formal, based on analytical models and financial theories; others are informal, often ad hoc heuristics and traditional industry guidelines. Aspects of evaluation are sometimes done explicitly; others are done implicitly (DeKluyver & Pearce II, 2003:110).

Although these aspects are fundamental to the development of strategy, organizations and executives go about the task differently, and variations in their approaches can be expected. Developing strategy can occur informally, where executives put more emphasis on experience, personal observations and assessments, feelings, intuition, and entrepreneurial judgments. The resulting strategy exists mainly in the managers' own minds and in oral understanding and commitments about where to head, what to accomplish, and how to proceed. Strategy can also develop more formally and in deeper detail where executives put more emphasis on the objective, logical, systematic approach. There is often considerable data gathering, situational analysis, and intense study of particular issues, all done using analytical models.

Executives vary in the degree of creativity they put when developing strategy, and how proactive they are in shaping how their organization businesses will be conducted. Some executives are more proactive, showing willingness to be good entrepreneurs in diagnosing shifting conditions and instituting whatever strategic adjustments are indicated. They are first-movers, willing to take risks and initiate strategies. The

approach taken by other managers is characterized by risk-averse, disinclination to embark on a different strategic course so long as they believe the present strategy can produce acceptable results for a while longer. There is pervasive resistance to bold strategic change and a wariness of deviating very far from the company's tried-and-true approaches unless absolutely forced to (Thompson & Strickland, 1999:12). Additionally, there is tremendous variety in who is involved in the strategy development. Some executives emphasize centralized, top-down strategic decision making, where only few people get involved. Other managers put more emphasis on participatory strategy development in which several layers of management at many organizational levels are involved in gathering, analyzing, and drawing strategic conclusions.

Evidently, executives face different internal and external conditions, and their approaches to strategy development reflect these differences. The next part of this chapter discussed the concept of national culture and included it as a base upon which variation in approaches toward strategy development expressed by executives could be partially explained.

The Concept of National Culture

Definition and Nature of Culture

The definition of culture and what is meant by culture have been open to debate and differences of interpretation. Culture is such a complex phenomena that, at present, has no single well-accepted definition. Multiple cultural definitions have been provided by anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and organizational researchers. Watts (1994), cited in Humphreys (1996), pointed out that there are over 150 significant definitions in current use. More definitions have been developed since then. However, clear similarities in the various terms used to identify and define culture have been observed, making it possible to develop a framework for a more generally understood set of meanings in the terms used to explain culture. Groeschl & Doherty (2000), for example, reviewed and compared concepts of culture suggested within different disciplines and came to the conclusion that many conceptualizations of culture have their roots in early developed definitions.

An early definition of the term culture was provided by Kluckhohn (1951:181). To him, “culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of behaviors acquired and transmitted by symbols constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts: the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and specially their attached

values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as conditioning elements of culture action.”

Schein (1985:19) defined culture as a “pattern of shared assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems.” Foster (1962) suggested that culture is “the way of life of the group of people.” Hofstede (1980:25) advanced the definition of culture, defining it as “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another.”

The above definitions point out the most intrinsic characteristics of cultures. Cultures are not genetically transmitted nor inherited, but they are obtained through life-long learning process that begins when one individual is born and goes on over his/her entire life. Cultures are a set of values, beliefs and practices that are shared by a group of people, and that differentiate this group from another.

In their attempts to define its boundaries, researchers have traditionally classified culture in different approaches. Several researchers have recognized that culture exists at several layers. The first layer includes the behavior and artifacts, and represents the explicit culture. A deeper layer, the implicit culture, includes the beliefs and values. The core of culture is formed by basic underlying assumptions. Shein (1985), Hofstede

(1980), and Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1998) organized these three levels from the easiest to see, which they argued as behavior, to the hardest to see, which they argued as values. The behavior layer is also more susceptible to change than the “core of culture,” which is made up of values and underlying assumptions.

The essence of culture, it is generally recognized, is not what is visible on the surface, rather it is the shared way that groups of people understand and interpret the world, based on their underlying value structures. Adler (1983) indicated that people express culture through values that they hold about life and the world around them. These values in turn affect their attitudes about the type of behavior considered most appropriate and effective in any given situation. Shein (1987; 1997) argued that assumptions and values hold the key to understanding a culture. Values are considered by many as the most appropriate in defining and studying culture. In most of the culture studies, the fundamental component of culture has been its value system; hence values were the analytic focus of cultural assessment. Considering it as the central tenets of a society's culture, Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961:2) defined values as “central core of meanings.” Hofstede (1985) described values as the broad preferences for one state of affairs over others, the unconscious and conscious feelings which manifest themselves in human behavior. To him, values are acquired early in one's youth, initially through nation and family, and then through schooling and occupation. William (1970: 27) defined values as standards by which members of a culture define what is desirable or undesirable, good or bad, beautiful or ugly.

To several researchers, culture also presents itself on different levels. Schein (1985) addressed various types of cultures; at the broadest level, there are civilizations (Western and Eastern cultures); at country level, there are national cultures; at the group level, there are ethnic cultures, occupational, and so forth. Other authors (Pizam, 1993; Trompenaars, 1994) used similar approaches to classify cultures and define its boundaries. A common understanding is that one person can belong to different cultural groups. For instance, one individual can belong to a national level according to his/her country of origin, while at the same time he/she may belong to a regional or ethnic group, as well as to a particular generation. In Hofstede's (1991: 10) words, "most people have several layers of culture that they often belong to. These cultural layers may be based upon national, regional, ethnic, religion, linguistic, gender, generational, social class, industry or corporate affiliations." Hofstede is quick to point out that the "mental programs" from these various levels are not necessarily in harmony.

Compared to other levels of culture, national culture has been the focus of a majority of cross-cultural researchers that it has recently been well-accepted in academic research (Clarck, 1990; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985). Hofstede (1980) argued that nations are a source of a considerable amount of mental programming of their citizens, therefore, national culture programming leads to a pattern of thinking, feeling, and acting that may differ from one nationality to another. Oudenhoven (2001) referred to national culture as the profound beliefs, values, and practices that are shared by the vast majority of people belonging to a certain nation. They are reflected in the ways people behave at school, in the family, on the job; and they are reinforced by national laws and governmental policies

with respect to education, family life, business, and so forth. To Marquardt & Engel (1993: 24), national culture is “existing in countries that have their national borders distinct and can be characterized by a discrete manner of thinking, doing, and living.” Adler (1991) defined three aspects of national culture: it is shared by all or almost all members of some social group; older members of the group try to pass on to the younger members; and it shapes behavior or structure one’s perception of the world , as in the case of morals, laws, customs, and values.

At this national level, therefore, researchers regard nation or country as the primary unit of analysis (Allen, Miller, & Nath, 1988) and country and cultural differences are viewed as virtually synonymous (Dawar & Parker, 1994; Inkeles & Levinson, 1969). A major reason for this procedure in cultural research is the researchers’ recognition of the many difficulties associated with the measurement and operationalization of culture (Clark, 1990; Inkeles & Levinson, 1969). Hofstede (1980; 1991) used national comparisons to differentiate cultural effects on management practices. Although nations and countries represent political units and are rarely culturally homogeneous (Tepstra & David, 1991), the tendency for using nations as cultural units has foundations. Some researchers argued that unique geographic, economic, and historical factors produce continued uniqueness in national culture. To these scholars, national boundaries delineate the legal, political, and social environments within which organization and people operate (Nicholson & Stepina, 1998; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985). Many nations have a dominant language, identifiable education systems, and other integration mechanisms that include members with common values and

outlooks (Dawar & Parker, 1994). Hofstede (1991) argued that within nations that have existed for some time, there are strong forces toward further integration, such as a national education system, a national army, a national political system, national representation in sports events with a strong symbolic and emotional appeal, a national market or certain skills, products, and services (Hofstede, 1991:12). As such, there is a strong case for using countries as building blocks for cultural analysis.

However, an important understanding by researchers is that not all members of a nation necessarily fit their respective national cultural profiles and pattern. In any given society, there would be individual people, as well as subcultures, that could be considered cultural deviants (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Hofstede, 1980; French & Weis, 2000; Huo & Randall, 1992). In the present dissertation study, the pragmatic advice by Williamson (2002) is taken into consideration: (a) there is a danger in assuming that all members of a culture homogeneously carry the same cultural attitudes; and (b) it would be fallacious to expect individuals' values or behaviors to be wholly determined by their cultural background.

Measurement of National Culture

Over the past few decades, the concept of national culture has attracted increased attention by scholars who have wanted to define the phenomenon in order to develop a better framework for analysis and comparisons among various national cultures. Measuring national culture in terms of dimensions and value orientations has been

common in scholarly work. A dimension of culture is an aspect of a culture that can be measured relative to other cultures (Hofstede, 1991: 14).

Several frameworks have been developed for analyzing various national cultures. Among the well-known models include the work of Hall (1960), Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961), Triandis (1982), Laurent (1983; 1986), Dorfman & Howell (1988), Schwartz (1994), House, Wright, & Aditya (1997), and Trompenaars & Hampton-Turner (1998). The Dutch scholar Geert Hofstede (1980; 1991) is credited with completing the largest cross-cultural study applicable to international management theory (Swierczek, 1991; Hoppe, 1990).

Hofstede's study (1980; 1983a; 1983b; 1984; 1991; 1994) utilized a data bank from a U.S. multinational corporation, IBM, that had subsidiaries in about sixty-seven countries. A total of 116,000 IBM employees participated in the survey that spanned from 1967 to 1973. In order to isolate nationality as the key factor affecting respondent perceptions and behaviors, the respondents at the IBM subsidiaries were well-matched in all respects except that they came from different countries. Four dimensions were derived, they are: Power distance, Uncertainty avoidance, Masculinity/femininity, and Individualism/collectivism. Hofstede attributed to each of the countries represented in his study an index value (between 0 and about 100) on each of these dimensions. Hofstede later recognized that his original study with its Western-developed measures carried a cultural bias. Bond and his Chinese colleagues (Bond, et al., 1987), with the aid of their Chinese Value Survey, tackled this shortcoming. Their study used Hofstede's measures

along with others developed within the Chinese culture. Administered to a Chinese sample, the researchers found cultural characteristics similar to Hofstede's four original dimensions. In addition, they recognized a fifth cultural dimension that has its philosophical focus on Confucius's teachings, which they labeled "Confucian Dynamism." Hofstede (1991; 1994) re-labeled this dimension as "long-term/short-term orientation."

His work laid the foundation for the vast majority of research done in the area of potential influences of national culture on management and organizations. Although it has been subject to considerable criticism (McSweeney, 2002; Smith & Bond, 1993; Robinson, 1983; Voronov & Singer, 2002; Korman, 1985; Punnett & Withame, 1990), Hofstede's study has been described in the literature as the most significant, the most widely cited, the most comprehensive, and the single most popularly supported measurement of national culture (Bhagat & McQuaid, 1986; Triandis, 1993; Rodrigues, 1998; Perlitz, 1994; Sondergaard, 1994; Kale & Barners, 1992; Dwyer, 1997). Its reliability and validity have been tested and shown to meet reasonable standards (Hambrick & Brandon, 1988; Kogut & Singh, 1988; Hoppe, 1990).

Furthermore, a review of the literature indicated that the dimensions identified by Hofstede capture the essence of many dimensions and value orientations proposed by other researchers. Many scholars (Morden, 1999; Groeschl & Doherty 2000; Rodrigues, 1998; 1997; Schwartz, 1994) including Hofstede himself (Hofstede, 1991) noted that these dimensions closely correspond to, and essentially capture the essence of many

dimensions proposed by other writers. Table (1) shows these similarities. While coming from different researchers, using different research approaches, similar sets of dimensions can be identified that can describe culture. Hofstede’s five dimensions are employed in this dissertation study because of their wide-spread acceptance as a solid framework for conducting national culture research and, as Hambrick & Brandon (1988) have noted, reflect enduring themes central to executive strategic decision making. A later section of this literature review provides material on these cultural dimensions, with emphasis on their linkages to business strategy development.

Table 1 Similarities among Cultural Frameworks

Hofstede’s Dimensions of National Culture	House ,Wright,& Aditya (1997) 8-dimensions	Kluckhol & Strodtbeck (1961) 6-dimensions	Inkele & Levinson (1969) 3-dimensions	Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1998) 7-dimensions	Schwartz (1992) 3-dimensions
Individualism vs. Collectivism	Collectivism	Relational Orientation		Individualism vs. Communitarianism	Embedded ness vs. Autonomy.
Power Distance	Power Distance	Hierarchical or Relational	Relation to Authority	Equality vs. Hierarchy	Hierarchy vs. Egalitarianism.
Uncertainty Avoidance	Uncertainty Avoidance	- Nature of Humans - Relationship with Nature	Decision Making Protocols	Universalism vs. Particularism.	
Masculinity vs. Femininity	-Gender Egalitarianism - Assertiveness - Human Orientation - Performance Orientation	Activity Orientation	Concept of Self	Relationship with Nature	Mastery vs. Harmony
Long-Term vs. Short-Term	Future Orientation	Time Orientation		Time as Sequence vs. Time as Synchronization	

Research on National Culture and Strategy

Given the growing attention paid to the many influences on managerial thinking and behaviors, it is not surprising that strategy literature started to converge into a research stream. Cultural heritage influences have become an interesting topic for researchers wanting to more deeply explain and describe strategic management.

The conceptual work of Schneider (1989) has laid the ground for additional research into the potential effects of national culture on strategy. Schneider synthesized available theories of culture and strategic issue management to argue that assumptions of national culture interfere and affect the processes through which strategic issues, a major component of strategy formulation process, are identified and prioritized. Interestingly, and unlike many of other research investigating the linkages between national culture and management phenomenon, Schneider based her analysis on a selected aspects of culture derived from a review and synthesis of cultural variables discussed in the management literature.

Recognizing the limitations of the traditional rationalist approach to strategy formulation, Schneider & De Meyer (1991) investigated the influences of national culture on the managers' perceptions of environmental uncertainty and organizational control, which in turn influence strategic behavior. The study concluded that national culture does influence interpretation and responses.

Kotha, Dunbar, & Bird (1995) noticed that the number of studies comparing Japanese and U.S. firms is steadily growing but very few of these studies attempted to highlight and discuss the subtler distinctions in policies and philosophies that truly separate the firms in these nations. The study was designed to identify differences that distinguish U.S. and Japanese managers' approaches to strategy. Perceptions of these managers revealed different underlying organizing principles leading to different understandings and interpretations of competitive strategy issues. Hitt, Dacin, Tyler, & Park (1997) compared the strategic orientations and decision models of U.S. and Korean executives. The results showed marked differences, suggesting the importance of understating such orientations of international competitors and partners in international strategic alliances.

In keeping with the research stream focusing on the role cultural values play in shaping managerial views of the environment and appropriate organizational responses, including the strategy process and its outcomes (Hambrick & Brandon, 1988; Schneider, 1989), Geletkanycz (1997) carried out a study to test this hypothesized linkage by examining the impact of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo across a sample of top managers of different nationalities. Cultural values were significantly related to executives' adherence to existing strategy. Once again, culture was found to have an important impact on executive mindsets, as demonstrated by the fact that executives of differing cultural background are not equally open to change in organizational strategy, and that their strategic orientations are prominently shaped by their cultural values.

Harris & Ghauri (2000) explored whether, and how, national values affect the strategic aims of business leaders, the content of their strategic deliberations, and the process they follow to develop those ways of thinking into enacted strategies. They found the aims and processes to be different in ways which reflected their national backgrounds, whereas the contents of the strategic issues they considered were more similar, reflecting industry norms and demands. A similar pattern of results was found by the study of Parnell (2004) of variations in strategic philosophy among American and Mexican managers. Only two out of five research propositions were found to be significant (i.e., approaching strategy as an art or as a science, and embracing strategic risk or avoiding it). The findings led the author to conclude that conventional wisdom on differences between American and Mexican managers in strategy formulation may not be true.

Only a token amount of literature spotlighted national culture's linkages to business strategy development. The total number of conceptual and empirical studies focusing on this area was sparse, to say the least. There have been some efforts made in this area but few attempted a systematic, holistic approach. Theoretical work by Schneider (1989) appeared to have inspired and influenced the thinking of subsequent researchers. With the exception of Geletkenycz (1997), and Harris & Ghauri (2000), these empirical studies, however, didn't lay out systematically how national cultural differences may influence business strategy. None attempted to empirically verify differences in seminal aspects of strategy development prevalent in the strategic management literature. While there has been some discussion of the differences of executives' strategic philosophies when compared with other executives in other

countries, there has been little discussion as to the underlying reasons for these differences. The literature presented a clear opportunity for a study that responds to, and improves upon, the inconclusive results of these dearth studies.

Potential Influences of National Cultural Dimensions on Business Strategy Development

Power Distance and Business Strategy Development

Hofstede (1985: 347) defined power distance as “the extent to which the members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally.” In some societies, people accept a hierarchical order in which everybody has a place which needs no justification (indicating high power distance cultures). Those at the top usually make all the decisions, and those at the lower levels simply carry out orders given by powerful groups at the top. In some other societies, people strive for power equalization and demand justification for power inequalities (indicating low power distance cultures). In these cultures, power is more evenly distributed among the members at the various hierarchical levels in the system, and more egalitarian relationships prevail.

Power and authority, it has been argued, are universal to all cultures, but the importance, emphasis, scope and application of power vary from one society to another

(Fatehi, 1996:279). In cultures high in power distance, children are raised to be loyal, respectful and devoted to their parents. When these children go to school, they carry over these cultural values with them, showing respect to teachers and avoiding questioning their teachings in an open fashion. Applied to organizations, this pattern of relationship is reflected in subordinates depending on superiors for directions, embodying a paternalistic behavior that governs their relationships. In cultures lower in power distance, children are taught by parents to be independent, and school teachers encourage students to contradict them. In the work setting, this behavior results in superiors who consult with their subordinates.

Although systematic research on the association of power distance to business strategy is not evident, insights describing this linkage can be logically drawn. A more participative approach to strategy development is possibly associated with low power distance. In these cultures, superior-subordinate relations are theoretically close and less formal in nature; whereas in high power distance culture these relationships tend to be more distant, hierarchically ordered, and reserved, indicating a preference for autocratic and paternalistic approach. In high power distant cultures, as suggested by Hofstede (1980), hierarchal structure and centralized decision making are the norm, in part because they help preserve the existing social order and its related distribution of power. Individuals dominated by low power distance do not tolerate highly centralized power and at least expect to be consulted in decision making (Rodrigues, 1990). Empirically, Venezuelans were found to be more likely than North Americans to accept as legitimate an unequal distribution of wealth (Hofstede, 1980). Compared to their Australian

counterparts, Vietnamese managers (high power distance) were found to accept the unequal distribution of managerial power in their companies, and were more tolerant of hierarchical managerial styles and position of authority (Berrell, Wright, & Hoa, 1999). Furthermore, Kakar (1971) reported that the paternal type of superior-subordinate relationship dominates the authority relations in organizations in India, a large power distance society. This framework implies that subordinates expect to be directed, and the ideal boss is a well-meaning autocrat. These characteristics of high power distance societies contrast with organizational involvement, which requires high degrees of consultation and capability development. Indeed, Schneider (1989) hypothesized that more autocratic styles of leadership are expected in these cultures, and that the leader plays a central role throughout most of the strategic management process. This argument leads to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

H1_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have low power distance cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than their counterparts associated with countries that have high power distance cultures.*

Similarly, the dimension of power distance may influence the willingness to change or keep existing strategic orientations. Hofstede (1997) suggested that in small power distance societies, teachers - who are considered experts transferring impersonal truths - expect initiative from students in class, whereas in large power distance societies, teachers - who are considered gurus transferring personal wisdom - are expected to take all the initiative in class. In the work setting, the tendency among subordinates to depend on the directives given to them by top executives promotes repetitiveness and hinders

innovation on behalf of subordinates and at the same time urges top executives to be innovative and more able to bring about the necessary changes in their organization's strategy. Empirically, Smeds (1997) found that in high power distance settings, successful change projects were more likely to be initiated from the top, whereas in small power distance these projects were more likely to be initiated in bottom-up fashion. With specific regard to strategic management, Geletkanycz (1997) found that in societies where there exists clear power imbalances, managers demonstrated a greater willingness to alter existing organizational profiles. That is, values of high power distance are associated with less resistance to change in the status quo. This, in turn, leads to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

H_{1b}: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have high power distance cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low power distance cultures.*

Harris & Ghauri (2000) argued that different values about what is of worth in life and what is not, and different assumptions regarding the environment, may be expected to result in a different range of issues when considering strategies, and to influence what business leaders believe is important and unimportant to consider. It may therefore be possible that power distance will influence a manager's orientation with regard to task vs. people. Interpersonal relationships are affected most by cultural differences, more than the content and practice of business (Scarborough, 1998), and members in many societies consider friends and family more important than the organization's vitality (Newman, Summer, & Warren, 1977; Rodrigues, 1997; 1998). Since they are expected to set the direction and various work rules, top executives socialized with high power distance

values would be more task and less people oriented (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994). Empirical results by Berrell, Wright, & Hoa (1999) indicated that Australian managers (low power distance) were motivated by a need to dominate, manage, transform, and restructure the working environment, as compared with Vietnamese managers (higher power distance) who sought to actualize harmonious relationships within the workplace. The following hypothesis can therefore be stated:

H1_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have low power distance cultures will emphasize people and societal concerns more than do their counterparts associated with countries that have high power distance cultures.*

The power distance dimension may potentially affect the control top managers exercise over strategy. Practices associated with high power distance values, including minimal involvement of subordinates as a result of a more authoritative approach to strategy development, suggest that top executives will tend to adopt a stronger formal control than it would be with managers associated with lower power distance values.

H1_d: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high power distance cultures are more likely to exert formal strategic control than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low power distance cultures.*

Uncertainty Avoidance and Business Strategy Development

This dimension centers on the extent to which members of a society are able to cope with uncertainty of the future without experiencing undue stress. People socialized with values of uncertainty avoidance usually experience more stress in dealing with unknown future than those socialized with values tolerant of ambiguity. According to Hofstede (1984), the fundamental issue this cultural dimension addresses is how a society reacts to the fact that time only runs one way and that the future is unknown: whether it tries to control the future or to let it happen.

All cultures have guidelines that help in the avoidance of uncertainty, and so differences among cultures refer to the number and extent of rules, laws, norms, and informal guidelines people are expected to know and follow. Societies considered to be high in uncertainty have a large number of such rules (Hofstede & Bond, 1986). In such cultures, people are socialized to believe that uncertainty about the future is best dealt with if everyone behaves according to the widely accepted guidelines. In societies low on uncertainty avoidance, people are less concerned with unpredictability, and therefore, less likely to establish large numbers of rules and regulations.

Although uncertainty avoidance-business strategy linkages have not been systematically explored, the literature suggested that the relationship may be understood in terms of several connections. As stated by Hofstede (2001:148) “countries with lower uncertainty avoidance tendencies demonstrate a low sense of urgency...in such

countries, not only familiar but unfamiliar risks are accepted, such as changing jobs and starting activities for which there are rules;” what is different is perceived as curious (Hofstede, 1997). In contrast, countries with higher uncertainty avoidance values have problems with the unfamiliar, and there is, according to Hofstede (2000:153), resistance to change and innovation. What is different is perceived as dangerous (Hofstede, 1997). The reviewed literature provides support for this notion. Executives who maintain a low tolerance for conditions other than a predictable or certain context (high uncertainty avoidance value) are likely to shy away from rendering action which alters their environment, whereas executives whose cultural backgrounds are characterized by low uncertainty avoidance values are more comfortable with instability and are likely to engage in greater entrepreneurial activity (Geletkanycz , 1997 ; Chang & Park, 2003; Schneider, 1989; Hambrick & Brandon, 1988; Robertson, Al-Khatib, & Al-Habib, 2002 ; Dorfman & Howell, 1988). Empirical support for this relationship is provided by several studies. Quenzada & Boyce (1987) found that Latin business is structured and bureaucratic, showing a strong need to avoid uncertainty by preserving the status quo. Geletkanycz (1997) found that executives whose background cultures are characterized by low uncertainty avoidance values tend to be more flexible in their dealings with surrounding environment; a similar finding to that of Shane (1995) who found that members of low uncertainty avoidance societies tend to accept innovation champions who overcome organizational inertia by violating organizational norms, rules and procedures more than those who belong to high uncertainty avoidance societies. Based on this argument, a hypothesis related to the potential influence of uncertainty avoidance on willingness to change can be stated as follows:

H2_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

Research on managerial styles suggests that high degrees of uncertainty avoidance may be associated with higher levels of subordinates' involvement in organizational decision making. Hofstede (2001:170) indicated that in low uncertainty avoidance work situations, top managers are involved in strategy, whereas in high uncertainty avoidance work situations, top managers are involved in operations. Employees belonging to high uncertainty avoidance countries prefer group decisions and are less in favor of risk-taking by individual decision-makers (Hofstede, 1984:123), making it more possible for a participative decision-making approaches to be applied in weak uncertainty avoidance culture as it allow for some degree of autonomy (Rodrigues, 1990). Laurent (1983) has demonstrated that Latin European managers prefer centralized decision-making and clear hierarchical lines. American managers are generally more supportive of a participative management style which allows employees from all organizational levels to engage in managerial decisions and practices through direct inputs (Cox, 1993). Therefore, it is expected that executives with different extents of uncertainty avoidance values will have different approaches in terms of the room they allow for involvement of other organizational members.

H2_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

Current understanding about information sources utilized by executives raises the possibility of higher levels of uncertainty avoidance being tied to the usage of more quantitative type of information in scanning activities and decision-making. Schneider (1989) suggested that in order to reduce uncertainty, some tend to heavily employ quantitative data, utilizing numbers and statistical evidence. The belief is that the “truth and reality” are determined by what is measurable and tangible, ignoring qualitative information and descriptive examples. Therefore, the following hypothesis may be constructed:

H2_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to utilize more quantitative sources of information than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

In weak uncertainty avoidance, there is a feeling that there should not be more rules than is strictly necessary, whereas in strong uncertainty avoidance societies, there is an emotional need for rules, even if such rules will never work (Hofstede, 1997). Trompenaars & Hamper-Turner (1998) asserted that some cultures have the tendency to impose their will upon nature, “inner-directed.” Members of these cultures believe that they are in control of most if not all of the life’s events and that their individual actions and effort will make a difference in their personal lives. Other cultures show a tendency to go along nature’s laws and forces, “outer-directed”. What differentiates these two groups of cultures is the use of structures. While an “outer-directed” culture tends to see itself as a part of nature, an inner-directed culture tends to identify with mechanisms. Indeed, high uncertainty avoidance cultures have been called “tight” because norms are

clear, and people are expected to behave exactly as specified by those norms; “loose” cultures allow more latitude in behavior (Triandis, 1994). Given the theoretical linkage between the use of rules and instructions with aspects of decision making, a relationship between uncertainty avoidance and strategy control is likely. Executives from high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more likely to find ways to exert tighter control over their strategic activities.

Uncertainty avoidance may, therefore, be expected to exert an influence on the strategy implementation. Members socialized with high uncertainty avoidance values usually emphasize strategy control, which in turn help ensure that many intertwined details and levels of analysis come together well. Specific and clear statements of how plans will be implemented under various contingencies would help to reduce ambiguities facing the implementation stage. Crozier (1964), as cited in Schneider (1998), indicated that bureaucratic rules are more likely to be found in countries in which uncertainty is measured through formalized policies and procedures.

H2_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more likely to exert formal strategic control than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

The need to avoid uncertainty and to create structures is likely to have an influence on the time horizons of strategic planning. Long-term plans guard against anxieties associated with uncertainty of the future, and shorter term plans handle the stress of the present uncertainties. Chang & Park (2003) suggested that managers from

high uncertainty avoidance usually prefer to operate in a work environment where the strategic planning process is formalized and provides authoritative rules and specific steps that can be followed, a view that was shared by (Nakata & Sivakumar, 1996). Thus, it appears that the higher a culture's uncertainty avoidance, the more attention, time, and efforts to formulating longer range plans that cover broad time horizons its managers give. However, low uncertainty avoidance seems to be also positive force as well.

Horovits (1980) found that U.K. companies use longer range planning, and focus more on strategic than operational issues, than German and French companies. Schneider (1989) attributed Horovits' results to the dimension of uncertainty avoidance, suggesting that long-term, strategic issues are more uncertain and may therefore be avoided by focusing on short-term, operational plans. In another study, Berrell, Wright, & Hoa (1999) found that, compared to their Vietnamese counterparts, Australian managers avoided uncertain situations more by using strategic planning techniques. Reid & Hinkley (1989) found that Hong Kong managers more strongly subscribe toward the view that planning aids the avoidance of unacceptably high levels of risks than U.K. managers (U.K. ranks higher than Hong Kong). Altogether, the findings about the effects of uncertainty avoidance on the time horizons of planning seem contradictory. This controversy in viewpoints leads to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

H2_e: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more likely to have longer strategic planning horizons than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

Individualism/ Collectivism and Business Strategy Development

This dimension defines the relationship between an individual, and members, and its society. “Individualism stands for a loosely knit social framework in a society in which individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families” (Hofstede, 1985: 348). In these societies, personal identity and self-serving behaviors are encouraged. Collectivism stands for a “closely-knit social framework in which individuals can expect their relatives, clan, or group members to look after them, in exchange for unquestioning loyalty”(Hofstede, 1985:348). In these societies, identity is based on the social network to which one belongs. The fundamental issue addressed by this dimension is the degree of interdependence a society maintains among individuals (Hofstede, 1984). Although the reviewed literature indicates that the potential ties of the dimension to strategy have not been examined extensively, specific insights into the nature of the relationship can be presented.

In collectivist societies, relationship prevails over task, whereas in individualist societies task prevails over relationship. Triandis, McCusker, & Hui (1990) indicated that individualist cultures emphasize values promoting individual goals, whereas collectivist cultures emphasize the wealth of the in-group. This, in turn, will affect the type of strategic goals pursued by executives. Research by Redding (1993) reported that members of individualistic cultures are oriented toward task achievement even at the expense of relationship. Managers from these cultures tend to be more pragmatic and efficiency-minded. On the contrary, managers from less individualistic societies are more

concerned with achieving idealistic, group-oriented goals (Chang & Park, 2003). For example, Gopalan & Stahl (1998) argued that Americans are socialized with practices that stress individual rights over group goals and aspirations (individualist values), while Indians are raised with the notion that the group is considered to be more important than the individual (collectivist values). Therefore, a hypothesis stating the potential influence of the individualism/collectivism dimension on strategic goals pursued can be formulated as follows:

H3_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are more likely to emphasize group goals than do their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures.*

The characteristics of individualism values seem to foster executives' willingness for change. As acknowledged by Hofstede (2001), in the work places of high individualism societies, more invention patents are granted and innovation champions want to venture on their own. This is so because of the tendency of managers socialized with an individualism value to foster policies and practices that allow for individual initiative (Gomez-Majia & Welbourn, 1991). In more collectivist societies, those who occupy a leading role in the group, be it the extended family or clans, tend to conform to the behaviors expected of their position, leaving little room for individual initiatives. In support of this argument, Shane (1995) found that individualistic societies were more innovative than collective ones as measured by the per capita number of innovation patents granted to nationals, across thirty-three countries. American managers were found by Parnell (2004) to be more likely to emphasize strategic flexibility, whereas their

Mexican (lower individualism than the U.S.A.) counterparts emphasized strategic consistency. However, Geletkenycz (1997) argued that individualist values may induce an overconfidence in executives' ability to lead the firm, which taken to an extreme, is likely to diminish executives' capacity to sense the need for change in organizational profiles and foster a greater preference for the organizational status quo. This controversy may lead to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

H3_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have individualist cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have collectivist cultures.*

The individualism/collectivism dimension will probably have an impact on strategic control. More rigorous controllability, through formal mechanisms and rules, is expected to be expressed by executives of individualist values. In the individualist cultures, people are more concerned about their self-interests than in the organizational goals, making executives tend to develop extensive rules in order to achieve the goals of the organization. In collectivistic cultures, the group orientation is strong and conformity is high. In these cultures, employees are more emotionally and morally involved with their organizations than employees in cultures which stress high individuals (Jacksofsky & Slocum, 1988), making it possible for their managers to apply less formalized controls (Rodrigues, 1995). The sense of interdependence and joint obligations to the system fosters a more cooperative and informal control mechanism as the goals of the organization are being achieved. Calori, Lubatkin, & Very (1994) and Calori (1994) found that U.S. managers exercise higher formal control over resources than do French managers. The following hypothesis can be formulated:

H3_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have individualist cultures are more likely to exert formal strategic control than do their counterparts associated with countries that have collectivist cultures.*

There are indicators that strategy evaluation seems to be influenced by individualism/ collectivism dimension. Executives in collectivistic societies will probably tend to evaluate strategy performance on the basis of group achievements and meeting organizational goals rather than on individual performance. Ueno & Sekaran (1992) argued that when group cooperation becomes the norm and competitive behaviors are conspicuous by their absence, the system tends to evaluate performance less on the basis of budget fluctuations and more on the basis of group performance.

Furthermore, the time horizon for this evaluation (long-term and short-term) seems to be influenced by the individualism/collectivism dimension. Hofstede (1980:24) indicated that the goals of collectivists are long term, since they see themselves as part of the chain. People in these societies prefer to wait for the acquisition of collective outcomes that provide shared benefits (Wagner & Much, 1986). Since it takes a longer time period for group achievements to become noticeable, companies in such societies will tend to place greater emphasis on long-term performance evaluation time horizons (Ueno & Sekaran, 1992). Therefore, and with regard to strategy evaluation, two hypotheses can be formulated as follows:

H3_d: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are more likely to evaluate performance*

based on group achievements than do their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures.

H3_e: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are more likely to utilize long-term performance evaluation than do their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures.*

A participative approach toward strategy development is more likely to be associated with individualist societies, than collectivist ones. The image of the father, the teacher, and the elder is extended to organizations, where subordinates not only integrate their wishes with those of others, but also continue to unquestioningly subscribe to the authority of the decision makers. Hofstede (1997) suggested that the relationship between the employee and the employer in collectivist societies is perceived in moral terms, like a family link. In support of this argument, Gopalan & Stahl (1998) indicated that age and seniority is given great respect in Indian tradition (collectivist culture), and children are raised to obey their elders and teachers who are considered to be the “expert” having answers to all questions. Similar observations are found in the Chinese society (Collectivist culture) where the emphasis is on acceptance of authority, cooperation, and obedience (Bond & Wang, 1983; Ho, 1980). Wright & Newton (1998) found that Vietnamese (another collectivist culture) rarely question in public the reasoning behind the directives of management. Mexican managers (collectivist culture) were found to perceive less need to share information and objectives with subordinates and have less belief in participative management styles than do U.S. managers (Ferrari, 1977). As a consequence, the following hypothesis can be stated:

H3_f: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have individualist cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have collectivist cultures.*

Masculinity / Femininity and Business Strategy Development

This cultural dimension describes the extent to which socially prescribed gender roles are acceptable in a society. A masculine society is “a society in which social sexual roles are clearly distinct. Men are supposed to be assertive, tough and focused on material success; women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life” (Hofstede, 1996: 89). These cultures stress fairness, competition, progress, challenge, ambition, and performance. Femininity describes a society which has “preference for relationships, modesty, caring for the weak, and the quality of life” (Hofstede, 1985: 348). In these societies, the dominant values are caring for others, preservation, cooperation, and good working relationships. When applied to work settings, masculinity leads to assertiveness, competitiveness, and a tough approach to decision making that sometimes downplays the feelings of people affected by the decision. Femininity leads to a desire for cooperative and pleasant coworkers, good working conditions, and a more tender approach to decision making that takes people’s feelings into account (Hofstede, 1980).

It has been suggested that money and things are important in masculine cultures, while people and the environment are more meaningful in feminine cultures (Hofstede, 1980). This tendency is expected to influence the type of strategic goals executives may set for their business. For instance, Evans, Hau, & Sculli (1989) argued that people in Western countries are generally considered to be more aggressive in everyday life than Asians, who tend to be more passive and defensive, and often strive for social harmony, even at the expense of efficiency. Bass & Eldridge (1979) discovered that successful managers in Denmark (a low masculine society) emphasized societal concerns in decision making, whereas successful American, British, and German (all high masculine societies) managers strongly valued a profit motive. With special regard to strategy development, Harris & Ghauri (2000) study of a Scotch and a Dutch managers found that both executives placed “masculine” emphasis on the performance of staff, though the Scotch manager showed a more “masculine” stance as to how this might be improved, and the Dutch (low masculinity culture) displayed some “feminine” concern for maintaining and developing harmonious working relationships. The following hypothesis may be constructed:

H4_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have feminine cultures are more likely to emphasize societal goals than do their counterparts associated with countries that have masculine cultures.*

In masculine societies there seems a belief in individual decision-making. According to Hofstede(1984) , improved quality of work life for individuals in feminine societies means offering opportunities for developing social relationships on the job, which is best accomplished, Rodrigues (1990; 1995) argued, through an organic

organizational structure and a participative decision-making. A high score on the masculinity index is associated with members of a society tending to endorse more frequently the view that decisions made by individuals are usually of a higher quality than decisions made by groups (Hofstede, 1984; 195). The masculine decision-maker is not socially oriented. Feminine societies, in contrast, emphasize equality between people and consensus through negotiation and compromise. This, Harris & Ghauri (2000) concluded, can be expected to lead to more participative and inclusive strategy formulation processes than in “masculine” societies, where managers are expected to be decisive, assertive, ambitious and tough. Empirically, Reid & Hinkley (1989) found that in Hong Kong there is a greater permeation of strategic planning involvement than in the U.K. (the U.K. ranks higher than Hong Kong on masculinity). Consequently, a hypothesis regarding the potential influence of masculinity on strategy development can be formulated as follows:

H4_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have feminine cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have masculine cultures.*

In feminine societies, managers use intuition and strive for consensus; in masculine societies, managers are expected to be decisive and assertive (Hofstede, 1997). These characteristics may influence the approach taken to develop strategy in terms of rigorous analysis and the type of information utilized. Newman & Nollen (1996) noticed that masculine cultures are characterized by acting, doing, and acquiring, rather than thinking and observing. Under these conditions, a broader and more intuitive approach to strategy development process may be favored in feminine cultures, whereas systematic

and normative approaches are more expected of managers socialized by masculine cultures (Harris & Ghauri, 2000). In many cultures, managers do not place much value on factual and logical support for decisions. These executives do not seek out facts; they often rely on emotional and mystical consideration (Rodrigues, 1997; 1999). In many other cultures, executives place much value on factual and rational support for decisions. For instance, Kagono, Nonaka, Sakakibara, & Okumara (1985) found that typical European and American (masculine cultures) managers' strategic behavior can be described as "strategic planning." They think about strategy in a logical and deductive fashion, analyzing environmental opportunities and risks, assessing the implications of success to financial resources, and evaluating specific domains in which strategy may be pursued. Interestingly, although of a masculine culture, Japanese managers' approach to strategy was described in the same study as intuitive, evolutionary, emerging, and adaptive to environmental conditions, as opposed to analytical and logical. Similar results were reported by Reid & Hinkley (1989) who found that Hong Kong managers appeared to have more positive beliefs about strategic planning than their U.K. counterparts (although the U.K. ranks higher on masculinity than Hong Kong); and by Parnell (2004) who found that American executives were more likely to perceive strategy formulation as an art, as opposed to a science. More evidence is needed to clarify the inconsistent results.

H4_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have masculine cultures utilize more analytical approach than do their counterparts associated with countries that have feminine cultures.*

Values of aggressiveness, career aspirations, ambition, and action orientation often associated with masculinity may be correlated with the need to react quickly and take risks, which in turn, affect the willingness for change and adaptation. Geletkanycz (1997) suggested that people with masculine values would be receptive to the alteration of existing arrangements, more likely than those associated with feminine values, where the maintenance of stable and nurturing interpersonal ties are given a high priority. This difference is more acute in situations where change or adaptation enhances chances of success. A hypothesis that relates the cultural dimension of masculinity to business strategy can then be formulated as follows:

H4_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have masculine cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with feminine cultures.*

Long-Term vs. Short-Term Orientation and Business Strategy Development

This cultural dimension is related to the choice of focus for people's efforts: the future or the present. In cultures with short-term orientations, quick results are expected. Those with long-term orientations prefer patience and steady progression toward long-term goals. Short-term oriented nations are concerned with single solutions (the "truth"); things are perceived as true or false, and black or white. Long-term oriented cultures see the truth as being ambiguous and recognizable in several forms.

According to Hofstede (2001), long-term orientations appear to be based on principles suggested in the teachings of Confucius (e.g., thrift, perseverance, face saving). Work settings consistent with a long-term cultural orientation include providing long-term employment and solving problems for the long term rather than making quick fixes. Persistence and perseverance are important when people face difficulties on the job. Rather than give up, people continue their efforts. If people are thrifty, they have money to invest in new businesses. If people have a sense of shame, they become upset with themselves if they do not work hard and if they do not contribute to group efforts (Hofstede & Bond, 1988).

Managers from countries that score high on the long-term orientation dimension usually take a more futuristic view of managerial actions and show greater willingness to sacrifice short-term efficiency gains for the sake of long-term collective goals (Chang & Park, 2003). For example, Americans (relatively short-term oriented) treat time as a linear path towards some future event or goal to be realized. In such a society, time is compartmentalized wherein meeting deadlines, schedules and appointments are emphasized. People are socialized to value punctuality and promptness and express strong disapproval towards late-coming and excessive delays; they also value meeting organizational goals based on pre-established time tables (Gopalan & Stahl, 1998; Evans, Hau, & Sculli, 1989; Kelly, Whately, & Worthley, 1987). In societies that score higher on the long-term time orientation (e.g., Japan and India), time is not viewed in a linear fashion, nor is it viewed as a commodity with perishable value, it is rather viewed as an infinite loop- one which has always been there and which will continue to exist, leading

to a comprehensive, broad and integrated approach to firm strategy (Kotha, Dunbar, & Bird, 1995; Gopalan & Stahl, 1998). Empirically, Vietnamese managers were found to tend to view time as infinite and intermittent, while Australian managers (relatively low on long-time orientation) placed emphasis on meeting specific deadlines, especially concerning planning and resource allocation (Berrell, Wright, & Hoa, 1997). Reid & Hinkley (1989) found that executives from both Hong Kong (high long-term orientation) and U.K. (low long-term orientation) showed short-term horizons in strategic planning, though the U.K. orientation appeared even shorter term. With specific regard to business strategy, Harris & Ghauri's (2000) study of two business leaders concluded that both leaders, although from different cultures, showed both short-term as well as longer-term concerns when developing strategy. Altogether, these studies are inconclusive about the effects of time orientation on planning horizons. These inconclusive findings lead to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

H5_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures are more likely to have longer strategic planning horizons than do their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures.*

In Confucian societies, where the emphasis is on long-term orientation, the patriarchal expectation of total obedience and loyalty that govern the family is extended to organizations (Scarborough, 1998; LeVine & White, 1986). Subordinates have been taught not to raise questions to supervisors, especially in the public settings, and to follow their patriarch to achieve stable relations between them (Song & Meek, 1998). In these cultures, a more authoritarian and patriarchal view is more likely wherein subordinates

accept ideas and views from highly ranked people without much criticism because they believe in most instances that their patriarchs possess greater knowledge and wisdom than they do themselves. This, in turn, fosters an autocratic approach to strategy formulation. Managers may treat subordinates with distant formality, and decision making is top-down. Consequently, the following hypothesis may be formulated:

H5_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures.*

Executives belonging to high long-term orientation cultures, with their preferred autocratic approach to strategy development, may show a high level of commitment to the decisions they make than executives socialized with lower long-term orientation. Chang & Park (2003) argued that being efficient is not a major concern for managers of high time orientation cultures as they are apt to show a high level of commitment to whatever they have decided upon. However, findings by Geletkanycz (1997) indicated that managers whose cultural heritage emphasizes a short-term orientation (low Confucian dynamism values) show greater commitment to strategic policies. This controversy leads to the construction of the following hypothesis:

H5_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures tend to be more committed to the decisions they make than do their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures.*

There is evidence that time orientation may influence executives' willingness for change. Geletkanycz (1997) indicated that executives of short-term oriented cultures will more likely promote fewer new initiatives inasmuch as they prefer adherence to past convention. However, several other researchers have hypothesized a relationship in which longer-term orientation values foster a sense of maintaining traditional heritage. Gopalan & Stahl (1998) indicated that Indians (past-oriented, high long-term orientation) attach pride and importance to maintaining their heritage by following practices that are handed down from the past by tradition. Such past orientation places tremendous pressure to conform to time-honored practices and beliefs. Consequently, the focus may be maintaining status quo through perpetuation of the past, and not change. In lower short-term, future-oriented cultures, not much emphasis is given to maintaining or upholding traditional customs or beliefs, change is valued and embraced as future time orientation results in the belief that the future will be "bigger", "brighter", and "better" than either the present or the past (Gopalan & Stahl, 1998). Schneider (1989) shared this view by stating that when the past is emphasized, there will be a slower approach to change, less pressure to act and hence there will be less of a sense of urgency. Empirical findings are needed to support either of these two viewpoints.

H5_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures.*

The literature points also to the potential influence time orientation may have on strategy evaluation time horizons. Adler (1997) stated that "making the numbers" is of paramount importance to American managers (low long-term orientation). Such

environment, she argued, tends to promote a more impatient short-term orientation that focuses on “here-and-now” results. In contrast, many decisions made by executives over a period of years have an impact on the long-term growth and success of companies, which become evident only with the passage of time and it is only in the long-term that these executives can be recognized for their contribution (Ueno & Sekaran, 1992). Executives socialized with longer-time orientation values are probably more willing to wait for longer periods of time to see the results of the decisions they make. Strategic evaluation done over longer periods of time will be more likely in high long-term orientation cultures as it reflect the performance and effectiveness of executives’ contributions. Consequently, the following hypothesis can be formulated:

H5_e: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures are more likely to utilize long-term performance evaluation than do their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures.*

Relevant Research from the Hotel Literature

A review of the literature revealed that only a token amount of research have acknowledged the effect of national culture on the strategic behavior of hotel top executives. An analysis of these studies suggested that national cultural influences, directly and indirectly, may have a substantial impact on the way hotel managers around the world manage. Some studies relevant to the present study in terms of content and methodology are described below.

Spa hotel top managers were among the 70 managers in the Finnish spa industry sampled in Gallen (2006) study of the effect of cognitive styles of managers on their view of the viable strategy for their hotels. The study was conducted on the premise that it is important for managers to know themselves and how this affects their process of strategic decision making. The study also aimed at inspiring other researchers to further study the cognitive style as an influencing factor on managers and their chosen business strategies. Answers obtained from the surveyed managers were linked to strategy types as identified by Miles & Snow (1978). Using a qualitative methodology, the study concluded that managers' cognitive styles and particularly their way of taking in information (sensing or intuition) have effect on strategies they tend to prefer. Intuitive managers (i.e., those who may ignore practical things but seek information from symbols, imaginary and metaphors) tend to view the prospector or the analyzer strategy as the most viable future alternative for their organizations. The analyzer or the defender strategy was found to be the preference of sensing managers (i.e., managers who focus their attention on facts). Relevant findings by the study (e.g., cognitive styles of managers) were compared to other similar results by studies done in other countries, including U.S.A. and the Netherlands.

Wong & Kwan (2001) examined and compared competitive business strategies employed by hotels and travel agencies in Hong Kong and Singapore. Based on a structured questionnaire, personal face-to-face interviews were held with top-level managers in 104 conveniently selected organizations. Comparisons between answers

obtained indicated that managers in both of these city-states equally put strong efforts to monitor and evaluate competitive strategies to ensure cost-effectiveness. Although managers from both sides agree over the significance of a clear company direction and philosophy, Hong Kong managers appeared to be lacking the efforts towards developing such directions. Middle-level and assistant managers in Singapore were found to be less aware of their hospitality firms' strategic goals. Larger number of managers from Hong Kong believes that they possess the required skills and equipment to offer quality services, while managers from Singapore were more confident in enhancing employees' skills level and use of improved technology. Compared to their counterparts in Hong Kong, managers of Singapore tended to show a stronger belief in the potential contribution of information technology to company success.

Mwaura, Sutton, & Roberts (1998) conducted a study that aimed at illustrating the interactions of national and corporate cultures. The study attempted to establish whether the corporate culture of a hotel organization can be effectively transferred to a country where a strong national culture exists. The national culture of People's Republic of China was analyzed in terms of its effects on both the work environment as well as on the employees employed by international hotel companies working in China. Employing participant observation, focus group, and using one hotel property as a case study, the research concluded that a strong national culture can have major influences on what happens in the workplace. This conclusion was drawn after identifying several aspects of Chinese culture through a sequence of observed critical incidents which demonstrated

areas of divergence between national and corporate culture, which in turn provoked management difficulties.

Wu, Costa, & Teare (1998) surveyed top managers of hotel properties belonging to a total of sixteen transnational hotel corporations with presence in China and Eastern Europe. One goal of the study was to characterize environmental scanning activities of general managers of the individual hotel units. The results of the study indicated that almost two-thirds of the general managers have formal responsibilities for scanning the business environment with the purpose of further business expansion in the host country or market. The study also found that all managers voluntarily feed back their assessment of the business environment in the host country with the potential for affecting the business development of their companies. General managers were found to play a more performance-related role than a strategic integrated role. However, although clear differences can be expected between China and Eastern Europe, the authors reported aggregate results with no comparison as to the differences among managers working in both regions.

Pizam, Pine, Mok, & Shin (1997) attempted to determine whether national culture have a greater effect on the managerial behavior of hotel managers than the culture of the hotel industry. Hofstede's definition and measurement of culture was employed in this study of 192 hotel managers in Hong Kong, Japan, and Korea. A questionnaire was designed to measure a total of 29 certain managerial practices related to Hofstede cultural dimensions, including, for example, decision making style, formalization of grievance

resolutions, loyalty, harmony maintenance,...etc. The analysis indicated that “in the majority of the practices (22 out of 29, or 76) there were significant differences between the managerial practices of the three nationality groupings indicating therefore that nationality cultures have a strong effect on managerial practices.” The study also found that there is a strong positive relationship between work-related values and managerial behavior. Although can be directly criticized at many levels (i.e., lack of rigorousness of methods, validity and reliability of measurement scales, unsubstantiated conclusions) , this study remains the exception to the virtually non-existent literature directly investigating national culture influences on top management in the hotel industry.

Olsen, Murthy, & Teare (1994) surveyed 52 chief executive officers of multinational hotel chains, mostly operating upscale or mid-price hotels, in all parts of the world. The purpose of the survey was to assess the environmental scanning practices in these hotel firms and to identify how the global business environment is viewed by their executives. The study investigated a wide range of issues related to scanning, including the type of data used, categories of environment, environmental variables used in assessing uncertainty, and the level of interest in scanning the environment. Differences among respondents in their approach to environmental scanning were investigated in terms of their firms’ organizational characteristics (such as size and international scope of operations) and the unit assigned the scanning process. Unfortunately, although respondents in the study represented several countries, comparisons among the participants’ scanning approach based on their cultural background or national origin were not reported in the study.

Clearly, much more still needs to be learned about how strategic philosophy of hotel managers around the world is shaped and influenced by cultural factors. Using appropriate research methods, the current study was a step toward realizing deeper understanding of this issue.

Summary

This chapter has established the theoretical foundations upon which the current research is based. An overview of the empirical research and other scholarly contributions to the key constructs in the study was provided. The sections on the strategy construct and its fundamental aspects defined the construct as a process, and highlighted the early researchers' recognition of the importance of top executives' role in the strategy development process.

Also presented was a review of the concept of national culture, its nature, definitions, and measurement. Culture not only has no single well-accepted definition, the essence of culture has been open to debate and differences of interpretation, with several authors proposing several frameworks that try to capture its essence. Nevertheless, Hofstede's cultural dimensions continued to be the most widely used in cross-cultural studies, and hence, was highlighted in the chapter.

Few studies investigated the connection between strategy and culture, and therefore we know little about this relationship. Based on related literature from several disciplines, specific hypotheses (summarized in Table 2 below) were proposed in this chapter to show how cultural differences might impact the approach expressed by executives toward the development of business strategy.

Finally, cross-national strategy studies in the hotel industry continued to grow. A general finding of these studies was that managerial style and philosophy of hotel executives are influenced directly or indirectly by their cultural heritage. However, the review demonstrated that much still needs to be learned about these influences, something which the current study tried to partially achieve. Subsequent chapters provided the methodology followed to conduct the investigation and the findings that resulted from the investigation.

Table 2 Summary of the Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses	
H1:	When developing business strategy, and compared to their counterparts associated with countries that have high power distance, hotel executives associated with countries that have low power distance are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. More likely to have a more participative approach b. Less open to strategic change c. More likely to emphasize people and societal concerns d. Less likely to exert formal strategic control
H2:	When developing business strategy, and compared to their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less open to strategic change b. More likely to have a participative approach c. More likely to utilize quantitative sources of information d. More likely to exert formal strategic control e. More likely to have longer strategic planning time horizons
H3:	When developing business strategy, and compared to their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. More likely to emphasize group goals b. Less open to strategic change c. Less likely to exert formal strategic control d. More likely to evaluate performance based on group achievements e. More likely to utilize long-term performance evaluation f. Less likely to have a participative approach
H4:	When developing business strategy, and compared to their counterparts associated with countries that have masculine cultures, hotel executives associated with countries that have feminine cultures are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. More likely to emphasize societal goals b. More likely to have a more participative approach c. Less likely to utilize rigor analysis and analytical approach d. Less open to strategic change
H5:	When developing business strategy, and compared to their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. More likely to have longer strategic planning time horizons b. Less likely to have a participative approach c. More committed to the strategic decisions they make d. Less open to strategic change e. More likely to utilize long-term performance evaluation

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The present study examined the potential influence of national culture on the approach to business strategy development expressed by hotel top executives in the international setting. The national culture was assumed to be an influencer of the approaches of participants from each of the countries investigated. This chapter described the methodology that was used. The chapter addressed the sampling, data collection, instrumentation, and statistical treatment.

Sampling

Sample

Cross-national research requires country samples to be comparable. The sample for this study was drawn from a population of top executives of individual strategic business units in several countries. These executives were similar in many characteristics, but different in their nationalities. The goal was to obtain matched country samples.

Sekaran (1983) suggested that matched sampling should be used where groups of individuals are compared over specific dimensions. Alerck & Settle (1985) recommended that the participant pool in a cross-cultural study be drawn from a consistent type of population. Koopman, *et al.* (1999) noted that samples should be relatively homogeneous within countries as if samples are unmatched the observed cultural differences could be due to sampling differences instead of cultural differences.

Countries included in the current study were the U.S.A., Thailand, Malaysia, and Turkey. Country selection was purposefully chosen to represent a varied continuum of countries and cultural dimensions. First, clear cultural and geographical differences were noticeable among these societies, and this will help in reducing the possibility of a cultural overlap. Second, as indicated in Table 3 below, the status of these countries, in terms of both classification (Low vs. High) and score on the cultural dimensions, were reported by Hofstede's studies (1980; 1991). Third, the number of hotel properties in each of these countries was relatively large enough to secure the minimum number of manager participants, native of their countries, needed for this type of studies, which in turn allowed the possibility of making statistically valid comparisons. Finally, the literature provided material about the cultures of these societies as they have been studied by other researchers, and this will help in discussing and explaining the results of the study.

Table 3 Country Status on Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

	U.S.A	Malaysia	Thailand	Turkey
Power Distance	Low (40)	High (104)	High (64)	High (66)
Uncertainty Avoidance	Low (46)	Low (36)	High (64)	High (85)
Individualism	High (91)	Low (26)	Low (20)	Low (37)
Masculinity	High (62)	Average (50)	Low (34)	Low (45)
Long-Term Time Orientation	Low (29)	-	High (56)	-

- Indicates that the score for the country is not available for this dimension in Hofstede's original study.

* The world average for power distance = 55, for uncertainty avoidance = 64, for individualism = 40, for masculinity = 50, and for long time orientation = 45.

Sample Size

Hofstede (1994; 2001) suggested that the minimum number of persons in the sample population for each country should be 20, with the ideal number of being 50. Below that, the influence of single individuals becomes too strong. Fraenkel & Wallen (2000) recommended a minimum of 30 individuals per sample for causal-comparative studies to be able to demonstrate the differences that exist among the national groups. With regard to strategy, Phelan, Ferreira, & Salvador (2002) investigated the empirical strategy studies published in the Strategic Management Journal and found the average sample size to be 175 cases. With that in mind, the current research aimed at securing the greatest sample as possible in the circumstances, but no less than 20 participants per cultural group.

Data Collection

Key Informants

As awareness of organizational issues tends to increase with organizational level, past research used top executives for measuring strategic constructs. Executives closest to the top of organizations generally tend to have the organization-wide and industry-wide perspectives necessary for accurately assessing strategies, compared to more specialized perspectives of middle level executives (Hambrick, 1981; Noburn & Birley, 1988). Therefore, executives closest to the top of the organization are most influential in shaping and developing business strategy. The key informants in the present study were the top executives in individual hotel properties. This included the general managers and other influential managers. Business unit managers in large, decentralized organizations are likely to have substantial decision-making autonomy (Govindarajan, 1989), allowing for possible variations in their approach to strategy development.

However, these executives are often seen as difficult to access. For example, in 2001 and 2002, the median response rate for using primary data in the *Strategic Management Journal* was 36% , with more than a quarter of the studies having a response rate of 20% (Slater & Atuahene-Gima, 2004). The demands of their jobs and the several organizational filters contribute to the usually harder access to managers in bigger firms (Thomas, 1993).

Considering budget and time constraints, efforts were made in the current study to secure the minimum number of participant from each country surveyed. This included limiting the number of questions in the survey instrument, including a detailed cover letter with the questionnaire explaining the importance of the response, providing pre-paid self-addressed envelopes for completed questionnaires, enhancement of the appeal of the instrument, ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of responses, and explaining how the results may be useful to the hotel executives. The participants were also told to provide their email address if they want a summary of the study, upon its completion, to be sent to them.

Survey Administration

The survey was conducted of samples of American, Thai, Malaysian, and Turkish hotel managers drawn from databases for each country. In the U.S.A., the survey instrument was distributed to 600 first class hotel properties in virtually all states in the country. The most recent edition available at the time of the study of the Hotel & Travel Index database (Winter edition, 2005-2006) was used to draw this sample. The instrument was administered in Malaysia to all three-, four-, and five-star hotels registered in the Malaysia Hotel Association, a total of 247 hotels. The Thai sample was drawn from the list of all three-, four-, and five-star hotels registered in the Thai Hotel Association, 359 hotels. In Turkey, the questionnaire was sent to hotels with three-, four-, five-star classification. In addition to the hotels that are members of the Turkish Hotel

Association, addresses of other more hotels of the same classifications in Turkey were obtained from online sources, including the directory of hotels in Turkey (<http://www.hotelguide.com.tr/>) and Turkey Hotel Guide (<http://www.hotelsinturkey.net/>), for total a number of 264 hotels. A packet containing a cover letter, a copy of the questionnaire (with a translated copy to respondents outside the U.S.A.), and a self-addressed pre-paid envelop was mailed to the general manager of each hotel property surveyed. The survey was administered in each country by the researcher or colleague doctoral students.

Response Rates

Out of 1470 potential respondents who received the questionnaire, 248 questionnaires were returned. This represented an overall response rate of 16.9%. To avoid cultural overlap, expatriates in each country who were not native of that country were then excluded. This left 207 usable responses, with an eventual response rate being 14.1%. Country response rates were 8.3% for the American group, 17.4% for the Malaysian group, 19.5% for the Thai group, and 16.7% for the Turkish group. Table 4 presented the details of the final sample.

Table 4 Response Rates by Country

Country	Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Received	Valid Questionnaires	Eventual Response Rate
U.S.A.	600	62	50	8.3%
Malaysia	247	55	43	17.4%
Thailand	359	85	70	19.5%
Turkey	264	46	44	16.7%
Overall response rate				14.1%

Instrumentation

Instrument Development

The instrument consisted of three major sections (see Appendix). The first section was composed of 27 items concerning some of the aspects that may differentiate top executives' approaches to strategy development. This included: involvement in strategy development (4 items), content of strategic objectives - people and societal concerns (4 items), focus of strategic objectives- group vs. individual (2 items), formality of strategic control (5 items), type of data used in strategic analysis (3 items), criteria for strategic evaluation (2 items), evaluation time horizons (2 items), and degree of rigorous analysis and rationality (5 items). The second section measured strategic planning time horizons (6 items), openness to strategic change (5 items), and commitment to strategic decisions (4 items). Respondents were queried about the extent to which they agreed with the

statements provided, on a five-point Likert-style scales. The selection of these variables was based on the possibility that logically drawn connections between the variables and national culture can be developed, utilizing relevant theoretical literature and empirical evidence. The third section of the questionnaire included questions relating to participants' demographic and organizational characteristics, including gender, age, education, nationality, years of experience, managerial level, functional background, and hotel size. Appropriate inventories of the aspects of business strategy development were mostly extracted from relevant literature as shown in Table 5 below. Re-wording and adaptations were made on the original scales to best fit the purpose of the current study.

Table 5 Literature Sources Used in the Development of Scales of the Current Study

Involvement in strategy development	Parnell (2004;2005) Yousef (1998)
Openness to strategic change	Gelentkanycz (1997) Susskind, Miller, & Johnson (1998)
Content of strategic objectives (people and societal concerns)	Harris & Ghauri (2000)
Focus of strategic objectives (group vs. individual)	Harris & Ghauri (2000)
Formality of strategic control	Chae & Hill (2000) O'Regan & Ghobadian (2002) Fiegen (1994)
Type of data used in strategic analysis	Reid & Hinkley (1989)
Strategic planning time horizons	Reid & Hinkley (1989) Rhyne (1986)
Criteria of strategic evaluation	Hastings (1996) Tangen (2003) Stathakopoulos (1998)
Strategy evaluation time horizons	Hastings (1996) Tangen (2003)
Degree of rigorous analysis and rationality	Parnell (2004;2005)
Commitment to strategic decisions	Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979)

To elicit a good response rate by keeping the questionnaire short, no more than five items (except for the strategic planning time horizon scales) were used to measure each of the aspects of strategy development utilized in the current study. Fifty-percent of the scales used in studies utilizing survey data that were published in leading management journals had 3-5 items (Hinkin, 1995). Scales with too few items may jeopardize validity, while scales with excessive items will induce respondent fatigue and response bias (Slater & Atuahene-Gima, 2004). Moreover, each scale used a 5-point Likert-type, agree-disagree format. Participants selected the one best response for each item. Each of the scales contained different number of items. In order to avoid response bias and acquiescent bias among the subjects, the instrument included both positive and negative items. Recoding of some items was done before data analysis.

The demographics section gathered personal information about respondents with respect to their gender, age, number of years of work experience in both their current hotel company and the hotel industry in general, managerial level, functional background, highest education obtained, number of employees in their hotel, hotel location, number of rooms in the hotel, and number of years of international hospitality experience. These questions were necessary to fully understand the respondents' background, and to make comparisons and contrasts among sample groups. These characteristics were also selected and included in the questionnaire because they have been shown or argued to influence some forms of behavior of top-level managers.

To avoid cultural overlap, the demographics section of the questionnaire asked for participants' nationality and nationality at birth (if different). Only those participants who stated their nationality as being one of the countries in the study and with no change from birth were included in the data analysis (Hofstede, 1980). Responses by people in any country sample who were born outside that country and immigrated to this country were excluded from the study.

The cover letter explained who was conducting the research, the topic of the research, what the respondents are expected to do, how long their participation would take, how anonymity and confidentiality are protected, and how to contact the researcher.

Contextual Variables

Although this study acknowledged that there are several variables that can be influential in shaping the strategic behavior of managers, the focus of this research was on national cultural influences. Through the employment of appropriate research methods, the effects of variables other than those related to national culture were reduced. The need to keep the questionnaire to an acceptable length has limited the number of questions that could be asked. This made it difficult to control for the whole range of contextual variables that might confound national cultural influences. Such variables, in particular, include: industry characteristics and industry culture (Negandhi, 1983; Miller,

1987; Markoczy, 2000; Hodgkinson & Johnson, 1994), individual personality (Miller, Kets de Vries, & Toulouse, 1982; Bamberger, 1983; Kotey & Meredith, 1997; Smicich & Studdart, 1985; Walsh & Fahey, 1986), individual demographic differences (Kathuria & Porth, 2003; Child, 1974), functional background (Song, 1982 ; Bowman & Daniels, 1995), organizational internal resources (Thompson & Strickland, 1999), and organizational culture (Johnson, 1987).

While some variables can be accounted for, other factors are harder to control. The design of the present study as limited to one industry was a deliberate attempt to minimize and control industry effects. In addition to the possibility of obtaining matched samples, taking the individual business units (hotel properties) from the same industry on a worldwide basis allowed for controlling the industry effects. It was indicated that managers in different organizations within an industry may subscribe to a more common set of assumptions, the industry “recipe” (Grinyer & Spender, 1979), and industry structure was found to be an important influence on managerial thinking (Calori, Johnson, & Sarnin, 1992). From a strategy standpoint, Slater & Atuahene-Gima (2004) stressed that since strategic constructs are relative phenomena that are largely influenced by industry conditions, it is difficult to control for industry-specific effects on strategy in broad samples. Additionally, Judge & Miller (1991) advocated using a single industry when studying the process of strategic decision making. Likewise, the questionnaire in the current study asked about participants’ demographics and functional background in an attempt to control for their potential influences. Hotel size was used in this study as a proxy for the variable of the organizational internal resources.

Recognizing that no single study is able to capture all of the contextual factors that vary across and within organizations that can influence managers' approach to strategy development, it is hoped that future studies will systematically include other contextual variables that may directly or indirectly influence strategic philosophies of managers. Such addition will contribute to a deeper understanding of the issue.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Slater & Atuahene-Gima (2004) advised strategy researchers to use a panel of experts to judge the relevance of the items to the domain of the construct and to suggest additional items. Therefore, following the initial construction of the instrument, a panel of academics with different cultural backgrounds who either teach or do research in the area of strategic management, in both hospitality and business schools in the U.S.A., was asked to examine the scales and assess their content validity, and to contribute their thoughts on any omissions or inappropriate items. Per their review and comments, the instrument was slightly modified.

The refined draft of the instrument went through online pre-testing with a small group of general managers of hotels based in the U.S.A. This list of managers and their direct email addresses were obtained from Global Hoteliers Club of the HOTELS Magazine (<http://www.hotelsmag.com/>). These executives were sent an email with a survey link attached and were asked to review the content, formatting, sequence of

questions, clarity and relevance of instructions, and coherence of the questionnaire. This procedure assessed the effectiveness of the data collection process and instrumentation. Appropriate changes to either the instrument or the data collection process were made accordingly.

In this research, eleven sets of measurements were used. These scales were: Commitment to strategic decisions, Openness to strategic change, Content of strategic objectives, Focus of strategic objectives, Formality of strategic control, Type of data used in strategic analysis, Strategic planning time horizons, Criteria for strategic evaluation, Strategy evaluation time horizons, Degree of analysis and rationality, and Involvement in strategy development. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to evaluate the internal consistency of the scales. The initial alpha coefficients showed that there was a poor consistency among the items on several scales, suggesting that these items should not be utilized as a scale without some improvement in scale composition. To raise the value of these coefficients, items measuring some of the variables were deleted. The measures of Focus of strategic objectives, Strategy evaluation time horizons, and Criteria for strategic evaluation were excluded from the reliability test due to their single-item status. Table 6 showed the alpha values obtained after the purification process. The minimum reliability criteria threshold established by Nunnally (1978) of .50 was met by the variables.

Table 6 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients of the Scales

Scale	Items in Questionnaire	U.S.A	Malaysia	Thailand	Turkey
- Involvement in strategy development	7,18,23	.51	.52	.50	.53
- Openness to strategic change	Question 29 (4 items)	.70	.52	.59	.73
- Content of strategic objectives	4,11,20	.51	.60	.63	.65
- Formality of strategic control	8,14,17,24	.75	.50	.65	.51
- Type of data used in strategic analysis	16,27	.55	.85	.64	.55
- Strategic planning time horizons	Question 28 (6 items)	.59	.64	.75	.80
- Degree of analysis and rationality	6,10,12,21	.57	.52	.56	.55
- Commitment to strategic decisions	Question 30 (3 items)	.84	.60	.69	.53

Hofstede (1994) suggested that the answers of the 20 content questions in his instrument that he used to construct his cultural dimensions vary among nationalities. This is not to imply that every respondent from one nationality gives one answer and everyone from another nationality gives another answer, but on average, a sample of respondents from a nationality will nearly always score higher, or always score lower, than a comparable sample of people from another nationality. Samples of cultures should not be confused with samples of individuals. In the appendix that he added to his study, Hofstede (1991:253) asserted that: "Mean values are calculated from the scores on each question for the respondents from each country. We do not compare individuals, but we compare what is called central tendencies in the answers from each country." Consequently, no scale for culture or cultural dimensions was employed in the current study.

Demographics related to respondents' nationality and nationality at birth (if different) were used to assign participants into the sample groups. Respondents were then assigned their country's cultural classification of low vs. high for individualism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, power distance, and long-term time orientation as provided by Hofstede (1980; 1991). Using a preformed explanatory framework (such as that of Hofstede) in order to account for deep cultural explanation in an operational and implementable way is recommended by researchers (Usunier, 1998), and other cultural scholars used the procedure in their studies (e.g., Gelentkycz, 1997; Ueno & Sekaran, 1992; Schneider & De Meyer, 1991)

Several studies have addressed both the validity and reliability of Hofstede's framework. Sondergaard (1994) cited 13 studies that reinforce the construct validity of Hofstede's original work. The validity of Hofstede's scales was discussed in detail in Hofstede (1980; 326-331). Hofstede reported that the reliability coefficients of the national culture measures varied between .12 to .95, and considered a score as reasonably stable if the coefficient exceeded .50. The reliability of Hofstede's (1980; 1997) data has been shown through more than 60 replications of the original study, the majority of which confirm the original findings (Sondergaard, 1994). One of the largest of these replications, Hoppe (1990) gave the instrument to 1,600 people from 17 countries, all of whom were alumni of a leadership institute. Although Hoppe's study had a different sample and different time period from Hofstede's original IBM study, his results confirmed Hofstede's four-dimension model of culture

Instrument Translation

The original instrument in English was translated and back-translated to ensure that not only the correct phrases but also the language-related sensitivities and actual equivalents of the original English phrases are observed in the translated versions. Active assistance was received in this process from multicultural personnel representing the countries in which the instrument was administered, allowing the interpretation of statements from participating culture's perspective and not from a single culture.

The Malaysian version was translated by a native student getting his doctorate in the U.S.A., and then was back-translated and reviewed by a native professor fluent in both English and Malay languages. The Thai translation and back-translation was carried out by a group of Thai doctoral students getting their education at American universities. Several changes were made to the original translation before the Thai version was finalized. A group of students in the U.S.A. whose native language was Turkish conducted the translation of the questionnaire from English into Turkish. Another native doctoral student back-translated the Turkish version into English. Changes were then made after comparing the original English with the back-translated version. The draft was then reviewed and refined by a Turkish professor teaching hospitality in Turkey. Respondents in Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey were given an opportunity to use either the English or the translated version of the questionnaire. The final translated versions of the questionnaire were included in the Appendix.

Statistical Analysis

Like many studies in the field, this study used national culture as the independent variable, with four levels representing the four countries surveyed. Respondents' managerial level, gender, age, number of years of work experience, functional background, and their hotel size (measured by number of rooms) were included in the analysis as contextual variables. The dependent variables were: involvement in strategy development, openness to strategic change, content of strategic objectives (people and societal concerns), focus of strategic objectives (group vs. individual), formality of strategic control, type of data used in strategic analysis, strategic planning time horizons, criteria of strategic evaluation, strategy evaluation time horizons, degree of analysis and rationality, and commitment to strategic decisions. To obtain the aggregate scores that were used in the analysis, the items of each scale were averaged for each of these dependent variables. For each national cultural dimension, countries were placed in either a high or low category, based on the original results of Hofstede (1980; 1991).

Utilizing the SPSS 14.0 statistical software, the study used several statistical procedures. Demographic and professional data of respondents were analyzed by descriptive statistics. Reliability analysis of the scales was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha. To examine the hypotheses stating that top executives from different cultures will be different on the variables related to hotel business strategy development, a series of one-way analyses of variance was conducted. This technique allowed testing for significant differences between the four countries on each of the dependent variables in

the study. Where significant differences along dependent variables were found, Tukey HSD was used as a post hoc test to identify which countries differed significantly from each other on these variables.

In cases where the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated, square-root transformation was carried out to make the data better fit the assumptions. The square-root of each observation was used in the analysis of variance for this particular dependent variable, and the Games-Howell test was used as a post hoc criterion as it does not rely on the assumption of equal variances. The Games-Howell test is recommended for the situation of unequal sample sizes and unequal or unknown variances (Toothacker, 1993; 66). A confidence level of .05 was used in all of the analyses in this study.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was employed to provide statistical control of the contextual variables. The contextual variables were dummy coded into dichotomous variables, and then treated as predictor variables, whereas the criterion variable in each of these separate analyses was the respondents' answers on each of the dependent variables. Hierarchical multiple regression added independent variables to the regression model in stages. At stage one, National Culture was entered as a predictor. At stage two, the variables of gender, education, age, functional background, years of experience in the hotel industry, as well as the hotel size were entered as predictors. The change in R-square was then calculated and tested with an *F*-test for significance. A significant *F*-change was interpreted as that the independent variables added in the second stage significantly improved the prediction power of the regression model.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Demographic and Professional Characteristics of the Respondents

A total of 207 valid questionnaires were collected and analyzed from the four countries surveyed in this study. This included 50 from U.S.A., 43 from Malaysia, 70 from Thailand, and 44 from Turkey. The response rates from these countries were as follows: U.S.A, 8.3%; Malaysia, 17.4%; Thailand, 19.5%; and, Turkey 16.7%.

Demographic and professional data were collected regarding respondents' gender, age, education, number of years with current hotel company and in the hotel industry, managerial level, functional background, international hotel experience, and hotel size as measured by the number of rooms.

Table 7 shows the demographic and professional characteristics of respondents in the study. The majority of the respondents were males for the overall sample (155; that is 77.9% of the total sample), as well as in the American (85.4%), Malaysian (78.6%) and Turkish (86.0%) groups. The Thai group has a relatively larger female representation, with females constituting 33.3% of the respondents.

The percentage of general manager respondents was similar in the four country groups, as most of the respondents identified themselves as general managers (ranging 53.6% to 86.0%). Respondents who identified themselves as vice presidents constituted 6.0% of the sample. The rest of the respondents indicated that their managerial positions are either resident managers or functional directors. The age distributions for the four country groups were fairly similar. The significant majority of respondents in the American (83.7%), Malaysian (70.0%), Thai (76.8%), and Turkish (61.4 %) groups indicated their age range to be in the two categories of 36 - 45 and 46 – 55. Overall, most of the respondents (42.1%) classified themselves to be between 34 to 45 years old; and additional 31.7% classified themselves to be 46 to 55 years old. Fewer respondents were younger than 35 years (17.8%) or over 55 years (8.4%).

More than half of respondents in each country group (American, 86.0%; Malaysian, 52.4%; Thai, 61.5%; and Turkish, 59.5%, respectively) reported that they have more than 15 years of experience in the hotel industry, for a total of 65.3% of the total sample. The majority indicated that they have been working with their current hotel company for less than 5 years, although 31.3% of the American managers reported having more than 15 years of work for their current hotel company. Additionally, a significant majority of these managers (86.4%) indicated that they have 5 years or less of these years of experience spent in other countries around the world (American, 86.0%; Malaysian, 79.1%; Thai, 90.0%; and Turkish, 88.4%, respectively). Noteworthy here is the finding that 84% of the American, 53% of the Malaysian, 80% of the Thai, and 84%

of the Turkish executives indicated that they do not have any international hotel experience at all. These are interesting percentages to be found among managers functioning in an industry that is considered to be one of the most international business sectors.

A total of 68 respondents (34.3%) claimed to have more than one functional background. However, a noticeable diversity did exist among the four country groups in this regard. While the majority of American respondents (63.3%) indicated to have hotel operations (i.e., housekeeping, food and beverage) as a functional background, a majority of Thai (44.8%) and Turkish (50.0%) respondents indicated that they have worked in more than one functional background. Most of the Malaysian respondents indicated they have hotel operations background (35.7%), and more than one function (26.2%). Significantly fewer number of respondents in all four country groups indicated that they have mere functional background in marketing and sales, human resources, engineering, or finance and accounting.

More respondents in each group work in hotels with either less than 151, or 151 to 300 full-time employees. These two categories respectively represented 40.0% and 32.0% of the American group; 44.7% and 34.2% of the Malaysian group; 45.7% and 32.9% of the Thai group; and, 77.5% and 15.0% of the Turkish group. Fewer respondents across all groups worked in hotels with more 450 full-time employees. A similar pattern was found in the number of part-time employees in hotels where the respondents in this study work. The majority of their hotels employ 50 or less employees on a part-time

basis. The percentages in the American, Malaysian, Thai and Turkish groups were as follows: 82%, 94.8%, 90%, and 90%, respectively. Significantly fewer hotels in all four groups employed more than 51 part-timers. Similarly, the equivalency of the size of hotels in the four groups was further supported by the finding that hotels surveyed in these countries tended to have 300 or less rooms, with 38.0% for the American group, 73.7% for the Malaysian group, 80% for the Thai group, and 79.1% for the Turkish group.

Overall, no significant variations existed regarding respondents' demographic and professional characteristics. Given the proposition that sample homogeneity in cross-cultural research results in a more conservative statistical test of cultural effects (Albers-Miller, 1996), sample similarities found in the current study strengthened its cultural findings. The concerns of cross-national comparative research literature as to the importance of having comparable country groups were thus incorporated in the current study.

Table 7 Respondents' Demographic and Professional Characteristics

	American Group (n= 48)	Malaysian Group (n= 42)	Thai Group (n= 66)	Turkish Group (n= 43)	Overall Sample (n= 199)
GENDER					
Male	41 (85.4%)	33 (78.6%)	44 (66.7%)	37 (86.0%)	155 (77.9%)
Female	7 (14.6%)	9 (21.4%)	22 (33.3%)	6 (14.0%)	44 (22.1%)
AGE	(n= 49)	(n= 40)	(n= 69)	(n= 44)	(n= 202)
35 or younger	1 (2.0%)	10 (25.0%)	10 (14.5%)	15 (34.1%)	36 (17.8%)
36-45	19 (38.8%)	18 (45.0%)	31 (44.9%)	17 (38.7%)	85 (42.1%)
46-55	22 (44.9%)	10 (25.0%)	22 (31.9%)	10 (22.7%)	64 (31.7%)
56 or over	7 (14.3%)	2 (5.0%)	6 (8.7%)	2 (4.5%)	17 (8.4%)
EDUCATION	(n= 45)	(n= 33)	(n= 68)	(n= 43)	(n= 152)
High school or less	2 (4.4%)	3 (9.1%)	3 (4.4%)	3 (7.0%)	11 (5.8%)
Associate degree	8 (17.8%)	13 (39.4%)	8 (11.8%)	7 (16.3%)	36 (19.1%)
Bachelor (4 years)	29 (64.4%)	7 (21.2%)	36 (52.9%)	25 (58.1%)	97 (51.3%)
Graduate degree	6 (13.3%)	6 (18.2%)	18 (26.5%)	7 (16.3%)	37 (19.6%)
Other	0 (0.0%)	4 (12.1%)	3 (4.4%)	1 (2.3%)	8 (4.2%)

YEARS WITH CURRENT HOTEL COMPANY					
Less than 5 years	(n= 48) 23 (47.9%)	(n= 42) 30 (71.4%)	(n= 65) 40 (61.5%)	(n= 43) 23 (53.5%)	(n= 198) 116 (58.6%)
6 to 10 years	6 (12.5%)	7 (16.7%)	9 (13.8%)	12 (27.9%)	34 (17.2%)
11 to 15 years	4 (8.3%)	5 (11.9%)	9 (13.8%)	5 (11.6%)	23 (11.6%)
More than 15 years	15 (31.3%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (10.8%)	3 (7.0%)	25 (12.6%)
YEARS IN HOTEL INDUSTRY					
Less than 5 years	(n= 50) 2 (4.0%)	(n= 42) 5 (11.9%)	(n= 65) 16 (24.7%)	(n= 42) 6 (14.4%)	(n= 172) 29 (14.6%)
6 to 10 years	1 (2.0%)	6 (14.3%)	3 (4.6%)	3 (7.1%)	13 (6.5%)
11 to 15 years	4 (8.0%)	9 (21.4%)	6 (9.2%)	8 (19.0%)	27 (13.6%)
More than 15 years	43 (86.0%)	22 (52.4%)	40 (61.5%)	25 (59.5%)	130 (65.3%)
MANAGERIAL LEVEL					
General Manager	(n= 50) 43 (86.0%)	(n= 41) 24 (58.5%)	(n= 69) 37 (53.6%)	(n= 42) 28 (66.6%)	(n= 202) 132 (65.3%)
Vice President	2 (4.0%)	1 (2.4%)	2 (2.9%)	7 (16.7%)	12 (6.0%)
Other	5 (10.0%)	16 (39.0%)	30 (43.5%)	7 (16.7%)	58 (28.7%)
FUNCTIONAL BACKGROUND					
Marketing and Sales	(n= 49) 7 (14.3%)	(n= 42) 5 (11.9%)	(n= 67) 13 (19.4%)	(n= 40) 16 (40.0%)	(n= 198) 41 (20.7%)
Human Resources	0 (0.0%)	6 (14.3%)	7 (10.4%)	1 (2.5%)	14 (7.1%)
Hotel Operations	31 (63.3%)	15 (35.7%)	6 (9.0%)	1 (2.5%)	53 (26.8%)
Engineering	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.4%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (2.5%)	4 (2.0%)
Finance and Accounting	4 (8.2%)	4 (9.5%)	9 (13.4%)	1 (2.5%)	18 (9.1%)
More than one function	7 (14.3%)	11 (26.2%)	30 (44.8%)	20 (50.0%)	68 (34.3%)
FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES					
0 to 150	(n= 50) 20 (40.0%)	(n= 38) 17 (44.7%)	(n= 70) 32 (45.7%)	(n= 40) 31 (77.5%)	(n= 198) 100 (50.5%)
151 to 300	16 (32.0%)	13 (34.2%)	23 (32.9%)	6 (15.0%)	58 (29.3%)
301 to 450	4 (8.0%)	5 (13.2%)	10 (14.3%)	3 (7.5%)	22 (11.1%)
451 to 600	6 (12.0%)	1 (2.6%)	3 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (5.1%)
More than 600	4 (8.0%)	2 (5.3%)	2 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.0%)
PART-TIME EMPLOYEES					
0 to 25	(n= 50) 21 (42.0%)	(n= 38) 28 (73.7%)	(n= 70) 54 (77.1%)	(n= 40) 35 (87.5%)	(n= 198) 138 (69.7%)
26 to 50	20 (40.0%)	8 (21.1%)	9 (12.9%)	1 (2.5%)	38 (19.2%)
51 to 75	1 (2.0%)	2 (5.3%)	5 (7.1%)	1 (2.5%)	9 (4.6%)
76 to 100	5 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.5%)	6 (3.0%)
101 and more	3 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.9%)	2 (5.0%)	7 (3.5%)
ROOMS IN HOTEL					
0 to 150	(n= 50) 4 (8.0%)	(n= 38) 15 (39.5%)	(n= 70) 22 (31.4%)	(n= 43) 27 (62.8%)	(n= 201) 68 (33.8%)
151 to 300	15 (30.0%)	13 (34.2%)	34 (48.6%)	7 (16.3%)	69 (34.3%)
301 to 450	14 (28.0%)	7 (18.4%)	8 (11.4%)	6 (14.0%)	35 (17.4%)
451 to 600	6 (12.0%)	1 (2.6%)	3 (4.3%)	2 (4.7%)	12 (6.0%)
More than 600	11 (22.0%)	2 (5.3%)	3 (4.3%)	1 (2.3%)	17 (8.5%)
INTERNATIONAL HOTEL EXPERIENCE					
0 to 5	(n= 50) 43 (86.0%)	(n= 43) 34 (79.1%)	(n= 70) 63 (90.0%)	(n= 43) 38 (88.4%)	(n= 206) 178 (86.4%)
6 to 10	1 (2.0%)	9 (20.9%)	3 (4.3%)	3 (7.0%)	16 (7.8%)
11 to 15	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.9%)
16 to 20	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (2.3%)	3 (1.5%)
21 and more	4 (8.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	5 (2.4%)

Statistical Testing of the Research Hypotheses

This exploratory research aimed at investigating the potential influences of national culture on the approach to business strategy development expressed by hotel executives in different countries. National culture was operationalized in terms of five cultural dimensions: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism/Collectivism, Masculinity/Femininity, and Time Orientation. Each of these dimensions was linked to several aspects of managers' approach to business strategy development through several hypotheses. A five-point scale assessing the extent of each of these aspects was used. A series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test these hypotheses.

Prior to conducting the ANOVA tests, the assumptions of the test were checked. The independent variable (national culture) was categorical, and the dependent variables were all measured on a Likert-type scale. The assumption that all observations be independent of each other was met by the research design, as the four country groups were made up of separate individuals. The adjustment in how the analysis of variance is computed for the unequal group sizes is done automatically in ANOVA in SPSS.

The number of observations in each of the country groups made the data more inclined to be normally distributed. Nevertheless, normality of distributions in each of the

four country groups was assessed qualitatively by means of frequency histograms. Data were checked to determine if they are normally distributed, with many scores near the mean and relatively fewer observations far above or below the mean. Except for the variable of Commitment to Strategic Decisions, all distributions fairly met the normality assumption. The variable Commitment to Strategic Decision was positively skewed. To make the data better fit the assumptions, the variable was square-root transformed. The square-root of each observation was used in the analysis of variance for this particular dependent variable.

The assumption that the dependent variables should have equal variance in each category of the independent variable was tested using Levene's test of homogeneity of variances. The null hypothesis that the groups have equal variances was rejected when the Levene statistic was significant at the .05 level. In the present study, this test examined whether the four country groups of U.S.A., Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey have the same variance.

A post hoc comparison was conducted on each of the scales using Tukey HSD test to identify what countries differed significantly. In cases where the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated, square-root transformation was carried out and the Games-Howell test was used as a post hoc criterion as it does not rely on the assumption of equal variances. A confidence level of .05 was used in all of the analyses for the current study. Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics for each of the four countries surveyed along each of the dependent variables used in these analyses. The results of

these hypotheses testing were organized and presented by cultural dimensions. Where the analysis is based on the same dependent variables, the same results were displayed in more than one table.

As was presented in Chapter 3 of the study, several contextual variables (i.e., managers' functional background and their individual demographic and professional differences) were shown in literature to have a potential effect on the strategic philosophy of managers around the world. To control for these contextual variables, a hierarchical multiple regression was used. This technique tested the significance of contributions of the contextual variables on each of the dependent variables. The analysis was done in two stages. In the first stage, National Culture was entered into the model in block one. In block two, the following variables regarding the respondents were added to the regression model: gender, education, age, functional background, years of experience in the hotel industry, as well as the number of rooms in their hotels. The first output showed the first regression equation with only respondents' National Culture as a predictor. Another output was then produced with the contextual predictors, together with the National Culture. This allowed for calculating the increase in the variance in each dependent variable accounted for when the second block of predictors was added. Table 8 shows the results of the hierarchical multiple regression.

Table 8 Descriptive Statistics of the Dependent Variables

	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Commitment to strategic decisions						
U.S.A	50	4.5333	.58709	.08303	4.3665	4.7002
Malaysia	42	4.3254	.49105	.07577	4.1724	4.4784
Thailand	70	4.4571	.52066	.06223	4.3330	4.5813
Turkey	44	4.5303	.40231	.06065	4.4080	4.65226
Total	206	4.4644	.51173	.03565	4.3941	4.5347
Openness to strategic change						
U.S.A	50	3.9200	.68965	.09753	3.7240	4.1160
Malaysia	42	3.5119	.61721	.09524	3.3196	3.7042
Thailand	70	4.1127	.55547	.06592	3.9812	4.2442
Turkey	44	3.7386	.71111	.10720	3.5224	3.9548
Total	206	3.8647	.67087	.04663	3.7728	3.9567
Content of strategic objectives						
U.S.A	50	3.1634	.46844	.06559	3.0316	3.2951
Malaysia	43	3.6008	.55770	.08505	3.4291	3.7724
Thailand	70	3.6009	.37212	.04416	3.5129	3.6890
Turkey	44	3.3636	.39908	.06016	3.2423	3.4850
Total	207	3.4442	.47879	.03312	3.3789	3.5095
Focus of strategic objectives						
U.S.A	50	3.16	.925	.129	2.90	3.42
Malaysia	42	3.24	1.078	.166	2.90	3.57
Thailand	69	2.28	.938	.113	2.05	2.50
Turkey	44	3.48	.876	.132	3.21	3.74
Total	205	2.95	1.065	.074	2.80	3.09
Formality of strategic control						
U.S.A	50	3.8775	.37872	.05303	3.7709	3.9840
Malaysia	43	3.8605	.55982	.08537	3.6882	4.0328
Thailand	70	4.2465	.45413	.05390	4.1390	4.3540
Turkey	44	4.0227	.55200	.08322	3.8549	4.1906
Total	207	4.0299	.50776	.03512	3.9607	4.0991
Type of data used in strategic analysis						
U.S.A	50	3.6961	.58377	.08174	3.5319	3.8603
Malaysia	42	3.4286	.50087	.07729	3.2725	3.5847
Thailand	70	3.5775	.56472	.06702	3.4438	3.7111
Turkey	44	3.4773	.67302	.10146	3.2727	3.6819
Total	206	3.5553	.58613	.04064	3.4752	3.6354
Strategic planning time horizons						
U.S.A	50	2.8500	.54102	.07576	2.6978	3.0022
Malaysia	41	3.4293	.74507	.11636	3.1941	3.6644
Thailand	68	3.6824	.81953	.09938	3.4840	3.8807
Turkey	43	3.2547	1.01482	.15476	2.9423	3.5670
Total	202	3.3315	.84997	.05966	3.2139	3.4492
Criteria for strategic evaluation						
U.S.A	50	3.00	1.114	.156	2.69	3.31
Malaysia	43	2.12	.931	.142	1.83	2.40
Thailand	70	2.33	.974	.116	2.10	2.56
Turkey	43	2.51	.910	.139	2.23	2.79
Total	206	2.49	1.033	.072	2.35	2.63
Strategy evaluation time horizons						
U.S.A	50	2.59	.898	.126	2.34	2.84
Malaysia	42	3.48	1.018	.157	3.16	3.79
Thailand	70	3.30	1.074	.127	3.04	3.55
Turkey	44	3.73	.997	.150	3.42	4.03
Total	206	3.25	1.079	.075	3.10	3.40
Degree of analysis and rationality						
U.S.A	50	3.2696	.50952	.07135	3.1263	3.4129
Malaysia	43	3.7267	.38116	.05813	3.6094	3.8440
Thailand	70	3.7535	.49730	.05902	3.6358	3.8712
Turkey	44	3.8371	.60653	.09144	3.6527	4.0215
Total	207	3.6475	.54661	.03781	3.5730	3.7221
Involvement in strategy development						
U.S.A	50	2.46	.771	.100	2.26	2.66
Malaysia	43	3.24	.610	.093	3.05	3.43
Thailand	70	3.55	.574	.068	3.42	3.69
Turkey	44	3.48	.759	.114	3.25	3.72
Total	207	3.21	.788	.055	3.10	3.32

* On a five-point Likert scale anchored on 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

As can be seen in Table 9, across the dependent variables, the addition of the contextual variables (national culture, gender, education, age, functional background, industry experience, hotel size) did not significantly increase the prediction power of the model. The exception was for the Focus of strategic objectives and Content of strategic objectives. For these two particular dependent variables, the analysis indicated that the addition of the contextual variables significantly improved the explanatory power of the model, as indicated by the p -values of the change in F (.036 and .003, respectively). A more detailed analysis indicated that the hotel size, as a proxy for the organizational internal resources, significantly (beta = -.253, p =.002) contributed to the model regarding the variable of Content of strategic objectives. With regard to the variable of Focus of strategic objectives, the analysis indicated that the age (beta= -.211, p = .014) and gender (beta= -.281, p >.001) significantly contributed to the increase in the prediction power of the regression model.

Table 9 Results for the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses of Factors Predicating the Dependent Variables

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	R ² Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
Commitment to strategic decisions	Block 1 National culture	.000	.047	.828
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.025	.747	.613
Openness to strategic change	Block 1 National culture	.001	.112	.738
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.055	1.671	.131
Content of strategic objectives	Block 1 National culture	.029	5.353	.022
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.072	2.306	.036*
Focus of strategic objectives	Block 1 National culture	.002	.340	.561
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.106	3.422	.003*
Formality of strategic control	Block 1 National culture	.039	7.233	.008
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.019	.585	.742
Type of data used in strategic analysis	Block 1 National culture	.009	1.624	.204
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.050	1.516	.175
Strategic planning time horizons	Block 1 National culture	.050	9.399	.003
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.035	1.098	.366
Criteria for strategic evaluation	Block 1 National culture	.024	4.296	.040
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.014	.415	.868
Evaluation time horizons	Block 1 National culture	.107	21.338	.000
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.049	1.676	.129
Degree of rigorous analysis and rationality	Block 1 National culture	.126	25.574	.000
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.010	.326	.923
Involvement in strategy development	Block 1 National culture	.242	56.834	.000
	Block 2 (National culture, Gender, Education, Age, Functional background, Industry experience, Hotel rooms)	.044	1.769	.108

*The change in F-value is significant at $p < .05$

Power Distance and Business Strategy Development

The cultural dimension of Power Distance was linked to the approach to business strategy development through four hypotheses. According to Hofstede (1980), the U.S.A. is ranked low on this dimension, whereas Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey are ranked high.

The first hypothesis related to Power Distance stated that:

H1_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have low power distance cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than their counterparts associated with countries that have high power distance cultures.*

Analysis of variance was conducted to test the differences with regard to the respondents' degree of involvement of others in the strategy development efforts. As shown in Table 10, ANOVA results revealed that the difference among the four country groups was significant, $F(3, 205) = 31.080, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for this scale was significantly lower in the American group than in the other three country groups of Malaysia ($MD = -.780, p < .001$), Thailand ($MD = -1.093, p < .001$), and Turkey ($MD = -1.024, p < .001$). These results support the hypothesis **H1_a**.

Table 10 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale – Power Distance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	40.392	3	13.464	31.080	.000
Within Groups	88.805	205	.433		
Total	129.196	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.075		3	205	.361	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		-.780	.136	.000
	Thai		-1.093	.121	.000
	Turkish		-1.024	.135	.000
Malaysian	American		.780	.136	.000
	Thai		-.314	.127	.068
	Turkish		-.245	.141	.309
Thai	American		1.093	.121	.000
	Malaysian		.314	.127	.068
	Turkish		.069	.126	.947
Turkish	American		1.024	.135	.000
	Malaysian		.245	.141	.309
	Thai		-.069	.126	.947

The second hypothesis related to Power Distance stated that:

H1_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have high power distance cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low power distance cultures.*

As seen in Table 11, the *F*-value of 8.592 produced by ANOVA was significant at the $p < .001$ level, indicating that not all the means for openness to strategic change across the four country groups were the same. **H1_b** would be supported if the differences occurred between the U.S.A. group on one hand and the Malaysian, Thai, and Turkish groups on the other. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that significant differences existed between the American and the Malaysian

groups ($MD = .40810, p = .013$), but not between the American and the Thai groups ($MD = -.19268, p = .359$), or between the American and the Turkish groups ($MD = .18136, p = .514$). Furthermore, significant differences were found between the Malaysian and the Thai groups ($MD = -.60077, p < .001$), and between the Thai and the Turkish groups ($MD = .37404, p = .013$). More significant differences among the countries high on Power Distance than between these countries and the U.S.A. were evident. Consequently, hypothesis **H1_b** is not substantiated.

Table 11 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale – Power Distance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.446	3	3.482	8.592	.000
Within Groups	82.267	203	.405		
Total	92.713	206			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.689		3	203	.170	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	.40810	.13324	.013	
	Thai	-.19268	.11753	.359	
	Turkish	.18136	.13159	.514	
Malaysian	American	-.40810	.13324	.013	
	Thai	-.60077	.12392	.000	
	Turkish	-.22673	.13733	.353	
Thai	American	.19268	.11753	.359	
	Malaysian	-.60077	.12392	.000	
	Turkish	.37404	.12214	.013	
Turkish	American	-.18136	.13159	.514	
	Malaysian	.22673	.13733	.353	
	Thai	-.37404	.12214	.013	

The third hypothesis related to Power Distance stated that:

H1_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have low power distance cultures will emphasize people and societal concerns more than do their counterparts associated with countries that have high power distance cultures.*

The analysis of variance using the transformed data, Table 12, revealed that the difference among the four country groups with regard to the emphasis on people and social concerns when developing strategic objectives was significant, $F(3, 205) = 12.186, p < .001$. Because of the significant result of Levene's test of homogeneity of variances ($p = .003$), Games-Howell criterion was employed as a post hoc test. This criterion indicated that the differences were significant between the American and the Malaysian groups ($MD = -.11826, p = .001$), and between the American and the Thai groups ($MD = -.12139, p < .001$). The mean difference between the American and the Turkish groups was not significant ($MD = -.05685, p = .115$). **H1_c** would be supported if the American group, representing a low power distance culture, has a mean which is significantly larger than the means for the countries representing high power distance cultures. While significant differences were found between these two types of cultures, the direction of these differences contradicted the hypothesized relationship. Hypothesis **H1_c**, therefore, is not substantiated.

Table 12 ANOVA, Levene's, and Games-Howell Tests for the Content of Strategic Objectives Scale – Power Distance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.533	3	.178	12.186	.000
Within Groups	2.990	205	.015		
Total	3.524	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
4.851		3	205	.003	
Games-Howell Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	-.11826	.02905	.001	
	Thai	-.12139	.02183	.000	
	Turkish	-.05685	.02517	.115	
Malaysian	American	.11826	.02905	.001	
	Thai	-.00314	.02518	.999	
	Turkish	.06140	.02812	.137	
Thai	American	.12139	.02183	.000	
	Malaysian	.00314	.02518	.999	
	Turkish	.06454	.02058	.012	
Turkish	American	.05685	.02517	.115	
	Malaysian	-.06140	.02812	.137	
	Thai	-.06454	.02058	.012	

The fourth hypothesis related to Power Distance stated that:

H1_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high power distance cultures are more likely to exert formal strategic control than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low power distance cultures.*

Significant differences across the four country groups were found to exist on mean scores for strategic control formality, Table 13, as indicated by the F -value of 8.211, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group was only significantly different than the Thai group ($MD = -.36903$, $p < .001$) but not than the Malaysian ($MD = .01699$, $p = .998$) or the Turkish groups ($MD = -.14528$, $p = .463$). A mean difference was also found between

two high Power Distance cultures, Malaysia and Thailand ($MD = -.38601, p < .001$).

Based on these results, hypothesis **H1_d** is not substantiated.

Table 13 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Formality of Strategic Control Scale – Power Distance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.752	3	1.917	8.211	.000
Within Groups	47.873	205	.234		
Total	53.626	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.005		3	205	.392	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	.01699	.10005	.998	
	Thai	-.36903	.08870	.000	
	Turkish	-.14528	.09943	.463	
Malaysian	American	-.01699	.10005	.998	
	Thai	-.38601	.09338	.000	
	Turkish	-.16226	.10363	.400	
Thai	American	.36903	.08870	.000	
	Malaysian	.38601	.09338	.000	
	Turkish	.22375	.09272	.078	
Turkish	American	.14528	.09943	.463	
	Malaysian	.16226	.10363	.400	
	Thai	-.22375	.09272	.078	

Uncertainty Avoidance and Business Strategy Development

The cultural dimension of Uncertainty Avoidance was linked to the approach to strategy development through five hypotheses. According to Hofstede (1980), Thailand and Turkey are ranked high on Uncertainty Avoidance, whereas U.S.A. and Malaysia are ranked low on this dimension.

The first hypothesis related to Uncertainty Avoidance stated that:

H2_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

Table 14 reports the results of the analysis of variance for this scale. The omnibus *F* test indicated that significant differences existed among the country groups with regard to the degree of openness to strategic change ($F = 8.592, p < .001$). However, when both the Thai and the Turkish groups (high Uncertainty Avoidance cultures) are compared to the American and the Malaysian groups (low Uncertainty Avoidance cultures), only one difference is found to be statistically significant, the mean difference between the Thai and the Malaysian groups ($MD = .60077, p < .001$). More of the significant differences were found within country groups with high Uncertainty Avoidance (Thailand and Turkey, $MD = .37404, p < .001$) or low on Uncertainty Avoidance (U.S.A. and Malaysia, $MD = .40810, p = .013$) than between country groups with low and high ranking on this dimension. Therefore, hypothesis **H2_a** is not substantiated.

Table 14 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale - Uncertainty Avoidance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.446	3	3.482	8.592	.000
Within Groups	82.267	203	.405		
Total	92.713	206			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.689		3	203	.170	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		.40810	.13324	.013
	Thai		-.19268	.11753	.359
	Turkish		.18136	.13159	.514
Malaysian	American		-.40810	.13324	.013
	Thai		-.60077	.12392	.000
	Turkish		-.22673	.13733	.353
Thai	American		.19268	.11753	.359
	Malaysian		.60077	.12392	.000
	Turkish		.37404	.12214	.013
Turkish	American		-.18136	.13159	.514
	Malaysian		.22673	.13733	.353
	Thai		-.37404	.12214	.013

The second hypothesis related to Uncertainty Avoidance stated that:

H_{2b}: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

As seen in Table 15, the analysis of variance test of significance of differences indicated an overall significant difference among the four country groups, $F(3, 205) = 31.080, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the American group is significantly different from that of the Thai ($MD = -1.093, p < .001$) and the Turkish ($MD = -1.024, p < .001$) groups. However, the mean of the other country that is ranked low on this dimension, Malaysia, is not significantly

different from that of the Thai ($MD = -.314, p = .068$) and the Turkish ($MD = -.245, p = .309$) groups. Therefore, hypothesis **H2_b** is not substantiated, a result supported by the finding that the U.S. group was significantly different from the Malaysian group.

Table 15 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	40.392	3	13.464	31.080	.000
Within Groups	88.805	205	.433		
Total	129.196	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.075		3	205	.361	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		-.780	.136	.000
	Thai		-1.093	.121	.000
	Turkish		-1.024	.135	.000
Malaysian	American		.780	.136	.000
	Thai		-.314	.127	.068
	Turkish		-.245	.141	.309
Thai	American		1.093	.121	.000
	Malaysian		.314	.127	.068
	Turkish		.069	.126	.947
Turkish	American		1.024	.135	.000
	Malaysian		.245	.141	.309
	Thai		-.069	.126	.947

The third hypothesis related to Uncertainty Avoidance stated that:

H2_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to utilize more quantitative sources of information than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

The results of the analysis of variance of the differences among the four country groups with regard to the type of data used in strategic analysis are shown in Table 16

below. F value (3, 204) = 1.956 was not significant ($p = .122$), indicating that no significant differences are found among the four country groups. Therefore, hypothesis **H2_c** is not substantiated.

Table 16 ANOVA and Levene's Tests for the Type of Data Used in Strategic Analysis Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.988	3	.663	1.956	.122
Within Groups	69.126	204	.339		
Total	71.114	207			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
.899		3	204	.443	

The fourth hypothesis related to Uncertainty Avoidance stated that:

H2_d: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more likely to exert formal strategic control than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

The four country groups differed significantly on formality of strategic control at $p < .05$, based on analysis of variances test of significance Table 17, $F(3, 205) = .8.211$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean difference is significant between the American and the Thai groups ($MD = -.36903$, $p < .001$), but not between the American and the Turkish groups ($MD = -.14528$, $p = .463$). Similarly, the mean difference between the other country (Malaysia) that is low on Uncertainty Avoidance is significant than the Thai group ($MD = -.38601$, p

< .001), but is not significant than the Turkish group ($MD = -.16226, p = .400$).

Hypothesis **H2_a** is only partially substantiated.

Table 17 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Formality of Strategic Control Scale – Uncertainty Avoidance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.752	3	1.917	8.211	.000
Within Groups	47.873	205	.234		
Total	53.626	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.005		3	205	.392	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	.01699	.10005	.998	
	Thai	-.36903	.08870	.000	
	Turkish	-.14528	.09943	.463	
Malaysian	American	-.01699	.10005	.998	
	Thai	-.38601	.09338	.000	
	Turkish	-.16226	.10363	.400	
Thai	American	.36903	.08870	.000	
	Malaysian	.38601	.09338	.000	
	Turkish	.22375	.09272	.078	
Turkish	American	.14528	.09943	.463	
	Malaysian	.16226	.10363	.400	
	Thai	-.22375	.09272	.078	

The fifth hypothesis related to Uncertainty Avoidance stated that:

H2_e: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more likely to have longer strategic planning horizons than do their counterparts associated with countries that have low uncertainty avoidance cultures.*

Table 18 gives the results of the analysis of variance with transformed data for the four groups with regard to strategic planning time horizons. The results revealed that the

difference among the four groups along each of the six types of plans was significant. Post hoc analyses (using the Games-Howell post hoc criterion for significance for the “Less than 1 year plan”, “1 year plan”, “2 to 4 year plan”, and “over 10 year plan”; and Tukey post hoc criterion of significance for “5 year plan”, and “6 to 10 year plan”) indicated that the U.S. group emphasized the short-term plans more than the Thai and the Turkish groups. This is evident in the mean differences on the “Less than 1 year plan” and “1 year plan” between the U.S. executives (2.08 and 2.15, respectively) compared to their Thai (1.92 and 1.95, respectively) and Turkish (1.92 and 1.91, respectively) counterparts. Interestingly, the Malaysian group, although was classified as a low uncertainty avoidance society, did not significantly differ from the Thai and the Turkish groups along these two types of plans. The analysis also indicated that the four groups did not differ along the middle-range plan of “2 to 4 year plan.” The Thai and the Turkish groups were found to place stronger emphasis on the long range plans than did their U.S. counterparts. This is evident in the mean differences along the “6 to 10 year plan” and “Over 10 year plan”, as the U.S group placed significantly less emphasis on these types of plans (1.29 and 1.16, respectively) than both the Thai (1.79 and 1.74, respectively) and the Turkish (1.65 and 1.57, respectively) groups. Again, the Malaysian group was not found to differ from the Thai and the Turkish groups along these two long-range plans. As a result, hypothesis **H2_e** is only partially substantiated.

Table 18 ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests for the Strategic Planning Time Horizon Scale –
Uncertainty Avoidance

	Mean				Overall ANOVA		Post Hoc Tests	
	U.S.A.	Malaysia	Thailand	Turkey	F	Sig.	Country Comparison	Sig.
Less than 1 year plan	2.08	1.87	1.92	1.92	4.374	.005	U.S.A vs. Thailand U.S.A vs. Turkey Malaysia vs. Thailand Malaysia vs. Turkey	.020 .023 .884 .919
1 year plan	2.15	1.99	1.95	1.91	9.555	.000	U.S.A vs. Thailand U.S.A vs. Turkey Malaysia vs. Thailand Malaysia vs. Turkey	.000 .000 .905 .551
2 to 4 year plan	1.85	1.91	1.93	1.78	3.728	.012	U.S.A vs. Thailand U.S.A vs. Turkey Malaysia vs. Thailand Malaysia vs. Turkey	.208 .604 .979 .140
5 year plan	1.64	1.84	1.90	1.77	6.536	.000	U.S.A vs. Thailand U.S.A vs. Turkey Malaysia vs. Thailand Malaysia vs. Turkey	.000 .186 .842 .757
6 to 10 year plan	1.29	1.66	1.79	1.65	16.397	.000	U.S.A vs. Thailand U.S.A vs. Turkey Malaysia vs. Thailand Malaysia vs. Turkey	.000 .000 .353 1.00
Over 10 year plan	1.16	1.58	1.74	1.57	18.116	.000	U.S.A vs. Thailand U.S.A vs. Turkey Malaysia vs. Thailand Malaysia vs. Turkey	.000 .000 .394 1.00

Individualism/Collectivism and Business Strategy Development

The cultural dimension of Individualism was linked to the approach to strategy development through six hypotheses. According to Hofstede (1980), the U.S.A. is ranked high on Individualism, whereas Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey are ranked low on this dimension.

The first hypothesis related to Individualism/Collectivism stated that:

H3_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are more likely to emphasize group goals than do their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures.*

The analysis of variance, Table 19, revealed that the difference among the four country groups was significant, $F(3, 202) = 18.130, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean difference for the American group was only significantly different from the Thai group ($MD = .882, p < .001$), but not from the Malaysian ($MD = -.081, p = .977$) and the Turkish ($MD = -.320, p = .361$) groups. Hypothesis **H3_a** is not substantiated, a conclusion also supported by the result that the differences in means between the Thai group, a collectivist culture, and the other collectivist cultures of Malaysia and Turkey were also significant

Table 19 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Focus of Strategic Objectives – Individualism/Collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	49.303	3	16.434	18.130	.000
Within Groups	183.110	202	.906		
Total	232.413	205			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.138		3	202	.335	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		-.081	.198	.977
	Thai		.882	.176	.000
	Turkish		-.320	.196	.361
Malaysian	American		.081	.198	.977
	Thai		.963	.186	.000
	Turkish		-.239	.205	.650
Thai	American		-.882	.176	.000
	Malaysian		-.963	.186	.000
	Turkish		-1.202	.184	.000
Turkish	American		.320	.196	.361
	Malaysian		.239	.205	.650
	Thai		1.202	.184	.000

The second hypothesis related to Individualism/Collectivism stated that:

H_{3b}: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have individualist cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have collectivist cultures.*

The analysis of variance, Table 20, revealed that there was a significant difference among the four country groups with regard to the openness to strategic change, $F(3, 203) = 8.592, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the American group differed significantly from only the Malaysian group ($MD = .40810, p = .013$) but not from the other two collectivist country

groups, Thailand ($MD = -.19268, p = .359$) and Turkey ($MD = .18136, p = .514$). These results did not show support for hypothesis **H3_b**.

Table 20 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale - Individualism/Collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.446	3	3.482	8.592	.000
Within Groups	82.267	203	.405		
Total	92.713	206			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.689		3	203	.170	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	.40810	.13324	.013	
	Thai	-.19268	.11753	.359	
	Turkish	.18136	.13159	.514	
Malaysian	American	-.40810	.13324	.013	
	Thai	-.60077	.12392	.000	
	Turkish	-.22673	.13733	.353	
Thai	American	.19268	.11753	.359	
	Malaysian	..60077	.12392	.000	
	Turkish	.37404	.12214	.013	
Turkish	American	-.18136	.13159	.514	
	Malaysian	.22673	.13733	.353	
	Thai	-.37404	.12214	.013	

The third hypothesis related to Individualism/Collectivism stated that:

H3_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have individualist cultures are more likely to exert formal strategic control than do their counterparts associated with countries that have collectivist cultures.*

Table 21 provides the results of the analysis of variance of the four country groups with regard to the formality of strategic control. The results revealed that the

difference among countries was significant, $F(3, 205) = 8.211, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group is only significantly different from the mean of the Thai group ($MD = -.36903, p < .001$), but not significantly different from the other two collectivist countries, Malaysia ($MD = .01699, p = .998$) and Turkey ($MD = -.14528, p = .463$). Hypothesis **H3_c** is not substantiated.

Table 21 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Formality of Strategic Control Scale - Individualism/Collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.752	3	1.917	8.211	.000
Within Groups	47.873	205	.234		
Total	53.626	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.005		3	205	.392	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		.01699	.10005	.998
	Thai		-.36903	.08870	.000
	Turkish		-.14528	.09943	.463
Malaysian	American		-.01699	.10005	.998
	Thai		-.38601	.09338	.000
	Turkish		-.16226	.10363	.400
Thai	American		.36903	.08870	.000
	Malaysian		.38601	.09338	.000
	Turkish		.22375	.09272	.078
Turkish	American		.14528	.09943	.463
	Malaysian		.16226	.10363	.400
	Thai		-.22375	.09272	.078

The fourth hypothesis related to Individualism/Collectivism stated that:

H3_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are more likely to evaluate performance based on group achievements than do their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures.*

The results of the analysis of variance of the four country groups with regard to the strategic evaluation criteria are presented in Table 22 below. The table shows that the difference between the countries was significant, $F(3,203) = 7.194, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the American group is significantly different from both the Malaysian ($MD = .884, p < .001$) and the Thai ($MD = .671, p = .002$) groups. However, contrary to the proposed relationship, the Malaysian and the Thai groups put less emphasis on this aspect than did the American group. Furthermore, the mean difference between the American and the Turkish groups was not significant at .05 level of significance ($MD = .488, p = .083$). Hypothesis **H3_a** is, therefore, not substantiated.

Table 22 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Strategy Evaluation Criteria Scale
- Individualism/Collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	21.114	3	7.038	7.194	.000
Within Groups	198.606	203	.978		
Total	219.720	206			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
2.590		3	203	.054	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		.884	.205	.000
	Thai		.671	.182	.002
	Turkish		.488	.205	.083
Malaysian	American		-.884	.205	.000
	Thai		-.212	.192	.685
	Turkish		-.395	.213	.252
Thai	American		-.671	.182	.002
	Malaysian		.212	.192	.685
	Turkish		-.183	.192	.775
Turkish	American		-.488	.205	.083
	Malaysian		.395	.213	.252
	Thai		.183	.192	.775

The fifth hypothesis related to Individualism/Collectivism stated that:

H3_e: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have collectivist cultures are more likely to utilize long-term performance evaluation than do their counterparts associated with countries that have individualist cultures.*

As shown in Table 23, the *F*-value of 11.420 produced by the analysis of variance was significant at $p < .001$ level, indicating that not all the means for strategy evaluation time horizon across the four country groups were the same. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group was significantly lower than in the other three country groups, Malaysia ($MD = -.888, p < .001$), Thailand ($MD = -.708, p = .001$), and Turkey ($MD = -.1.139, p < .001$). Therefore,

hypothesis **H3_e** is substantiated. This outcome is also supported by the result that no significant differences were found among the collectivist cultures.

Table 23 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Strategy Evaluation Time Horizon Scale - Individualism/Collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	34.655	3	11.552	11.420	.000
Within Groups	206.345	204	1.011		
Total	241.000	207			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
.914		3	204	.435	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	-.888	.210	.000	
	Thai	-.708	.185	.001	
	Turkish	-1.139	.207	.000	
Malaysian	American	.888	.210	.000	
	Thai	.180	.196	.793	
	Turkish	-.251	.217	.654	
Thai	American	.708	.185	.001	
	Malaysian	-.180	.196	.793	
	Turkish	-.431	.193	.117	
Turkish	American	1.139	.207	.000	
	Malaysian	.251	.217	.654	
	Thai	.431	.193	.117	

The sixth hypothesis related to Individualism/Collectivism stated that:

H3_f: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have individualist cultures have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have collectivist cultures.*

The analysis of variance, Table 24, revealed that the difference between the four countries with regard to the involvement of others in the strategy development efforts

was significant, $F(3, 205) = 31.080, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group was significantly lower than in the Malaysian group ($MD = -.708, p < .001$), the Thai group ($MD = -1.093, p < .001$), and the Turkish group ($MD = -1.024, p < .001$). No significant differences were found among the collectivist countries. Consequently, hypothesis **H3_f** is substantiated.

Table 24 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale - Individualism/Collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	40.392	3	13.464	31.080	.000
Within Groups	88.805	205	.433		
Total	129.196	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.075		3	205	.361	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	-.780	.136	.000	
	Thai	-1.093	.121	.000	
	Turkish	-1.024	.135	.000	
Malaysian	American	.780	.136	.000	
	Thai	-.314	.127	.068	
	Turkish	-.245	.141	.309	
Thai	American	1.093	.121	.000	
	Malaysian	.314	.127	.068	
	Turkish	.069	.126	.947	
Turkish	American	1.024	.135	.000	
	Malaysian	.245	.141	.309	
	Thai	-.069	.126	.947	

Masculinity/Femininity and Business Strategy Development

The cultural dimension of Masculinity/Femininity was linked to the approach to strategy development through four hypotheses. According to Hofstede (1980), U.S.A. is ranked high on Masculinity, whereas Thailand and Turkey are ranked low. Malaysia was excluded from analysis with regard to this particular dimension because it was ranked average on the dimension in the original study of Hofstede (1980).

The first hypothesis related to Masculinity/Femininity stated that:

H4_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have feminine cultures are more likely to emphasize societal goals than do their counterparts associated with countries that have masculine cultures.*

As Table 25 shows, the analysis of variance with transformed data revealed that the difference among the country groups with regard to the content of the strategic objectives was significant, $F(3, 205) = 12.186, p < .001$. Because of the significant result of Levene's test of homogeneity of variances ($p = .003$), Games-Howell criterion was employed as a post hoc test. This criterion for significance indicated that the mean of the American group is significantly lower than the Thai group ($MD = -.12139, p < .001$), but not significantly different from the Turkish group ($MD = -.05685, p = .115$). Hypothesis **H4_a** is partially substantiated.

Table 25 ANOVA, Levene's, and Games-Howell Tests for the Content of Strategic Goals Scale - Masculinity/Femininity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.533	3	.178	12.186	.000
Within Groups	2.990	205	.015		
Total	3.524	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
4.851		3	205	.003	
Games-Howell Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	-.11826	.02905	.001	
	Thai	-.12139	.02183	.000	
	Turkish	-.05685	.02517	.115	
Malaysian	American	.11826	.02905	.001	
	Thai	-.00314	.02518	.999	
	Turkish	.06140	.02812	.137	
Thai	American	.12139	.02183	.000	
	Malaysian	.00314	.02518	.999	
	Turkish	.06454	.02058	.012	
Turkish	American	.05685	.02517	.115	
	Malaysian	-.06140	.02812	.137	
	Thai	-.06454	.02058	.012	

The second hypothesis related to Masculinity/Femininity stated that:

H4_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have feminine cultures have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have masculine cultures.*

The four country groups differed significantly on involvement at $p < .05$, based on analysis of variance test of significance, as seen in Table 26. ($F = 31.080, p < .001$). Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group was significantly lower than the mean of the Thai ($MD = -1.093$,

$p < .001$) and the Turkish ($MD = -1.024, p < .001$) groups. Hypothesis **H4_b** is substantiated.

Table 26 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale - Masculinity/Femininity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	40.392	3	13.464	31.080	.000
Within Groups	88.805	205	.433		
Total	129.196	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.075		3	205	.361	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	-.780	.136	.000	
	Thai	-1.093	.121	.000	
	Turkish	-1.024	.135	.000	
Malaysian	American	.780	.136	.000	
	Thai	-.314	.127	.068	
	Turkish	-.245	.141	.309	
Thai	American	1.093	.121	.000	
	Malaysian	.314	.127	.068	
	Turkish	.069	.126	.947	
Turkish	American	1.024	.135	.000	
	Malaysian	.245	.141	.309	
	Thai	-.069	.126	.947	

The third hypothesis related to Masculinity/Femininity stated that:

H4_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have masculine cultures utilize more analytical approach than do their counterparts associated with countries that have feminine cultures.*

As can be seen in Table 27, the results of the analysis of variance of the four country groups with regard to the rationality in strategic analysis revealed that the difference was significant, $F(3, 205) = 13.000, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the

Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group is significantly lower than that of the Thai ($MD = -.48391, p < .001$) and the Turkish ($MD = -.56751, p < .001$) groups. However, hypothesis $H4_c$ proposed that the American group, as a masculine culture, will have a higher mean than the Thai and the Turkish groups, both of which are classified as feminine cultures. This result, while statistically significant, contradicted the proposed hypothesis in direction. Consequently, hypothesis $H4_c$ is not substantiated.

Table 27 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Rationality of Strategic Analysis Scale - Masculinity/Femininity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.933	3	3.311	13.000	.000
Within Groups	52.213	205	.255		
Total	62.146	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.222		3	205	.303	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	-.45714	.10449	.000	
	Thai	-.48391	.09264	.000	
	Turkish	-.56751	.10384	.000	
Malaysian	American	.45714	.10449	.000	
	Thai	-.02678	.09752	.993	
	Turkish	-.11038	.10822	.783	
Thai	American	.48391	.09264	.000	
	Malaysian	.02678	.09752	.993	
	Turkish	-.08360	.09683	.824	
Turkish	American	.56751	.10384	.000	
	Malaysian	.11038	.10822	.738	
	Thai	.08360	.09683	.824	

The fourth hypothesis related to Masculinity/Femininity stated that:

H4_a: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have masculine cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have feminine cultures.*

The results of the differences on openness to strategic change are displayed on Table 28. The analysis of variance revealed that the difference among country groups was significant, $F(3, 203) = 8.592, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean for the American group is not significantly different from both the Thai ($MD = -.19268, p = .359$) and the Turkish ($MD = .18136, p = .514$) groups. Hypothesis **H4_a**, therefore, is not substantiated.

Table 28 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change Scale - Masculinity/Femininity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.446	3	3.482	8.592	.000
Within Groups	82.267	203	.405		
Total	92.713	206			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.689		3	203	.170	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
American	Malaysian	.40810	.13324	.013	
	Thai	-.19268	.11753	.359	
	Turkish	.18136	.13159	.514	
Malaysian	American	-.40810	.13324	.013	
	Thai	-.60077	.12392	.000	
	Turkish	-.22673	.13733	.353	
Thai	American	.19268	.11753	.359	
	Malaysian	.60077	.12392	.000	
	Turkish	.37404	.12214	.013	
Turkish	American	-.18136	.13159	.514	
	Malaysian	.22673	.13733	.353	
	Thai	-.37404	.12214	.013	

Long-Term vs. Short-Term Time Orientation and Business Strategy Development

The cultural dimension of Long-Time Orientation was linked to the approach to strategy development through five hypotheses. According to Hofstede (1991), U.S.A. is ranked low on this dimension, whereas Thailand is ranked high. Malaysia and Turkey were not included in the analysis on this dimension in the original study of Hofstede.

The first hypothesis related to Time Orientation stated that:

H5_a: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures are more likely to have longer strategic planning horizons than do their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures.*

As shown in Table 29, the results of the analysis of variance of the transformed data of the country differences with regard to strategic planning time horizon indicated that the six overall differences were all significant. Post hoc analyses (using the Games-Howell post hoc criterion for significance for the “Less than 1 year plan”, “1 year plan”, “2 to 4 year plan”, and “Over 10 year plan”; and Tukey post hoc criterion of significance for “5 year plan”, “6 to 10 year plan”) indicated that there was a clear pattern in the results of differences between the U.S. group and the Thai group: the U.S group significantly emphasized shorter term plans, with means for the “1 year plan” and “less than 1 year plan” (20.8 and 2.15, respectively) that were markedly larger than the means for the Thai group (1.92 and 1.95, respectively). While no significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of the emphasis they put on the “2 to 4 year

plan”, the Thai group significantly emphasized stonger emphasis on longer term plans, as indicated in the larger means for “5 year plan”, “6 to 10 year plan”, and “Over 10 year plan.” Hypothesis **H5_a** is, therefore, substantiated.

Table 29 ANOVA and Post Hoc Tests for the Strategic Planning Time Horizon Scale – Time Orientation

	Overall ANOVA		Post Hoc Tests		
	F	Sig.	Mean		Sig.
			USA	Thailand	
Less than 1 year	4.374	.005	2.08	1.92	.020
1 year plan	9.555	.000	2.15	1.95	.000
2 to 4 year plan	3.728	.012	1.85	1.93	.208
5 year plan	6.536	.000	1.64	1.90	.000
6 to 10 year plan	16.397	.000	1.29	1.79	.000
Over 10 year plan	18.116	.000	1.16	1.74	.000

The second hypothesis related to Time Orientation stated that:

H5_b: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures will have a more participative approach to strategy development than do their counterparts associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures.*

The analysis of variance, Table 30, revealed that the difference among the country groups with regard to the involvement of others in the strategy development efforts was significant, $F(3,205) = 31.080, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean was significantly lower in the American group than in the Thai group ($MD = -1.093, p < .001$). However, the hypothesis proposed

that the American group would have larger mean than the Thai group. Hypothesis **H5_b** is, therefore, not substantiated.

Table 30 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Involvement of Others in the Strategy Development Scale – Time Orientation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	40.392	3	13.464	31.080	.000
Within Groups	88.805	205	.433		
Total	129.196	208			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.075		3	205	.361	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		-.780	.136	.000
	Thai		-1.093	.121	.000
	Turkish		-1.024	.135	.000
Malaysian	American		.780	.136	.000
	Thai		-.314	.127	.068
	Turkish		-.245	.141	.309
Thai	American		1.093	.121	.000
	Malaysian		.314	.127	.068
	Turkish		.069	.126	.947
Turkish	American		1.024	.135	.000
	Malaysian		.245	.141	.309
	Thai		-.069	.126	.947

The third hypothesis related to Time Orientation stated that:

H5_c: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures tend to be more committed to the decisions they make than do their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures.*

Table 31 below presents the results of the analysis of variance of transformed data for the country groups with regard to commitment to strategic decisions. The results revealed that the difference among the countries was not significant, $F(3, 202) = 1.478, p$

= .222. The American group (ranked low on Long-Time Orientation) is not significantly different from the Thai group (ranked high on Long-Time Orientation). Hypothesis **H5_c** is, therefore, not substantiated.

Table 31 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Commitment to Strategic Decisions Scale– Time Orientation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.069	3	.023	1.478	.222
Within Groups	3.150	202	.016		
Total	3.219	205			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
2.019		3	202	.112	

The fourth hypothesis related to Time Orientation stated that:

H5_d: *Hotel executives associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures are more open to strategic change than do their counterparts associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures.*

The analysis of variance, Table 32, revealed that the difference among the country groups was significant, $F(3,203) = .8.592, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean of the American group is not significantly different from the mean of the Thai group ($MD = -.19268, p = .359$). Therefore, hypothesis **H5_d** is not substantiated.

Table 32 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Openness to Strategic Change – Time Orientation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.446	3	3.482	8.592	.000
Within Groups	82.267	203	.405		
Total	92.713	206			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
1.689		3	203	.170	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		.40810	.13324	.013
	Thai		-.19268	.11753	.359
	Turkish		.18136	.13159	.514
Malaysian	American		-.40810	.13324	.013
	Thai		-.60077	.12392	.000
	Turkish		-.22673	.13733	.353
Thai	American		.19268	.11753	.359
	Malaysian		..60077	.12392	.000
	Turkish		.37404	.12214	.013
Turkish	American		-.18136	.13159	.514
	Malaysian		.22673	.13733	.353
	Thai		-.37404	.12214	.013

The fifth hypothesis related to Time Orientation stated that:

H5_e: *When developing business strategy, hotel executives associated with countries that have long-term time orientation cultures are more likely to utilize long-term performance evaluation than do their counterparts associated with countries that have short-term time orientation cultures.*

Table 33 below displays the results of the analysis of variance for the group countries with regard to the strategy evaluation time horizon. The results revealed that the difference among the country groups was significant, $F(3, 204) = 11.420, p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the mean was significantly lower in the American group than in the Thai group ($MD = -.708, p = .001$). Therefore, hypothesis **H5_e** is substantiated.

Table 33 ANOVA, Levene's, and Tukey Tests for the Strategy Evaluation Time Horizon Scale – Time Orientation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	34.655	3	11.552	11.420	.000
Within Groups	206.345	204	1.011		
Total	241.000	207			
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.	
.914		3	204	.435	
Tukey Post Hoc Test					
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
American	Malaysian		-.888	.210	.000
	Thai		-.708	.185	.001
	Turkish		-1.139	.207	.000
Malaysian	American		.888	.210	.000
	Thai		.180	.196	.793
	Turkish		-.251	.217	.654
Thai	American		.708	.185	.001
	Malaysian		-.180	.196	.793
	Turkish		-.431	.193	.117
Turkish	American		1.139	.207	.000
	Malaysian		.251	.217	.654
	Thai		.431	.193	.117

Summary

This chapter presented the results related to demographic information about the respondents and the research hypotheses. The analysis included a total of 207 usable questionnaires (with an overall response rate of 14.1%) from American, Malay, Thai, and Turkish hotel top executives.

After testing its assumption, a series of one-way ANOVA was used to identify differences between these country groups with regard to eleven aspects of executives'

approach to strategy development. These variables were Commitment to strategic decisions, Openness to strategic change, Content of strategic objectives, Focus of strategic objectives, Formality of strategic control, Type of data used in strategic analysis, Strategic planning time horizons, Criteria for strategic evaluation, Evaluation time horizons, Degree of analysis and rationality, and Involvement in strategy development. Tukey and Games-Howell were used as a post hoc criterion. For each national cultural dimension, countries were placed in either a high or low category. Except for the Content and Focus of strategic objectives, hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicated that the contextual variables did not significantly improve the prediction power of the model. The analysis was conducted using .05 level of significance. Table 34 summarized the result of the statistical testing of the research hypotheses.

As shown in the Table, six hypotheses (H1_a, H3_c, H3_f, H4_b, H5_a, H5_e) were substantiated, three hypothesis (H2_d, H2_e, H4_a) were only partially substantiated, and fifteen hypotheses (H1_b, H1_c, H1_d, H2_a, H2_b, H2_c, H3_a, H3_b, H3_d, H3_e, H4_c, H4_d, H5_b, H5_c, H5_d) were not substantiated. It is important to note, however, that the lack of support for several hypotheses did not mean lack of significant differences. Instead, it indicated that the differences were in the opposite direction of what the hypotheses originally proposed. The next chapter, Chapter 5, discussed these results and provided implications for practice as well as suggestions for future research.

Table 34 Results Summary of Statistical Testing of the Research Hypotheses

	Power Distance <i>U.S.A. vs. Malaysia, Thailand, Turkey</i>	Uncertainty Avoidance <i>Thailand & Turkey vs. U.S.A. & Malaysia</i>	Individualism/Collectivism <i>U.S.A. vs. Malaysia, Thailand, Turkey</i>	Masculinity/Femininity <i>U.S.A. & Malaysia vs. Thailand & Turkey</i>	Time Orientation <i>U.S.A. vs. Thailand</i>
Commitment to strategic decisions					H5 _c not substantiated
Openness to strategic change	H1 _b not substantiated	H2 _a not substantiated	H3 _b not substantiated	H4 _d not substantiated	H5 _d not substantiated
Content of strategic objectives	H1 _c not substantiated			H4 _a Partially substantiated	
Focus of strategic objectives			H3 _a not substantiated		
Formality of strategic control	H1 _d not substantiated	H2 _d partially substantiated	H3 _c not substantiated		
Type of data used in strategic analysis		H2 _c not substantiated			
Strategic planning time horizons		H2 _e Partially substantiated			H5 _a substantiated
Criteria for strategic evaluation			H3 _d not substantiated		
Evaluation time horizons			H3 _e substantiated		H5 _e substantiated
Degree of analysis and rationality				H4 _c not substantiated	
Involvement in strategy development	H1 _a substantiated	H2 _b not substantiated	H3 _f substantiated	H4 _b substantiated	H5 _b not substantiated

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to empirically explore the potential influences of national culture on the approaches to business strategy development, comparing hotel executives belonging to different national cultures. This chapter provided discussion of the empirical findings, presented the limitations, suggested the implications for practice, and recommended several directions for future research.

Discussion of Empirical Findings

Influence of Power Distance on Strategy Development

Analysis in this section tested the hypotheses that executives associated with countries that have high power distance cultures (namely, Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey) were different from their counterparts associated with countries that have low

power distance cultures (namely, U.S.A.) in relation to four aspects of strategy development efforts. While the four hypothesized relationships were not fully substantiated, interesting findings were revealed.

The results indicated that executives from the low power distance country of the U.S.A. used a significantly less participative approach in the strategy development process than did executives from high power distance countries of Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey. It was expected that executives from Thailand, Malaysia and Turkey would be less likely to indicate support for the involvement of others than executives from the U.S.A. since people from within countries with higher levels of power distance accept differences in power and expect obedience. It was evident that the cultural dimension of power distance did not adequately explain the differences in executives' approach with regard to involvement of others in strategy development. However, while contrary to the predicated relationship, this result provided confirmation of the finding of Barrell, Wright, & Hoa (1997) that the low power distance managers of Australia were motivated by a need to manage and dominate.

In high power distance cultures, more emphasis on change is expected from those on top of the hierarchy. Yet the present results indicated no consistent differences between the high and low power distance countries for the variable of openness to strategic change. The U.S.A. was classified as a low power distance country, whereas Thailand, Malaysia and Turkey were classified as high power distance cultures, yet the results did not consistently indicate that the U.S. executives were less open to change

than the executives from high power distance. For example, U.S. executives were found to be more open to strategic change than the Malaysian executives, but not significantly so than their Thai and Turkish counterparts. This finding is in contrast to previous research that found the values of high power distance to be less resistant to change in the status quo (Geletkanycz, 1997). It may be that the items in the current questionnaire that measured openness to change were not adequate. It may also be that there were not enough differences in regard to these items between Thailand and Turkey on the one hand and the U.S.A. on the other. As calculated by Hofstede (1980), the power distance score of Thailand and Turkey were 64 and 66 respectively (compared to 104 of Malaysia). The smaller difference in scores for Thailand and Turkey in relation to the score of the U.S.A. may explain the lack of clear difference between these two groups of countries. Future research might want to consider gathering data from executives from very high power distance and very low power distance cultures to help better uncover differences that could be explained by this cultural dimension.

In high power distance countries, top executives are less people oriented and more concerned in setting directions and work rules. Yet this prediction did not match the practices of the Malaysian, Thai, and Turkish executives in this study when it came to setting strategic goals. Interestingly, the U.S. executives showed less emphasis on people and social concerns when developing strategic goals. As a low power distance culture, the U.S. executives were expected to have stronger concerns toward people, yet the U.S. executives did not significantly show such concerns. Perhaps the scale used to measure this variable is not a high-quality measure of attitude toward people and social concerns,

or perhaps the U.S. executives really tended to care more about the task and less about bigger social concerns. However, while contradicting the suggestion of Bochner & Hensketh (1994), this finding confirmed a similar result by Barrell, Wright, & Hoa (1999) who indicated that Australian managers (low power distance) were found to be motivated by a need to manage and restructure the work environment, as compared to the Vietnamese managers (high power distance) who were found to seek to actualize harmonious relationships within the workplace. Nevertheless, this is an area which would benefit from future research.

Power distance did not appear to affect the degree of formality of control over strategy implementation. The U.S. executives emphasized formality of strategic control less than their Thai counterparts, but were not significantly different from the Malaysian and Turkish executives. However, the result pertaining to the U.S. executives is consistent with the previous research of Whitely & England (1980) who found that the U.S. managers attached less importance to two factors the researchers labeled personal influence and assertiveness-control. An interesting finding from the analysis in this section, though, was that the U.S. executives tended to be dominant when developing business strategies, but less strict when it came to controlling strategy implementation.

Overall, the results from analysis of potential influences of the cultural dimension of power distance on strategy development are less supportive to the hypothesized relationships which predicted that executives from power distance cultures would exhibit varied degrees of participative approach, openness to strategic change, formality of

strategic control, and people-focused orientation when setting strategic goals. The statistical results did not support the hypotheses, but they are interesting enough to encourage further empirical testing.

Influence of Uncertainty Avoidance on Strategy Development

Uncertainty avoidance was found to have little or no association with the degree of openness to strategic change. According to the previous literature (e.g., Geletkaycz, 1997; Shnieder, 1989; Robertson, Al-Khatib, & Al-Habib, 2002), values of low uncertainty avoidance should be expected to lead to more willingness for embracing change. However, in this present research, executives from the low uncertainty avoidance countries of the U.S.A. and Malaysia did not significantly differ in this regard from their high uncertainty avoidance counterparts of Thailand and Turkey. One possible reason for this is that being flexible to adapt to the ever-changing business environment is a quality that is imperative for all executives to master, regardless of their national culture; and hence the lack of marked differences between executives in different countries in this regard.

The results also showed no consistent differences between executives from high uncertainty avoidance and low uncertainty avoidance with regard to degrees of their involvement of others in the process of strategy development. This finding contradicted the result by Cox (1993) who found the American managers to be more supportive of a

participative style that allow all other organizational members to provide inputs and participate in managerial decisions and practices. The result of the current research suggested that executives from higher uncertainty avoidance countries may be beginning to develop deeper appreciation of the benefits a more participative style of management can deliver.

When it came to the type of data sources used in strategy development, there were no observed differences among the executives from the four countries, indicating that uncertainty avoidance was not associated with managerial preferences toward qualitative or quantitative data. This result confirmed the argument that the cultural gap in managerial practices is reducing in many parts around the world. Additionally, only partial support was found for the proposed theoretical linkage between uncertainty avoidance and the extent to which executives use strict and formal control over strategy implementation. Representing a high uncertainty avoidance country, Thai executives were found to believe in more rigorous control than did their low uncertainty avoidance counterparts of the U.S.A. and Malaysia. While executives from the other high uncertainty avoidance country, Turkey, used stronger control over strategy implementation than the U.S. and Malaysian executives, the difference was not remarkable. Possibly the real reason for the lack of evidence is not much a question of cultural heritage, but much more of a forced reality of prevalent economic and social conditions. More empirical research is needed to verify these results and to further clarify the link between the cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance and formality of strategic control.

Earlier literature was inconclusive concerning the potential association between uncertainty avoidance and the time horizons of strategic planning. One view is that more attention and efforts to formulate longer range plans are associated with high uncertainty avoidance values (Chang & Park, 2003; Nakata & Sivakumar, 1996). However, a counter argument suggested that longer term plans are uncertain and may be avoided by focusing on shorter term plans, a practice to be found in low uncertainty avoidance cultures (Shneider, 1999). Nevertheless, the results of the present research fell short in providing a definitive support to either side of the argument, with a potential explanation that managers became less country dependent as they were exposed to greater levels of business environment sophistication. Business organizations in many countries have realized the need for certain business practices, and many may train and expect their managers to use similar techniques, regardless of their locations. Thus, many executives in this survey may have been socialized to these practices in their own countries.

To sum up, it can be concluded that the cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance had minimal influences on the approach executives might adopt toward developing their business strategies. These approaches were found to be converging, as different executives from cultures with different degrees of uncertainty avoidance demonstrated noticeable similarities in their openness to strategic change, involvement of others, data types and sources, and formality of strategy control. Indeed, the irrelevance of uncertainty avoidance as a cultural dimension in comparative management studies was outlined by several researchers. For example, Schneider & De Meyer (1991) questioned

whether this dimension corresponds to notions of environmental analyzability as discussed in the organizational theory literature. Furthermore, Newman & Nollen (1996) argued that uncertainty avoidance may be improper as a concept in countries labeled as low uncertainty avoidance. These researchers argued that the clarity of policies and directions is good management practice, not dependent on the national culture. They also questioned its relevance to the Asian societies, citing Hofstede & Bond (1988) study of Chinese values which could not establish uncertainty avoidance as a dimension that discriminated among countries. Therefore, it is not incomprehensible that uncertainty avoidance in the current study contributed little to the understanding of differences in executives' approach toward strategy development.

Influence of Individualism/Collectivism on Strategy Development

The analysis conducted in this section made a comparison of six aspects of approach to strategy development based on the cultural dimension of individualism vs. collectivism. Executives from countries high and low on this cultural dimension were found to be different in their approach in terms of the aspects covered in this analysis.

It was shown that although strategy evaluation is practiced by executives in different countries, it had a different quality depending on the cultural setting.

Apparently, executives from countries with individualist cultures (namely, U.S.A.) placed more emphasis on group-based measures of strategy performance, more so than did the

executives from the collectivist countries of Malaysia and Thailand. This is in disagreement with the proposition derived from the discussion in Chapter 2, and contradictory to studies on cross-cultural management practices, such as Hofstede (1980) and Ueno & Sekaran (1992). It is possible that the widespread use of work teams in the U.S.A. has sensitized Americans to the importance of pursuing business goals of group nature, even with their inherent propensity for individualism.

Further, it was shown that executives with individualism and collectivism values differed with regard to the strategy evaluation time horizons. The U.S. executives tended to utilize shorter range for their evaluation than the Malaysian, Thai and Turkish executives. This finding can be attributed to the differences in cultural values and cultural context as was described in the hypotheses development section in Chapter 2 earlier. It is interesting, though, to note that while it is expected that group-based outcomes will probably take longer time to be realized, the U.S. executives tended to utilize shorter time horizon for strategy performance evaluation. Business practices (e.g., individual-based reward systems) and the frequency with which individuals move in the U.S. probably help in explaining this finding.

The results also indicated a marked difference between executives with regard to involvement of others in the strategy development efforts. The U.S. executives, as representing individualist country, used significantly less involvement in the process than did their collectivist Malaysian, Thai and Turkish counterparts. This result is consistent to a great extent with previous cross-cultural managerial behavior. The finding is similar to

the findings from previous studies (Bond & Wang, 1983; Ho, 1980; Wright & Newton, 1998), where a significant relationship between collectivism and participative managerial styles was reported.

The executives from individualist and collectivist countries were found to have significantly different degrees of openness to strategic change. A difference was that the U.S. executives were markedly more open to strategic change than their Malaysian counterparts. Noteworthy is the finding that differences along this variable were also found among the three collectivist countries in the study. The Thai executives were more open to change than both the Malaysian and the Turkish executives. This finding did not provide comprehensible support for Geletkenycz's (1997) and Shane's (1992) findings, although the result pertinent to the U.S. executives is consistent with Parnell (2004) who found American managers to value strategic flexibility.

In the light of the extant literature (e.g., Calori, Lubatkin, & Very, 1994; Calori, 1994), individualism was hypothesized in the present study to be associated with stronger control over strategy implementation. Nevertheless, the results failed to provide a convincing support to this hypothesis, with a possible explanation being the difference in Hofstede's individualism score obtained for Thailand, Malaysia and Turkey (see Table 2 in Chapter 3). The U.S.A. and Thailand represent two ends on the individualism dimension; therefore, the U.S. executives exercised remarkably lighter control on strategy implementation than did the Thai executives. Malaysian and Turkish executives, whose countries scored less than Thailand on this dimension, were not significantly different in

this regard from their U.S. counterparts. According to Hofstede (1984), countries which are less economically developed score closer to the collectivist end of the dimension, while the more economically developed countries score closer to the individualist end of this dimension. This scenario may be true for Malaysia and Turkey in the late sixties and early seventies when Hofstede collected his data. However, with more than three decades of development, Malaysia and Turkey have notably developed in terms of economic growth. Thus, it is possible that people in these countries have been shifting from collectivism to greater individualism.

Only a partial support was found for the hypothesis that collectivism is associated with stronger emphasis on achieving goals that are group-oriented. While the U.S. executives emphasized these types of goals less than did the Malaysian and Turkish executives, these differences were not significant. However, and contrary to the predicted relationship, the U.S. executives significantly emphasized strategic goals that are group-based more than did their Thai counterparts. This later finding is in disagreement with previous studies which found that individualist values lead to focus of individual rights over group goals (Redding, 1993; Gopalan & Stahl, 1998). One possible reason for this result is that more people from collectivist countries have been influenced by Western cultural values, including these of individualism. Many people from these countries are pursuing self-actualization needs which can be realized by developing individual skills and capabilities rather than developing ties with other people outside their immediate surroundings. This suggested that today, especially in business settings, more people value individual rights over the group well-being.

In conclusion, the findings related to relationship of individualism and collectivism with strategy evaluation criteria, focus of strategic objectives, openness to strategic change, and formality of strategic control, were surprising, particularly when contrasted to the results obtained in previous empirical studies. Lesser degrees of difference were found; and as a result, support for several propositions was mixed. A later section in this chapter addressed additional potential explanations for the unanticipated results.

Influence of Masculinity/Femininity on Strategy Development

The analysis pertaining to the potential influences of the cultural dimension of masculinity revealed that the U.S. executives showed less emphasis on achieving bigger societal goals than did their feminine Malaysian and Thai counterparts. While they also placed less emphasis on these types of goals, the U.S. executives did not significantly differ from the Turkish executives. This finding supported the hypothesis that executives from countries associated with feminine cultures are more likely than masculine countries to emphasize societal goals. The results by Bass & Eldrige (1979) and Harris & Ghauri (2000) were confirmed in the present study.

The results also suggested that the differences on countries' status on this dimension between the U.S.A. on one hand, and Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey on the other, led to differences to the extent these executives from these two types of cultures

involve others in the process of strategy development. The results indicated that in the U.S.A., a country with high masculinity, executives used less participative style toward strategy development than did the feminine executives of Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey. This finding is consistent with past research on cross-national differences, which suggested that individuals expressing more participative managerial style are largely those associated with countries that share feminine values (Reid & Hinkley, 1989; Harris & Ghauri, 2000; Rodrigues, 1995).

With regard to rationality of strategic analysis, several researchers (e.g., Neman & Nollen, 1996; Harris & Ghauri, 2000; Kanogno, Nonaka, Sakakibara, & Okumara, 1985) suggested that masculinity leads to emphasis on rationality and logic in business settings. Counter empirical evidence by Reid & Hinkley, (1989) and Parnell (2004) indicated that managers associated with masculinity values showed less scientific style in their behavior. The results from the current study, nevertheless, supported the former argument. That is, stronger masculinity values led to less rigor and systematic approach by managers. Feminine executives of Malaysia, Thailand, and Turkey all reported preference toward rationality in strategy development than did their U.S. counterparts. However, when interpreting this result, it is important to note that most of the respondents from Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey were highly educated. It is likely that, given the dominance of the Western style of management education around the globe, these managers had learned the techniques and tools of strategic management and probably understood its applicability in their business environment. Given that the business environments in their countries are supposedly less sophisticated than the

American one, these executives may have realized the viability and value of these analytical and systematic tools and techniques. Still, this suggestion requires further investigation.

The hypothesis that masculine values are associated with more openness to strategic change was not fully substantiated. The U.S. executives were more open to change than Malaysian executives, but not than the Thai and Turkish executives. This result is in disagreement with Geletkanycs (1997) who suggested that alteration of existing arrangements is usually pursued by people with masculinity values. The disagreement may be explained by the fact that both Thai and Turkish people have been undergoing economic and institutional reforms which may have contributed to recent entrepreneurship of these people. As a result, more and more Thai and Turkish managers are willing to take risk, thus the lack of significant differences toward openness to change among the Thai and Turkish executives when compared to the U.S. executives.

In conclusion, the cultural dimension of masculinity / femininity appeared to provide a strong base which can be used to uncover differences in executives' preferences for certain behaviors when developing business strategy. Masculinity values were found to be associated with less emphasis on social goals, less involvement by others, and less rationality in strategy analysis and development.

Influence of Long-Term Time Orientation on Strategy Development

The analysis in this section investigated the extent to which executives associated with high and low long-term time orientation were different in their approach to strategy development, and whether the differences between the two types of cultures, if any, can be traced to the differences in countries' status along this cultural dimension. Based on the previous cross-national studies, it was hypothesized that long-term time orientation was associated with five aspects of approach toward strategy development: strategic planning time horizons, extent of involvement of others in the process, commitment to decisions made, openness to strategic change, and evaluation time horizon of strategy performance.

A look at the results from the current study revealed that long-term time orientation is an important factor for explaining differences in executives' approach toward strategy development. While the results of previous cross-national empirical studies were inconclusive in this regard, longer strategic planning time horizons were found in this study to be associated with values of high long-term time-orientation. Thai executives were found to have longer horizons than the U.S. executives when developing strategic plans for their businesses. Harris & Chauri (2000) found managers associated with different values of high and low long-term time orientations to have both short-time as well as long-term concerns when they formulate strategies. Reid & Hinkley (1989) found short-term concerns to be prevalent in societies that are high and also in societies that are low on time orientations. Differences in the finding of the current study and that of

Reid & Hinkley can be attributed to the countries covered in analysis in both studies. Reid & Hinkley compared U.K. managers with managers from Hong Kong. However, characteristics of Hong Kong as an interesting blend of East and West are understood, and Hong Kong managers are not only associated with Confucianism values, but they are also profoundly affected by Western capitalism (Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1993). Therefore, Hong Kong may not be the proper country to be used in direct cultural comparisons. Furthermore, differences in data collection methods may have led to different results in the present study compared to that of Harris & Ghauri (2000). The results of Harris & Ghauri were based on interviews with only one Dutch and one Scottish business leader, whereas the analysis in the current study is based on a survey of 50 U.S. and 70 Thai executives.

However, contrary to what was expected, a more participative approach toward strategy was prevalent more among executives in Thailand, a country of long-term time orientation, than in the U.S.A., a country of short-term time orientation. This is a surprising finding. It is quite logical that managers from Confucian societies (and hence long-term time orientation) should have less participative managerial style as, according to Song & Meek (1998), subordinates are raised to be obedient to their supervisor, not to ask questions, and to follow their patriarch in order to maintain harmonious relationships among themselves. However, this was not the case with the Thai executives. One possible explanation for this finding might be that the concept of involvement may have different qualities in different cultures. While in some countries, especially in the Western countries, involvement means actively engaging others and soliciting their

inputs in the business situations, the same concept may be used by managers in other countries as a technique to make people feel part of the group so that they do not feel left out. This later practice, however, is not asking for their opinions and feedback or creating consensus on the issues at hand. Different interpretation of the same concept by people from differing cultures may lead to different results.

Earlier theoretical literature suggested that executives belonging to high long-term time orientation cultures will probably demonstrate a higher level of commitment to the decisions made, more so than would their counterparts belonging to lower long-term time orientation. The analysis in the current study did not reveal statistically significant difference for this variable. The U.S. executives showed a level of commitment similar to their Thai counterparts. The reason for the lack of support for this hypothesis may be that it was invalid. It might, however, also be that it could not be verified using the current measurement scale. Still, with the empirical finding by Geletkanycz (1997) that short-term orientation showing greater commitment to strategic policies, the inconclusive results by literature continued to exist, providing an area of interest for future research.

A similar pattern was also found with regard to the relationship between long-term time orientation and openness to strategic change. A controversy did exist among researchers regarding this relationship. On the one hand, Gopalan & Stahl (1998) and Shneider (1998) hypothesized that people associated with longer-term and past-oriented cultures will more likely to be slow to change and feel less pressure to act. Geletkanycz (1997), on the other hand, indicated that it is the individuals with short-term oriented

values that will more likely to promote fewer new initiatives. The empirical results of the present study suggested that this particular cultural dimension may not adequately account for differences in the extent of executives' openness to strategic change, as no significant differences were evident between executives associated with low long-term time orientation (U.S.A.) and those associated with high long-term time orientation (Thailand).

A convincing support was revealed in the current study for the hypothesis that values of longer-term time orientation are associated with preference toward utilizing longer-term horizon for evaluating the strategy performance. Thai executives were found to use longer time horizons to evaluate the performance of their business strategy, more so than did the U.S. executives. The results confirmed the suggestions and findings of Adler (1997) and Ueno & Sekaran (1992).

On the whole, these findings suggested that the cultural dimension of long-term time orientation provided a relatively proper base for testing the differences between executives from countries low and high on time orientation in terms of several aspects of their approach to developing strategies for their businesses.

General Explanations for the Unanticipated Results

Several mixed and interesting findings were obtained in this study. Not all hypotheses were substantiated. Counter-evidence for some of the hypotheses was obtained. Two general explanations need to be considered when interpreting and discussing the results. Both of these potential explanations are related to the framework upon which the study was based, namely, that of Hofstede (1980; 1991).

First, Hofstede's cultural dimensions are based on national level cultural traits. In reality, not all individuals in a society measure as indicated in Hofstede's framework. It is quite reasonable to assume that, for example, not all individuals in Thailand measure long-term time orientation, nor do all Americans measure short-term time orientation. Furthermore, some people in, for instance, masculine societies may behave as such in some situations, and behave feminine in other situations. Yet some other people may behave as individualists, while preferring to behave as collectivists, or behave as collectivists in later times. Empirical research indicated that, for example, sub-cultures and social groups within the same country may show differences regarding their country's core cultural values (e.g., Peppas, 2001). It is important to note that the U.S. has diversity and cultural heterogeneity that the other countries in this study do not share. Sub-cultural and individual variations within each of the studied countries may have affected the results of this study.

Second, the hypotheses in the study are based on a measure derived from Hofstede's survey which was carried out during the late sixties and early seventies. Obviously, there is a noticeable time gap between the moment Hofstede collected his data on the cultural dimensions and the moment the current study was conducted. Therefore, changes in the actual status on the cultural dimensions of the countries studied may have affected the results of the present study. Hofstede himself (1980) proposed that cultural values of a country change over time. Although such changes may not be dramatic and fundamental (Wong & Birnbaum-More, 1994), their influences on individual's professional and business behaviors cannot be underestimated.

Additional possible explanations can be connected to the research design. A later section in this chapter provided the limitations associated with the present study, as well as the implications for future research.

Implications for Practice

In general, the findings of this study supported the notion that the strategic orientation and behavior of executives are culturally bound, and indicated that dissimilar approaches to developing business strategy are adopted by executives with dissimilar national cultural background. Among the five cultural dimensions investigated, the masculinity and long-term time orientation appeared to have the greatest influences, and uncertainty avoidance appeared to have little or no influence. Results for the other two

dimensions, namely power distance and individualism, were not definitive and revealed interesting findings. Almost each aspect of executives' approach toward strategy development was affected to a greater or lesser extent.

These findings are important not only to extend the theoretical knowledge of strategic behavior, but also because they have practical values for the hotel organizations around the world. The results suggested that international hotel organizations are well advised to take national culture into consideration when recruiting and selecting their managers. These companies may want to obtain more national culture-related information about potential managers when faced with hiring decisions. Local employees of hotel properties located in the feminine countries of Thailand and Turkey, for example, may react more favorably to executives who display stronger emphasis on people and bigger societal concerns as a base for strategic decision making. The results in the current study indicated that such managerial behavior is more likely to be expressed by those executives associated with feminine cultures, than by masculine executives who tended to overlook relationship building in favor of analytical and rational factors. Assessing the congruence between organizational policies and the deep-rooted cultural traits of executives could greatly improve the probability of success for both parties.

The executives employed by an international hotel organization are the key strategic resources which will ultimately determine the success or failure of its operations overseas. As they give indication of the most culture-sensitive practices, the present findings could serve as a guide in transferring top executives within an international hotel

organization. The headquarters may need to consider reassigning top executives when changing the strategic orientations of international individual hotel properties within the company. The success of international managerial assignment should be improved by matching the preferred strategic business orientation with the managers who will actually implement it. Fiedler's (1965) observations four decades ago that it is better to "engineer the job to fit the manager" rather than the other way around, is to be remembered. Ignoring cultural differences will adversely influence hotel organizations capabilities in attaining and sustaining potential competitive advantages. For instance, international hotel organizations that wish to install teamwork practices at their properties located in individualist countries (i.e., U.S.A.) can benefit from the underlying tendency among collectivist executives from Malaysian, Thailand and Turkey to prefer cooperation and harmony. The experience and the make-up of such collectivists can be incorporated in the management teams of properties located in more individualist work settings.

The differences in executives' approach to strategy development that this study identified suggest that hotel executives engaging in international alliances, affiliations, joint ventures, and other forms of collaboration with other executives should be aware of their counterparts' differences in strategic behavior. The potential for effective business partnerships can be facilitated by people who can share a common managerial style while at the same time appreciate differences in strategic orientations of each other. For example, on the dimension of individualism, the U.S. hotel executives' tendency to seek faster evaluations of the performance of business strategy may frustrate their Malaysian, Thai and Turkish colleagues who were found to prefer longer evaluation time horizons.

The information gained should help hotel organizations better understand their own values as well as the values of other managers in the industry in different parts of the world.

Hospitality consultants as well as corporate trainers and educators can use the information revealed by this study to foster better working relationships and to help hospitality organizations make improved business decisions. Instead of a rigid “list of do’s and don’ts” in terms of business practices, hospitality training is more effective if refocused on the understanding of why executives and people in other countries behave the way they do. The findings from this study question the wisdom of adopting the attitude that international hotel business is the same as in the domestic business context, and imply that trainers should be greatly cautious about attempting to standardize hotel managerial practices and behaviors. As more culturally-diverse managers get involved in business partnerships, feelings of confusion and frustration may arise. The findings suggested that the U.S. hotel executives who plan to work with Malaysian, Thai and Turkish hotel executives may benefit from special training beyond the traditional forms of business training they may have received in business schools. For example, a need exists for training that can show the U.S. executives working in Thailand, Malaysia, or Turkey that (1) decision-making in collectivist cultures involves gradual consensus-building, which is time consuming; (2) the American style of individual performance evaluation systems may not match the sensibilities of the collectivists; and, (3) collectivist executives tend to favor certain people (e.g., family members) when hiring or promoting employees. The resulting findings and understating can be used by hospitality

trainers to demonstrate to manager trainees and clientele the implicit structure of their value systems, and the extent to which it is shared by others in the industry.

Understanding differences and commonalities among executives at deeper levels is a powerful training and consulting approach in an era of unprecedented internationalization of hotel operations and organizations.

Limitations

The current study has benefited from having data from practicing managers of upper-scale hotels in four different countries. The study also benefited from investigating all five of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, while controlling for several contextual variables that could account for differences in executives' strategic management behavior. However, as with any exploratory study, especially in cross-cultural management, limitations are inevitable. This quantitative research presented several limitations that should be considered prior to a generalization outside its immediate scope.

The study suffered from biases inherent to its methods of data collection. The accuracy of the findings of this study relied on the self-report data. While self-reporting has been shown to have some robustness (Crampton & Wagner, 1994), and has been acknowledged as an appropriate method to employ when conducting strategy research

(Conant, Mokwa, & Varadarajan, 1990), there is always a danger of reporting bias and error (e.g., misunderstanding of the questionnaire items, respondent motivation).

The study was weakened by low internal consistency of several dependent variables. The items used to measure these variables were extracted from studies designed for other purposes and were not widely replicated in the empirical literature. Furthermore, to raise the values of Cronbach's Alpha, some of these variables ended up being measured with a single item. Consequently, reliance upon single-item measures of several aspects of strategy development will limit the confidence that may be placed in the viability and validity of these measures.

Although strict measures to ensure the most appropriate and culturally sensitive translations of the research instrument were taken in this study, it is possible that the translation of particular words led to some of its results. The study assumed that the respondents assigned similar meanings to its scale-response choices. For example, it was assumed that respondents attached equivalent meanings to the word "agree", and this meaning was used in the cross-cultural comparison made in this study. However, Usunier (1998) pointed out that translation and back translation does not necessarily guarantee equivalence of language, and that the generation of a false verbal equivalence is possible.

The number of cultures included in a cross-cultural research can lead to sampling problems if that number is very small. Nasif, Al-Daeaj, Ebrahimi, & Thibodeaux (1991) noticed that the number of cultures in cross-cultural research has been low; with more

than half of the 57 studies they reviewed involving only two countries. A four-country study is large relative to most cross-cultural studies (Albers-Miller, 1996; Boddewyn, 1981). The present study acknowledged that while the four countries of the U.S.A., Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey are culturally diverse, they are hardly representative of the cultures existent in the world.

Finally, the non-response bias could not be assessed in the present study. The lack of an external source that can provide the relevant characteristics of hotel managers around the world limited the ability to compare the characteristics of the survey respondents to non-respondents. Additionally, the study used one wave of mail survey and therefore a comparison of the characteristics between the early and late respondents could not be established. It is therefore possible that those who did respond to this survey may not be sufficiently representative to those who did not.

Future Research

In investigating the influence of national cultural dimensions on business strategy development by hotel executives in different countries, several hypotheses were formulated in this study. While not providing a definitive answer to the cultural differences and similarities existing between executives surveyed, the results did contribute to a longer-term aim of the research stream in this area, and provided a sound foundation on which to take the literature forward. The exploratory nature of this study

called for conducting further research on the several relationships expressed in the research hypotheses.

Several methodological challenges were encountered in this study. The fact that the researcher was restricted in the design, time and resources likely contributed to some of the shortcomings of this study. Therefore, the present study can be improved by utilizing more comprehensive research designs. The following improvements are recommended:

- National culture was operationalized in the study as the respondent's nationality. However, the actual measure of the national cultural dimensions would provide an accurate and current measure of respondents' country status on each of the cultural dimensions, making the comparison more meaningful. The actual status of several countries can change as a result to economic and political changes. Additionally, future research could explore whether other indices of national culture (e.g., high context vs. low context cultures) are associated with aspects of executives' approach to strategy development.
- The current study was limited to four countries. More research involving other countries would provide important insights into how business strategy development and national culture interact.

- It would be beneficial to measure the dependent variables analyzed in this study in alternative ways. Similar results obtained by these different scales of the same variables would add validity and confidence in the current results.
- It would be useful for future research to use sample frames and data collection methods that may result in improved response rates. Higher response rate might result in less potential for non-response bias. This can be partially realized by collaboration with local researchers in each country of interest. Such diversified research team composition would also increase the functional equivalence of research instruments.

In addition to improving this study, opportunities for expanding and extrapolating this study abound:

- To gain a more sophisticated understanding of the cultural influences on strategic behavior of managers, future research might explore the simultaneous relationships among two or more cultural dimensions and test for their combined effect on executive's approach to strategy development.
- This study assumed that the participants from each country share a common national culture, irrespective of the different subcultures that may constitute a country's culture. It is useful to acknowledge that a country can have several subcultures while many countries can have the same culture. For example, Peppas (2001) found that the subcultures of the African- and Euro-American

groups felt significantly different with regard to several basic U.S.A. values.

Future research may look at how behaviors of managers from different population segments within a nation are affected by their subcultures.

- It can be imprecise to assume that national culture is the dominant driver of executives' approach to strategy development. There was not clear evidence in the current study to suggest that executives' approach in relation to strategy development was linked to respondents' individual and organizational variables (i.e., gender, education, age, functional background, industry experience, company size). This contradicted previous findings that individual demographic differences (Kathuria & Porth, 2003; Child, 1974), individual personality (Miller, Ketz de Vries, & Toulouse, 1982; Walsh & Fahey, 1986), and functional background (Song, 1982; Bowman & Daniels, 1995) influence managerial behavior. Future research is needed to demonstrate the main and interaction effects of individual and organizational characteristics with national culture on executive approach to strategy development. Additionally, two particular variables were not accounted for in this study, namely organizational culture and individual personality. Although Adler (1997) noticed that organizational culture does not erase national culture, and that , according to Dastmalchian, Lee, & Ng (2000), organizational culture is significantly affected by the national culture, future research will need to investigate the relative explanatory power of both national and organizational cultures in relation to approach toward strategy

development. Personality traits (e.g., locus of control, tolerance of ambiguity) can also be examined with regard to the extent that they affect how executives approach the task of strategy development.

- To further verify the suggested hypotheses in this study and to strengthen its findings, future research may use different research strategy, namely in-depth qualitative investigations. Important insights can be generated by interviewing managers, as this approach will allow researchers to access richer information about the many factors influencing strategic behavior of managers. Utilizing both qualitative and quantitative research methods in future research will broaden our understanding of this important issue.

- This study contributed to filling a void in the literature on strategic behavior of managers, especially in the international hotel industry. Hospitality researchers may wish to test the relationships and hypotheses presented in the current study in other segments of the hospitality industry. Similarly, to expand hospitality research into the effects of national culture, it would be promising to continue to investigate additional measures of cultural influences on other components of hospitality management, including, for example, human resource management, information technology, and corporate communication.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. (1983). A Typology of Management Studies Involving Culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2), 29-47.
- Adler, N. (1991). *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. Boston, MA: PWS-Kent.
- Adler, N. (1997). *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Company.
- Albers-Miller, N.D. (1996). Designing Cross-Cultural Advertising Research: A Closer Look at Paired Comparisons. *International Marketing Review*, 13(5), 59-75.
- Allen, D., Miller, E., & Nath, R. (1988). North America. In R. Naith (Ed.), *Comparative Management: A Regional View*. Boston, MA: Ballenger Publishing Company.
- Andrews, R. (1971). *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones Irwin.
- Ansoff, I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Co.
- Armstrong, J.S., & Overton, T.S. (1977). Estimating Non-Response Bias in Mail Surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14, 396-402.
- Bamberger, I. (1983). Value Systems, Strategies, and Performance of Small and Medium-Sized Firms. *International Small Business Journal*, 1(4), 25-39.

- Bass, M., Burger, C., Doktor, R., & Barrett, V. (1979). *Assessment of Managers: An International Comparison*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, M., & Eldridge, L. (1979). Accelerated Managers' Objectives in Twelve Centuries. *Industrial Relations*, 12(2), 158-171.
- Beattie, R. (1991). Hospitality Internationalization: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 3(4).
- Berrell, M., Wright, P., & Hoa, T. (1999). The Influence of Culture on Managerial Behavior. *Journal of Management Development*, 18, 578-589.
- Bhagat, S., & McQuaid, J. (1982). Role of Subjective Culture in Organizations: A Review and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 653-685.
- Black, S., & Porter, W. (1991). Managerial Behaviors and Job Performance: A Successful Manager in Los Angeles May not Succeed in Hong Kong. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22(1), 99-113.
- Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, and Job-Related Attitudes in a Culturally Diverse Work Groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25, 233-257.
- Boddewyn, J.J. (1981). Comparative Marketing: The First Twenty-Five Years. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 12(2), 61-79.
- Bond, M., et al. (1987). Chinese Values and the Search for Culture-Free Dimensions of Culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18(June), 143-164.

- Bond, H. & Wang, A. (1983). China: Aggressive Behavior and the Problem of Maintaining Order and Harmony. In P. Goldstein & M. Segall (Eds.), *Aggression in Global Perspective*, (pp. 112-142). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Boulton, W. (1984). *Business Policy: The Art of Strategic Management*. New York, NY: McMillan Publishing Company.
- Bourgeois, L. (1980). Strategy and Environment: A Conceptual Integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 25-39.
- Bowman, C. & Daniels, K. (1995). The Influence of Functional Experience on Perception of Strategic Priorities. *British Journal of Management*, 6(2), 157-167.
- Boyd, K. (1991). Strategic Planning and Financial Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28, 353-374.
- Boyd, K., & Reuning-Elliot (1998). A Measurement Model of Strategic Planning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19 (2), 181-192.
- Brews, P., & Hunt, M. (1999). Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn: Resolving the Planning School/Learning School Debate. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 889-913.
- Burgess, C., Hampton, A., Price, L., & Roper, A. (1995). International Hotel Groups: What Makes them Successful? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 7(2/3), 74-80.
- Buzzell, R., Gale, B., & Sultan, R. (1975) .Market Share – A Key to Profitability. *Harvard Business Review*, 53 (February), 97-106.

- Byars, L. (1984). *Strategic Management: Planning and Implementation*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Calori, R., Jounson, G., & Sarnin, P. (1992). French and British Top Managers' Understanding of the Structure and the Dynamics of Their Industries: A Cognitive Analysis and Comparison. *British Journal of Management*, 3, 61-78.
- Calori, R., Jounson, G., & Sarnin, P. (1994). CEOs' Cognitive Maps and the Scope of the Organization. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 437-457.
- Calori, R., Lubatkin, M., & Very, P. (1994). Control Mechanisms in Cross-Border Acquisitions: An International Comparison. *Organization Studies*, 15, 361-379.
- Chae, M., & Hill, J. (2000). Determinants and Benefits of Global Strategic Marketing Planning Formality. *International Marketing Review*, 17, 538 – 563.
- Chaffee, E. (1985). Three Models of Strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 89-98.
- Chandler, A. (1962). *Strategy and Structure*. Cambridge, MA. :MIT Press.
- Chang, H., & Lee, H. (1989). *National Differences in Managerial Practices*. In H. Chung & H. Lee (Eds.), *Korean Managerial Dynamics*, (pp.163-180). New York: Praeger.
- Child, J. (1972). Managerial and Organizational Factors Associated with Company Performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 11(1), 13-27.
- Chong, J., & Park, J. (2003). National Culture and Classical Principles of Planning. *Cross-Cultural Management*, 10(1), 29-39.

- Clampitt, P., DeKoch, R., & Cashman, T. (2000). A Strategy for Communicating about Uncertainty. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(4), 41-57.
- Clarck, T. (1990). International Marketing and National Character: A Review and Proposal for an Integrative Theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (October), 66-79.
- Conant, J.S., Mokwa, M.P., & Varadajan, P.R. (1990). Strategic Types, Distinctive Marketing Competencies and Organizational Performance: A Multiple Measures Based Study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 365-383.
- Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, & Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Crampton, S.M., & Wagner, J.A. (1994). Percept-Percept Inflation in Micro-Organizational Research: An Investigation of Prevalence and Effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(1), 67-76.
- Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago, IL: University Press.
- D'Annunzio-Green, N. (1997). Developing International Managers in the Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9 (5/6), 198 - 208.
- D'Annunzio-Green., N. (2002). An Examination of the Organizational and Cross-Cultural Challenges Facing International Hotel Managers in Russia. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 14, 266-273.
- Daft, L., & Weick, K. (1984). Toward a Model of Organizations as Interpretation Systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 284-295.

- Dastmalchian, A., Lee, S., & Ng, I. (2000). The Interplay between Organizational and National Cultures: A Comparison of Organizational Practices in Canada and South Korea Using the Competing Values Framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11, 388-412.
- David, F. (1995). *Strategic Management*. 3rd edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Dawar, N., & Parker, P. (1994). Marketing Universals: Consumers' Use of Brand Name, Price, Physical Appearance, and Retailer Reputation as Signals of Product Quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(April), 81-95.
- De Kluyver, C., & Pearce II, J. (2003). *Strategy: A View from the Top*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Derr, B., & Laurent, A. (1989). The Internal and External Career: A Theoretical and Cross-Cultural Perspective. In M. Arthur, R. Lawrence & T. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of Career Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dillman, D. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: Wiley.
- Dorfman, P., & Howell, J. (1988). Dimensions of National Culture and Effective Leadership Patterns: Hofstede Revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127-150.
- Dwyer, T. (1997). *National Culture, Organizational Culture, and Personal Value Influences on Personal Selling Practices: A Five Nation Study*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama.
- England, W. (1975). *The Manager and His Values*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

- Evans, W., Hau, K., & Sculli, D. (1989). A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Managerial Styles. *Journal of Management Development*, 8(3), 5-13.
- Fatehi, K. (1996). *International Management: A Cross-Cultural and Functional Perspective*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Ferrari, S. (1977). A Mexican Approach to Industrial Training. *Management Industrial Review*, 17(4).
- Fiedler, F.E. (1965). Engineering the Job to Fit the Manager. *Harvard Business Review*, 43, 115-122.
- Fiegenger, M. K. (1994). Matching Business-Level Strategic Controls to Strategy: Impact on Control System Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10 (1), 25-34.
- Foster, M. (1962). *Traditional Cultures*. New York, NY: Intercultural Press.
- Fredrickson, W. (1983). Strategic Process Research: Questions and Recommendations. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 565-575.
- Fredrickson, W. (1984). The Competitiveness of Strategic Decision Processes: Extension, Observations, Future Directions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 445-466.
- French, W., & Weis, A. (2000). An Ethics of Care or an Ethics of Justice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(1/2), 125-136.
- Gallen, T. (2006). Managers and Strategic Decisions: Does the Cognitive Style Matter? *Journal of Management Development*, 25(2), 118-133.

- Geletkanycz, M. (1997). The Salience of 'Culture's Consequences': The Effect of Cultural Values on Top Executive Commitment to the Status Quo. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 615-634.
- Gesteland, R. (1996). *Cross-Cultural Business Behavior: Marketing, Sourcing, Negotiating, and Managing Across Cultures*. Copenhagen: Handleshojskolens Forlag.
- Giorg, L., & Marsh, C. (1990). The Protestant Work Ethics as a Cultural Phenomenon. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 499-517.
- Gomez-Meja, R., & Welbourne, T. (1991). Compensation Strategies in a Global Context. *Human Resources Planning*, 14(1), 29-41.
- Gopalan, S., & Stahl, A. (1998). Application of American Management Theories and Practices to the Indian Business Environment: Understanding the Impact of National Culture. *American Business Review*, (June), 30-41.
- Govekar, M. (1994). Cultural and Strategic Effects on MCN Managers' Perceptions of Strategy and Subsidiary Goals. In meeting of the Strategic Management Society. Strategic Management Society, Paris.
- Govindarajan, V. (1989). Implementing Competitive Strategies at the Business Unit Level: Implications for Matching Managers to Strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 251-270.
- Grinyer, P.H., & Spender, J.C. (1979). 'Recipes, Crises and Adaptation in Mature Businesses'. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 11, 113-123.
- Groeschl S., & Doherty, L. (2000). Conceptualizing Culture. *Cross Cultural Management – An International Journal*, 7(4), 12-17.

- Gupta, A. (1995). Matching Managers to Strategies: Point and Counterpoint. In J. Miner & D. Crane (Eds.), *Advances in the Practice, Theory, and Research of Strategic Human Resource Management*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Hall, E. (1960). The Silent Language in Overseas Business. *Harvard Business Review*, 38(3), 87-96.
- Hall, E. (1977). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hall, S. (1998). Companies Clash to Gain Edge. *Hotel & Motel Management*, 213(4), 63-66.
- Hambrick, C., & Brandon, G. (1988). Executive Values. In D. Hambrick (Ed), *The Executive Effect: Concepts and Methods for Studying Top Managers*, (pp.3-34). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Hambrick, D., & Mason, P. (1984). Upper Echelons: The Organization as a Reflection of its Top Managers. *The Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206.
- Hambrick, D. (1989). Guest Editor's Introduction: Putting Top Managers Back in the Strategy Picture. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(Special Issue), 5-15.
- Harris, S., & Ghauri, P. (2000). Strategy Formation by Business Leaders: Exploring the Influence of National Values. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(1/2), 126-142.
- Hart, S., & Banbury, C. (1994). How Strategy-Making Process Can Make a Difference. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 251-269.
- Hastings, S. (1996). A Strategy Evaluation Model for Management. *Management Decision*, 34(1), 25-34.

- Hill, C. (1988). Differentiation Versus Low Cost or Differentiation and Low Cost? A Contingency Framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 401-412.
- Hitt, M., Dacin, T., Tyler, B., & Park, D. (1997). Understanding the Differences in Korean and U.S. Executives' Strategic Orientations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(2), 159-167.
- Hinkin, T. (1995). A Review of Scale Development Practices in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21, 967-988.
- Hodgkinson, G., & Johnson, J. (1994). Exploring the Mental Models of Competitive Strategists: The Case for a Processual Approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31, 425-448.
- Hofer C., & Schendel, D. (1978). *Strategy Formulation: Analytical Concepts*. New York: West.
- Hoffman, J., & Schniederjans, M. (1990). An International Strategic Management Goal Programming Model for Structuring Global Expansion Decisions in the Hospitality Industry: The Case for Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 9, 175-190.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, (abridged Ed), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. (1988). The Confucius Connections: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 5-21.

- Hofstede, G. (1983a). The Cultural Relativity of Organizational Practices and Theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14 (2), 75-89.
- Hofstede, G. (1983b). Dimensions of National Culture in Fifty Countries and Three Regions. In J. Deręgowski, S. Dziuraweic, & R Annis (Eds.), *Expiscations in Cross-Cultural Psychology*, (pp. 335-355). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Hofstede, G. (1985). The Interaction Between National and Organizational Value Systems. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32, 347-357.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations*. The Netherlands: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hofstede, G. (1994). Management Scientists are Human. *Management Science*, 40(1), 4-14.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hoppe, M. (1990). A Comparative Study of Country Elites: International Differences in Work-Related Values and Learning and their Implication for Management Training and Development. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC.
- Horovitz, H. (1980). *Top Management Control in Europe*. New York: St. Martin.
- House, R., Wright, N., & Aditya, R. (1997). Cross Cultural Research on Organizational Leadership: A Critical Analysis and a Proposed Theory. In P. Early & M. Erez (Eds.), *New Perspectives in International Organizational Psychology*. San Francisco: New Lexington.

- Humphreys, M. (1996). Culture Difference and its Effect on the Management of Technical Education. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(2), 34-41.
- Inkeles, A., & Levinson, D. (1969). National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems. In G. Lindzey, & E. Aronson. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol.4. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Jackofsky, F., & Slocum, W. (1988). *CEO Roles Across Cultures*. In D. Hambrick. (Ed), *The Executive Effect: Concepts and Methods for Studying Top Managers*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Jackson, S., & Schuler, R. (1995). Understanding Human Resource Management in the Context of Organizations and their Environments. In M. Rosenzweig & L. Porter (Eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, (pp. 237-264). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Jayawardena, C., & Haywood, M. (2003). International Hotel Managers and Key Caribbean Challenges. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15 , 195-198.
- Johnson, G. (1987). *Strategic Change and the Management Process*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Judge, W.Q., & Miller, A. (1991). Antecedents and Outcomes of Decision Speed in Different Environmental Contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 449-463.
- Kagono, T., Nonaka, I., Sakakibara, K., & Okumara, A. (1985). *Strategic vs. Evolutionary Management*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Kakar, S. (1971). Authority Patterns and Subordinate Behavior in Indian Organizations. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 16, 298-307.

- Kale, S., & Barnes, J. (1992). Understanding the Domain of Cross-National Buyer-Seller Interactions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23 (First Quarter), 101-127.
- Kathuria, R., & Porth, S. (2003). Strategy-Managerial Characteristics Alignment and Performance: A Manufacturing Perspective. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 23, 255-276.
- Katz, F., & Kahn, R. (1987). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kaye, M., & Taylor, W. (1997). Expatriate Culture Shock in China: A Study in the Beijing Hotel Industry. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12, 496-510.
- Klester, S., & Sproul, L. (1982). Managerial Response to Changing Environments: Perspectives and Problem Sensing from Social Cognition. *Administrative Quarterly*, 37, 548-570.
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, III: Row, Peterson.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). The Study of Culture. In D. Lerner & H. Laswell (Eds.). *The Policy Sciences*, (pp. 57-68). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The Effects of National Culture on the Choice of Entry Mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19, 411-432.
- Korman, A. (1985). Review of Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 6, 243-244.

- Kotey, B., & Meredith, G. (1997). Relationships Among Owner/Manager Personal Values, Business Strategies, and Enterprise Performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(2), 37-64.
- Kotha, S., Dunbar, R., & Bird, A. (1995). Strategic Action Generation: A Comparison of Emphasis Placed on Generic Competitive Methods by U.S. and Japanese Managers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16, 195-220.
- Krager, D., & Malik, Z. (1975). Long-Range Planning and Organizational Performance. *Long Range Planning*, 8(6), 60-64.
- Kroeber, A. & Kluckhohn, F. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Business Press.
- Lambert, E., Hamers, W., & Frasure-Smith. (1979). *Child Rearing Values*. New York: Praeger.
- Lane, W., DiStefano, J., & Maznevski, L. (1996). *International Management Behavior: From Policy to Practice*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Laurent, A. (1983). The Cultural Diversity of Western Conceptions of Management. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 13(1-2), 75-96.
- Laurent, A. (1986). The Cross-Cultural Puzzle of International Human Resource Management. *Human Resource Management*, 25 (1), 91-102.
- Laurent, A. (1983). The Cultural Diversity of Western Conceptions of Management. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 13 (1-2), 75-96.
- LeVine, A., & White, I. (1986). *Human Conditions*. New York: Routledge & Kagan Paul.

- Lindblom, E. (1959). The Science of Muddling Through. *Public Administration Review*, 19(Spring), 79-88.
- Littlejohn, D. (1997). Internationalization in Hotels: Current Aspects and Developments. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9, 187-192.
- Lodge, C., & Vogel, E. (1987). *Ideology and National Competitiveness*, (Eds.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Malley, M. (1997). Mergers and Acquisitions. *Hotel & Motel Management*, 212(20), 36-46.
- Markides, C. (1999). In search of Strategy. *Sloan Management Review*, 40(3), 6-7.
- Markoczy, L. (2000). National Culture and Strategic Change in Belief Formation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31, 427-442.
- Marquardt, M., & Engel, D. (1993). *Global Human Resource Development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mathews, V. (2000). Competition in International Hotel Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(2), 114-118.
- McGlashan, R., & Singleton, T. (1987). *Strategic Management*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith- a Failure of Analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89-118.

- Miles, R. E., & Snow, C.C. (1978). *Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Miles, R. E. & Snow, C. (1994). *Fit, Failure, and the Hall of Fame: How Companies Succeed or Fail*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Miller, D. (1987). The Structural and Environmental Correlates of Business Strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8(1), 55-76.
- Miller, D., Kets de Vries, M., & Toulouse, J. (1982). Top Executive Locus of Control and its Relationship to Strategy-Making, Structure and Environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 237-253.
- Minturn, L., & Lambert, W. (1964). *Mothers of Six Cultures*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Mintzberg, H. (1987). The Strategy Concept: Five Ps for Strategy. *California Management Review*, 30(1), 11-24.
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B. & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategic Safari*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Mintzberg, H., & Waters, J. (1985). Of Strategies Deliberate and Emergent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6, 257-272.
- Mintzberg, H., & McHugh, A. (1985). Strategy Formulation in an Adhocracy. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 30, 160-197.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-47.

- Moutinho, L., McDonagh, P., Peris, S., & Bigne', E. (1995). The Future Development of the Hotel Sector: An International Comparison. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 7(4), 10-15.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Nakata, C., & Sivakumar, K. (1996). National Culture and New Product Development: An Integrative Review. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(January), 61-72.
- Nasif, E.G., Al-Daeaj, H.A., Ebrahimi, B., & Thibodeaux, M.S. (1991). Methodological Problems in Cross-Cultural Research: An Updated Review. *Management International Review*, 31, 79-91.
- Negandhi, R. (1983). Cross Cultural Management Research: Trend and Future. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2), 17-28.
- Newman, K., & Nollen, S. (1996). Culture and Congruence: The Fit Between Management Practice and National Culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27, 753-780.
- Newman, H., Summer, E., & Warren, K. (1977). *The Process of Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nicbolson, J., & Stepina, P. (1998). Cultural Values: A Cross-National Study. *Cross-Cultural Management*, 5(1), 34-49.
- Nonaka, I., & Johansson, K. (1985). Japanese Management: What About 'Hard Skills?' *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 181-191.

- Norburn, D. (1987). Corporate Leaders in Britain and America: A Cross-National Analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18(3), 15-32.
- Norbrun, D., & Birley, S. (1988). The Top Management team and Corporate Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 225-237.
- Nunnally, J. (1987). *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olsen, M. (2004). Literature in Strategic Management in the Hospitality Industry. *Hospitality Management*, 23, 411-424.
- Olsen, M., Murthy, B., & Teare, R. (1994). CEO Perspectives on Scanning the Global Hotel Business Environment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 6(4), 3-9.
- O'Regan, N., & Ghobadian, A. (2002). Effective Strategic Planning in Small and Medium Sized Firms. *Management Decision*, 40 (7), 663 - 671.
- Pang, C., Roberts, D., & Sutton, J. (1998). Doing Business in China - The Art of War? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10, 272-282.
- Parnell, J. (2004). Variations in Strategic Philosophy Among American and Mexican Managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50 (3), 269-278.
- Parnell, J. (2005). Strategic Philosophy and Management Level. *Management Decision*, 43 (2), 157-170.
- Peppas, S.C. (2001). Sub-Cultural Similarities and Differences: An Examination of US Core Values. *Cross Cultural Management*, 8(1), 59-70.

- Peterson, F., Smith, B., Akande, A., & Ayestarom, S. (1995). Role Conflict, Ambiguity, and Work Load: A 12-nation study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 429-452.
- Perlitz, M. (1993). Why Most Strategies fail today: The Need for Strategy Innovations. *European Management Journal*, 11(1), 114-121.
- Pizam, A. (1993). Managing Cross-Cultural Hospitality Enterprises. In P. Jones & A. Pizam (Eds.), *The International Hospitality Industry*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Pizam, A., Pine, R., Mok, C., & Shin, J. (1997). Nationality vs. Industry Cultures: Which has a Greater Effect on Managerial Behavior? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 127-145.
- Phelan, S., Ferreira, M. & Salvador, R. (2002). The First Twenty Years of the Strategic Management Journal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 1161-1168.
- Pongyeela, A. (1995). A Comparative Study of Leadership Styles Among American and Thai Female Managers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Porter, M. (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Porter, M. (1997). Creating Tomorrow's Advantages. In R. Gibson (Ed.), *Rethinking the Future*. London: Necholas Brealey Publishing.
- Prahalad, C., & Bettis, A. (1986). The Dominant Logic: A New Linkage Between Diversity and Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 485-501.

- Puffer, M. (1993). A Riddle Wrapped in an Enigma: Demystifying Russian Managerial Motivation. *European Management Journal*, 11, 473-480.
- Punnet, B., & Withame, S. (1990). Hofstede Value Survey Module: To Embrace or to Abandon? *Advances in Comparative Management*, 5(1), 69-89.
- Quinn, B. (1980). *Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism*. Homewood, IL: Richard C. Irwin, Inc.
- Ralston, D.A., Gustafson, D. J., Cheung, F.M., & Terpstra, R.H. (1993). Differences in Managerial Values: A Study of U.S., Hong Kong, and PRC Managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(2), 249-275.
- Redding, G. (1993). *The spirit of Chinese Capitalism*. New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Reid, D., & Hinkley, C. (1989). Strategic Planning: The Cultural Impact. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 7(11/12), 4-12.
- Rhyne, L. C. (1985). The Relationship of Information Usage Characteristics to Planning System Sophistication: An Empirical Examination. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6, 319-337.
- Rhyne, L.C. (1986). The Relationship of Strategic Planning to Financial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 423-436.
- Robertson, C., Al-Khatib, J., & Al-Habib, M. (2002). The Relationship between Arab Values and Work Beliefs: An Exploratory Examination. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 44, 583-601.
- Robinson, B., & Pearce, A. (1983). The Impact of Formalized Planning on Financial Performance in Small Organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4, 197-208.

- Robinson, V. (1983). Review of Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. *Work and Occupations*, 10(1), 110-115.
- Rodrigues, A. (1990). The Situation and National Culture as Contingencies for Leadership behavior: Two Conceptual Models. In B. Prasad (Ed.), *Advances in International Comparative Management*, (pp. 52-68). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Rodrigues, A. (1995). Headquarters-Foreign Subsidiary Control Relationships. *Empowerment in Organizations: An International Journal*, 3(3), 25-34.
- Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering Countries on Attitudinal Dimensions: A Review and Synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 435-454.
- Ross, D. (1999). Culture as a Context for Multinational Business: A Framework for Assessing the Strategy-Culture 'Fit'. *Multinational Business Review*, 7(1), 13-19.
- Rothwell, W., & Kanas, H. (1994). *Human Resource Development: A Strategic Approach*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press Inc.
- Scarborough, J. (1998). Comparing Chinese and Western Cultural Roots: Why "East is East and West is West". *Business Horizons*, 41 (6), 15-23.
- Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Schein, E. (1999). *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide: Sense and Nonsense About Corporate Culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Schneider, S., & De Meyer, A. (1991). Interpreting and Responding to Strategic Issues: The Impact of National Culture. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 307-320.

- Schneider, S. (1989). Strategy Formulation: The Impact of National Culture. *Organization Studies*, 10, 149-168.
- Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. (1987). Linking Competitive Strategies with Human Resource Development Practices. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1, 207-219.
- Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the Content of and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, (pp.1-16). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. (1994). Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values. In U. Kim, H. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications*, (pp. 85-119). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sekaran, U. (1983). Methodological and Theoretical Issues and Advancements in Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2), 61-73.
- Selmer, J., Kang, L., & Wright, P. (1994). Managerial Behavior of Expatriate Versus Local Bosses. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 24(3), 48-63.
- Shane, A. (1995). Uncertainty Avoidance and the Preference for Innovation Championing Roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26(1), 47-68.
- Sims, P., & Gioia, A. (1986). *The Thinking Organization*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Slater, S., & Atuahene-Gima, K. (2004). Conducting Survey Research in Strategic Management. In D. Kethchen & D. Bergh. (Eds.), *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, (pp. 227-249). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Inc.

- Smeds, R. (1997). Radical Change through Incremental Innovations: Generic Principles and Cultural Differences in Evolution Management. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 14 (2), 146-162.
- Smircich L., & Stubbart, C. (1985). Strategic Management in an Enacted World. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 724-736.
- Smith, B., Dungan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National Culture and the Values of Organizational Employees: A Dimensional Analysis Across 43 Countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 231-264.
- Smith, P. (1992). Organizational Behavior and National Cultures. *British Journal of Management*, 3(1), 39-51.
- Smith, P., & Bond, M. (1993). *Social Psychology Across Cultures*. New York, NY: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Sondergaard, M. (1994). Hofstede's Consequences: A Study of Reviews, Citations and Replications. *Organization Studies*, 15, 447-456.
- Song, J. (1982). Diversification Strategies and Experiences of Top Executives in Large Firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3, 377-380.
- Song, Y., & Meek, C. (1998). The Impact of Culture on Management Values and Beliefs in Korean Firms. *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 1(1).
- Starbuck, W., & Milliken, F. (1988). Executives' Perceptual Filters: What they Notice and How they Make Sense. In D. Hambrick (Ed.), *The Executive Effect: Concepts and Methods for Studying Top Managers*. Greenwich, CT: JAI press.

- Stathakopoulos, V. (1998). Enhancing the Performance of Marketing Managers: Aligning Strategy, Structure and Evaluation Systems. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32 (5/6), 536 - 558.
- Stephens, G., & Greer, C. (1995). Doing Business in Mexico: Understanding Cultural Differences. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24(1), 39-55.
- Sullivan, J., & Nonaka, I. (1988). Culture and Strategic Issue Categorization Theory. *Management International Review*, 28(3), 6-10.
- Susskind, A.M., Miller, V.D., & Johnson, J.D. (1998). Downsizing and Structural Holes: Their Impact on Layoff Survivors' Perceptions of Organizational Chaos and Openness to Change. *Communication Research*, 25 (1), 30-65.
- Sweeney, E., & Hardaker, G. (1994). The Importance of Organizational and National Culture. *European Business Review*, 94(5), 3-14.
- Swierczek, F. (1991). Leadership and Culture: Comparing Asian Managers. *Leadership and Development Journal*, 12(7), 3-10.
- Tangen, S. (2003). An Overview of Frequently Used Performance Measures. *Work Study*, 52, 347-355
- Terpestra, V., & David, K. (1991). *Cultural Environment of International Business*. 3rd Ed. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Thomas, R. (1993). Interviewing Important People in Big Companies. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22(1), 80-96.
- Thomas, A., & Ramaswamy, K. (1996). Matching Managers to Strategy: Further Tests of the Miles and Snow Typology. *British Journal of Management*, 7, 247-261.

- Thompson, A., & Strickland, A. (1999). *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*. 11th Ed. Irwin / McGraw Hill.
- Toothacker, L.E. (1993). *Multiple Comparisons Procedures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Torbrion, I. (1985). The Structure of Managerial Roles in Cross-cultural Settings. *International Studies of Management and Organization Development Journal*, 16(6), 27-34.
- Triandis, H. (1982). Dimensions of Cultural Variation as Parameters of Organizational Theories. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 12 (4), 139-169.
- Triandis, H. (1993) .The Contingency Model in Cross-Cultural Perspective. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership and Research*, (pp. 167-188). New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.
- Triandis, H., McCusker, & Hui, C. (1990). Multimethod Probes of Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (5), 1006-1020.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the Waves of Culture* .2nd Ed. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing Ltd.
- Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*. Chicago, IL: Irwin.
- Ueno, S., & Sekaran, U. (1992). The Influence of Culture on budget Control Practices in the USA and Japan: An Empirical Study. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23, 659-674.

- Usunier, J. (1998). *International and Cross-Cultural Management Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Voronov, M., & Singer, J. (2002). The Myth of Individualism–Collectivism: A Critical Review. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*, 461-480.
- Yousef D. A. (1998). Predictors of Decision-Making Styles in a non-Western Country. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *19*(7), 366-373.
- Wagner, J. & Moch, M. (1986). Individualism-Collectivism: Concept and Measure. *Group & Organization Studies: An International Journal*, *11*, 280-303.
- Walsh, J., & Fahey, L. (1986). The Role of Negotiated Belief Structures in Strategy Making. *Journal of Management*, *12*, 325-338.
- Watts R. (1994). The Monkey and the Fish Revisited – Cultural Pitfalls for the Management Developer. Paper presented at conference on *Challenging learning: The experience of management*. Blackrod, Bolton, 20-22 November.
- Weick, K. (1985). The Significance of Corporate Culture. In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Lois, C. Lundberg & J. Marting (Eds.), *Organizational Culture*, (pp. 381-389). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Whitely, W., & England, G. (1980). Variability in Common Dimensions of Managerial Values Due to Value Orientation and Country Differences. *Personnel Psychology*, *33*, 77-78.
- Williamson, D. (2002). Forward from a Critique of Hofstede’s Model of National Culture. *Human Relations*, *55*, 1373-1395.

- Withiam, G. (1997). More Consolidation Ahead. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administrative Quarterly*, 38(3), p.13.
- Wong, G.Y., & Birnbaum-More, P.H. (1994). Culture, Context and Structure: A Test on Hong Kong Banks. *Organization Studies*, 15(1), 99-123.
- Wong, K. K., & Kwan, C. (2001). An Analysis of the Competitive Strategies of Hotels and Travel Agents in Hong Kong and Singapore. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13, 293-303.
- Wright, P. & Newton, B. (1998). Management Training Challenges in Vietnam. *Corporate University Review*, July/August, 40-41.
- Wu, A., Costa, J., & Teare, R. (1998). Using Environmental Scanning for Business Expansion into China and Eastern Europe: The Case of Transnational Hotel Companies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10, 257-263.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument - English Version

Dear Manager,

My name is Baker Ayoun , a doctoral student in the School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration at Oklahoma State University. I am currently doing an international survey of hotel managers from different countries and would like to ask for your help and participation in this survey.

This research study is designed to help us assess how hotel managers from different countries go about developing their business strategy. Examining the influence of culture on business strategy would help hotel executives to comprehend how approaches to strategy development and implementation are bound to differ from nation to another as a function of differences in shared norms and beliefs among individuals within each culture. Such understanding will enable hotel managers to minimize misconceptions, misinterpretations, and frustrations, while increasing their tolerance for deviations in strategic behavior.

Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. This research study is approved by the Institutional Review Board IRB at the university (irb@okstate.edu) and poses no risk to you greater than those encountered in daily life. Participants in this survey will not be asked about their names, ID numbers, or any forms of codes that can identify their identities. Upon your request, a summary of the research results will be sent to you once the study is completed. Please write your email address on the completed questionnaire to get the results summary.

Please remember that there is no right or wrong answer. I am mainly interested in learning about differences in approaches to developing business strategies by hotel managers in various countries.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please respond to all of the questions on the survey by June 20 , 2006 and return the completed questionnaire via the enclosed postage-paid envelop provided in this packet. If you have any questions concerning this research study, you could contact me at baker.ayoun@okstate.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this research study.

Sincerely,

Baker Ayoun, MBA

Doctoral Student
Oklahoma State University
School of Hotel & Restaurant Administration
210 HESW
Stillwater, Ok 74078
baker.ayoun@okstate.edu
(405)332-2527

Section A: In this section of the survey, you will see a series of statements. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements by circling the choice number next to the statement.... (Please choose one answer in each line across):

- 1 = Strongly Disagree**
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. It is difficult to teach one the ability to formulate an outstanding business strategy.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Individual performance of managers should be the main focus for strategy performance evaluation.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Middle and lower-level managers and other employees should make significant contributions to the hotel strategy formulation process.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Employee's problems and/or needs are as important as the task to be achieved.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Evaluation of hotel business strategy should stress short-term measures of performance.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Strategy making is more an analytical process than an art or intuition.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The strategy formulation process should be controlled by top executives.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Revisions should be used to make midcourse adjustments to hotel strategy, and to determine whether or not its strategic activities should be terminated.	1	2	3	4	5
9. It is more important for a hotel executive to have quantitative and analytical skills as opposed to people skills.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Effective strategies usually result from a detailed, systematic formulation process.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Strategic objectives of the hotel should be mainly concerned with developing good relationships in and outside the business.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The best way to develop a business strategy is through the use of systematic planning steps.	1	2	3	4	5

13. Strategy performance should be evaluated mainly on the basis of group achievements and meeting organizational goals. (For example, return on sales, return on assets and equity...)	1	2	3	4	5
14. Intermediate results of a strategic efforts should be compared with previously defined indicators of the long-term success or failure of the efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Long-term evaluations of hotel business strategy (3 years or more) are more valuable than short-term range evaluations.	1	2	3	4	5
16. To develop hotel business strategies, subjective data that are based on perception or opinion are more useful than objective data that are based on facts.	1	2	3	4	5
17. It is the responsibility of the top management to develop a climate in the hotel that supports the strategic control effort.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Top executives should drive the strategy-making process, because they are the most experienced.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Strategic objectives set for the hotel should aim at broad achievements, including managers' personal growth.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Strategic objectives of the hotel should focus mainly on the achievement of specific goals and the vision.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Identifying an effective process for strategy formulation is not difficult.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Meeting productivity and profitability targets is more important than developing relationships with employees.	1	2	3	4	5
23. To maintain secrecy, it is usually best that top executives avoid discussing the hotel business strategy with others in the hotel.	1	2	3	4	5
24. It is necessary to set detailed rules and procedures in place to direct the implementation of the hotel business strategy.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Benefits of individual managers should be considered when setting strategic business objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
26. It is important that a hotel be very flexible in implementing its business strategy.	1	2	3	4	5
27. The best data to use when developing hotel business strategy is the quantitative data (financial, economic...).	1	2	3	4	5

28. Please indicate how much effort you put into the following types of plans in your hotel by circling the choice number next to the statement.

- 1 = No Effort**
- 2 = Little Effort**
- 3 = Some Effort**
- 4 = Considerable Effort**
- 5 = A Great Deal of Effort**

- Less than 1 year plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 1 year plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 2 to 4 year plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 5 year plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 6 to 10 year plan	1	2	3	4	5
- over 10 year plan	1	2	3	4	5

29. Please indicate the extent to which you as a manager value the following five factors:

- 1 = Not at all**
- 2 = To a slight extent**
- 3 = To a moderate extent**
- 4 = To a great extent**
- 5 = To a very great extent**

- Being very reluctant to consider changing the way things are done.	1	2	3	4	5
- Willing to experiment with different systems and practices to improve work performance.	1	2	3	4	5
- Being receptive to suggestions for changes in strategic directions that needs to be pursued by the hotel.	1	2	3	4	5
- Accepting risky solutions with uncertain outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
- Being quick to look for new ideas in response to changing external events.	1	2	3	4	5

30. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree**
- 2 = Disagree**
- 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree**
- 4 = Agree**
- 5 = Strongly Agree**

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| - I measure my success by how well the hotel achieves its strategic objectives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond what is expected of me in order for this hotel to achieve its strategic objectives | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - I would encourage others in the hotel to work toward the achievement of the hotel's strategic objectives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - What my hotel is trying to achieve as strategic objectives is important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Section B: Background Information

31. Your gender:

- Male
- Female

32. Your age:

- 25 or younger
- 26 – 35
- 36 – 45
- 46 – 55
- 56 – 64
- 65 or over

33. Your years with the current hotel company:

- Less than 6 months
- 6 months to 1 year
- 1 to 2 years
- 2 to 4 years
- 4 to 6 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 10 to 15 years
- More than 15 years

34. Your years of experience in the hotel industry:

- Less than 6 months
- 6 months to 1 year
- 1 to 2 years
- 2 to 4 years
- 4 to 6 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 10 to 15 years
- More than 15 years

35. Your current managerial level:

- General Manager
- Vice President
- Other (Please Specify)

36. Which of the following best represents your functional background?

- Marketing and sales
- Human resources
- Hotel operations (housekeeping, food & beverage,...)
- Engineering
- Finance and accounting
- Other (*Please specify*)

37. Your highest education:

- High school or less
- Associate degree (2 years)
- Bachelor (4 years)
- Master degree
- Doctorate degree
- Other (*Please Specify*).....

38. What is your nationality?
39. What was your nationality at birth (if different)?
40. Approximately how many employees does your hotel employ?
- Full-time employees
- Part-time employees
41. How many rooms your hotel have?
42. In which country your hotel is located?
43. Approximately how many years have you worked in the hotel industry in other countries?

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

Appendix B

Survey Instrument - Malay Version

Tuan/Puan:

Salam Sejahtera. Saya, Baker Ayoun pelajar peringkat kedoktoran pengurusan hospitality di Oklahoma State Universiti, USA. Saya sedang menjalankan soal-selidik untuk projek tesis dan ingin meminta jasa baik anda untuk mengambil bahagian dalam soal-selidik ini.

Matlamat kajian ini adalah untuk menganalisa strategi perniagaan oleh pengurus-pengurus hotel dari beberapa buah negara. Tujuan utama kajian ini adalah untuk mempelajari bagaimana budaya dan strategi perniagaan mempengaruhi strategi perniagaan seseorang pengurus. Ianya akan dapat membantu pengurus hotel untuk memahami gelagat individu dari pelbagai budaya dan bangsa dan bagaimana mereka membuat keputusan.

Bersama-sama ini disertakan soalan untuk soal-selidik didalam bahasa Malaysia dan Inggeris, sila pilih bahasa yang sesuai untuk anda. Walaubagaimanapun, penyertaan anda didalam kajian ini adalah secara sukarela. Kajian ini tidak mempunyai sebarang risiko seperti yang anda alami pada hari-hari biasa. Penyelidikan ini juga telah mendapat kelulusan dari pihak pengurusan penyelidikan universiti (Institutional Review Board, IRB, irb@okstate.edu). Nama dan nombor pengenalan anda tidak diperlukan untuk penyertaan didalam kajian ini. Kami juga tidak menggunakan sebarang kod atau apa jua kaedah untuk mengetahui identiti peserta. Pada penghujung kajian ini, rumusan soal-selidik ini akan diterbitkan dan saya akan menghantar rumusan soal-selidik ini kepada sesiapa yang berminat untuk mendapatkannya. Sila lampirkan e-mail anda dipenghujung soal-selidik ini.

Untuk pengetahuan anda, tiada jawapan yang betul atau salah dalam kajian ini. Saya cuma berminat untuk mempelajari cara-cara pengurus hotel dari pelbagai negara merancang strategi perniagaan mereka.

Soal-selidik ini hanya akan mengambil 10 minit sahaja. Diharapkan agar anda dapat menjawab semua soalan dan mengposkannya kembali menggunakan sampul-surat berstem dan beralamat sendiri yang dilampirkan bersama-sama soal selidik ini selewatnya-lewatnya pada 27hb Jun, 2006. Jika anda mempunyai sebarang pertanyaan mengenai kajian ini, anda boleh menghubungi saya di alamat e-mail, baker.ayoun@okstate.edu.

Terima kasih diatas penyertaan anda di dalam kajian ini.

Yang benar,

Pelajar Ijazah Kedoktoran,

Doctoral Student
School of Hotel & Restaurant Administration
210 HESW
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Ok 74075 U.S.A
baker.ayoun@okstate.edu

Bahagian A: Didalam bahagian ini, anda akan melihat beberapa siri kenyataan. Sila nyatakan sejauh manakah anda bersetuju atau tidak bersetuju dengan kenyataan tersebut dengan memilih nombor yang sesuai disebelah kenyataan itu. (Sila pilih satu jawapan sahaja)

- 1 = Sangat tidak bersetuju**
2 = Tidak bersetuju
3 = Berkecuali
4 = Bersetuju
5 = Sangat Bersetuju

Adakah sukar untuk mengajar seseorang cara untuk mengubal strategi perniagaan	1	2	3	4	5
Prestasi kerja seseorang pengurus perlu dijadikan kriteria utama dalam proses menilai keberkesanan strategi.	1	2	3	4	5
Pengurus peringkat bawah dan pertengahan serta pekerja seharusnya menyumbang pendapat yang bernas dalam proses pengubalan strategi perniagaan.	1	2	3	4	5
Masalah dan keperluan pekerja adalah sama pentingnya dengan matlamat perniagaan yang ingin dicapai.	1	2	3	4	5
Penilaian strategi perniagaan perhotelan seharusnya menekankan juga matlamat jangka pendek.	1	2	3	4	5
Membuat strategi adalah proses yang memerlukan daya pemikiran yang tinggi jika dibandingkan dengan seni atau intuisi.	1	2	3	4	5
Proses merancang strategi perlu dikawal oleh pengurus atasan sahaja	1	2	3	4	5
Perubahan atau pembetulan ke atas strategi hotel perlu dilakukan atau dihentikan segera jika terdapat kesilapan.	1	2	3	4	5
Adalah penting untuk eksekutif perhotelan mempunyai kemahiran kuantitatif dan pemikiran yang tinggi berbanding kemahiran hubungan-roya.	1	2	3	4	5
Strategi yang efektif adalah hasil dari proses rumusan yang terperinci.	1	2	3	4	5
Matlamat strategi yang utama sesebuah hotel adalah untuk menjalin hubungan yang baik di dalam dan di luar ruang lingkup perniagaan.	1	2	3	4	5
Cara yang paling baik untuk merancang strategi perniagaan adalah dengan menggunakan rancangan yang bersistematik.	1	2	3	4	5
Perlaksanaan dan kejayaan strategi seharusnya dinilai berdasarkan kejayaan kumpulan sejajar dengan matlamat organisasi.	1	2	3	4	5

Pencapaian jangka pendek program strategi mesti dibandingkan dengan kejayaan jangka panjang atau kegagalan program yang lepas.	1	2	3	4	5
Penilaian jangka panjang strategi perniagaan perhotelan (lebih dari 3 tahun) adalah lebih bererti dari penilaian jangka pendek.	1	2	3	4	5
Untuk membangunkan strategi perniagaan perhotelan, data berbentuk subjektif seperti pendapat dan buah fikiran adalah lebih penting dari data objektif yang nyata.	1	2	3	4	5
Adalah menjadi tanggungjawab pihak pengurusan untuk mewujudkan suasana positif bagi menyokong kawalan strategi dihotel.	1	2	3	4	5
Eksekutif atasan mesti mengetuai proses membuat strategi kerana mereka sangat berpengalaman.	1	2	3	4	5
Objektif strategik perhotelan yang dirumuskan seharusnya mempunyai hala tuju yang luas termasuk juga aspek perkembangan peribadi pengurus.	1	2	3	4	5
Objektif strategik hotel hanya perlu fokus kepada pencapaian sesuatu tujuan dan visi sahaja.	1	2	3	4	5
Mengenal pasti proses yang efektif untuk merumuskan strategi adalah tidak sukar.	1	2	3	4	5
Meningkatkan produktiviti dan keuntungan semata-mata adalah lebih penting dari perhubungan sesama pekerja.	1	2	3	4	5
Cara terbaik untuk merahsiakan strategi perniagaan perhotelan adalah dimana pihak pengurusan atasan tidak seharusnya berbincang dengan orang lain di sekitar kawasan hotel.	1	2	3	4	5
Adalah sangat penting untuk menyediakan perincian perancangan dan peraturan pengurusan sebelum ia dilaksanakan.	1	2	3	4	5
Pendapatan atau keuntungan untuk seseorang pengurus mesti diambil kira semasa merumuskan strategi perniagaan.	1	2	3	4	5
Adalah penting untuk hotel memberi kelonggaran semasa melaksanakan strategi perniagaan.	1	2	3	4	5
Data yang terbaik untuk digunakan dalam mengembangkan strategik perniagaan perhotelan adalah data kuantitatif (data kewangan, ekonomi....)	1	2	3	4	5

Sila nyatakan sebanyak manakah penekanan atau usaha yang anda berikan apabila membuat perancangan di hotel. Sila pilih nombor yang sesuai di sebelah kenyataan tersebut.

- 1 = Tiada usaha/penekanan langsung**
- 2 = Sangat sedikit usaha/ penekanan**
- 3 = Sedikit usaha/penekanan**
- 4 = Bersungguh-sungguh berusaha/ memberi penekanan**
- 5 = Terlalu banyak usaha dan memberi penekanan serius**

- Perancangan kurang dari satu tahun	1	2	3	4	5
- Perancangan 1 tahun	1	2	3	4	5
- Perancangan 2 hingga 4 tahun	1	2	3	4	5
- Perancangan 5 tahun	1	2	3	4	5
- Perancangan 6 hingga 10 tahun	1	2	3	4	5
- Perancangan lebih dari 10 tahun	1	2	3	4	5

Sila nyatakan sikap anda sebagai seorang pengurus menilai lima fakta dibawah:

- 1 = Tidak minat sama sekali**
- 2 = Menunjukkan sedikit minat**
- 3 = Menunjukkan minat**
- 4 = Berminat**
- 5 = Terlalu berminat**

- Sangat sukar untuk mengubah perkara yang telah menjadi kebiasaan	1	2	3	4	5
- Bersedia untuk menggunakan pelbagai cara untuk meningkatkan prestasi kerja.	1	2	3	4	5
- Bersedia menerima idea atau pengunjuran baru di dalam pengurusan strategik di hotel.	1	2	3	4	5
- Bersedia menghadapi risiko tanpa mengetahui hasilnya.	1	2	3	4	5
- Cepat mendapatkan idea terkini disebabkan tindakan persekitaran.	1	2	3	4	5

Sila nyatakan pendapat anda dengan bersetuju atau tidak bersetuju dengan kenyataan dibawah.

- 1 = Sangat tidak bersetuju**
2 = Tidak bersetuju
3 = Neutral
4 = Bersetuju
5 = Sangat Bersetuju

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| - Saya mengukur kejayaan saya melalui tahap kejayaan objektif strategik hotel. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Saya sanggup untuk berkerja keras untuk hotel ini demi mencapai objektif strategiknya. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Saya akan mendorong pekerja di hotel ini untuk bekerja keras bagi mencapai objektif strategik hotel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Objektif strategik yang mahu dicapai oleh hotel adalah penting untuk saya | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Bahagian B: Sila tandakan keterangan yang terbaik mengenai anda.

Jantina:	Umur:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Lelaki	<input type="checkbox"/> Dibawah 25 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 26 – 35
<input type="checkbox"/> Perempuan	<input type="checkbox"/> 36 – 45	<input type="checkbox"/> 46 – 55
	<input type="checkbox"/> 56 – 64	<input type="checkbox"/> Lebih 60 tahun

Berapa tahun anda telah berkerja di hotel ini:		Berapa tahun pengalaman anda berkerja dalam industri perhotelan:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Kurang dari 6 bulan	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 bulan ke 1 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> Kurang dari 6 bulan	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 bulan ke 1 tahun
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 2 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 - 4 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 2 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 - 4 tahun
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 - 6 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 - 6 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10 tahun
<input type="checkbox"/> 10 - 15 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> Lebih dari 15 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 - 15 tahun	<input type="checkbox"/> Lebih dari 15 tahun

Jawatan pengurusan anda pada masa ini

- Pengurus Besar
 Timbalan President/VP
 Lain-lain (nyatakan).....

Manakah di antara berikut mencerminkan latarbelakang pekerjaan anda?	Tahap pengajian anda:
<input type="checkbox"/> Permasaran dan jualan	<input type="checkbox"/> Sekolah menengah
<input type="checkbox"/> Pengurusan perjawatan	<input type="checkbox"/> Diploma/Sijil (2 tahun)
<input type="checkbox"/> Operasi perhotelan (jabatan pengurusan bilik, jabatan makanan& minuman, ...)	<input type="checkbox"/> Sarjana Muda (4 tahun)
<input type="checkbox"/> Kejuruteraan	<input type="checkbox"/> Sarjana
<input type="checkbox"/> Kewangan dan perakaunan	<input type="checkbox"/> Ijazah Kedoktoran
<input type="checkbox"/> Lain-lain (nyatakan)	<input type="checkbox"/> Lain-lain (nyatakan).....

Apakah kerakyatan anda?

Negara kelahiran anda (jika berlainan)?

Jumlah pekerja di hotel anda?

- Sepenuh masa.....
- Separuh masa.....

Berapa banyak bilik di hotel anda?

Di negara manakah letaknya hotel anda?

**Nyatakan lebih kurang berapa tahun anda pernah berkerja hotel di negara asing?
.....**

Terima kasih diatas kerjasama anda.

Appendix C

Survey Instrument - Thai Version

เรียน ท่านผู้จัดการโรงแรม

Baker Ayoun ผู้วิจัย เป็นนักศึกษาปริญญาเอกของ School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration, Oklahoma State University ผู้วิจัยกำลังทำวิทยานิพนธ์ระดับปริญญาเอก ดังนั้นจึงใคร่ขอความร่วมมือจากท่านในการตอบแบบสอบถาม เรื่อง กลยุทธ์พฤติกรรมของผู้จัดการโรงแรม โดยงานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ ศึกษาความแตกต่างในการพัฒนากลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจของผู้จัดการโรงแรมในแต่ละประเทศ

การศึกษาอิทธิพลของวัฒนธรรมที่มีต่อกลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจ จะช่วยให้ผู้บริหารโรงแรมทราบถึงวิธีการ ในการพัฒนาและปฏิบัติตามกลยุทธ์ที่แตกต่างกันในแต่ละประเทศ ความเข้าใจในเรื่องดังกล่าวจะส่งผลให้ ผู้จัดการโรงแรมสามารถลดการตีความที่พลาดในเรื่องของแนวความคิด การแปลความหมายและ ความขัดแย้ง ในการทำงาน และการวิจัยนี้จะช่วยเสริมสร้างความเข้าใจในกลยุทธ์เชิงพฤติกรรม ที่แตกต่างกันของผู้จัดการโรงแรม

การวิจัยเรื่องนี้เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการสำเร็จการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาเอก ด้าน Hospitality Administration ของ Oklahoma State University และได้รับการอนุญาตจาก คณะกรรมการตรวจสอบ ของมหาวิทยาลัย (Institutional Review Board (irb@okstate.edu)

การตอบแบบสอบถามขึ้นอยู่กับความสมัครใจของท่าน การศึกษานี้จะไม่มีผลกระทบต่อ การทำงานของท่าน แบบสอบถามจะไม่มีคำถาม ชื่อ เลขที่พนักงาน หรือข้อมูลอื่นใดที่สามารถ เชื่อมโยงถึงตัวท่าน เมื่องานวิจัยเสร็จสมบูรณ์ หากท่านมีความประสงค์จะทราบผลสรุป ของงานวิจัยในครั้งนี้ ท่านสามารถติดต่อผู้วิจัยได้ตาม อีเมล หรือ ที่อยู่ที่แจ้งไว้ในแบบสอบถามนี้

การตอบแบบสอบถามนี้จะใช้เวลา ประมาณ 10 นาที ขอความกรุณาตอบคำถามทุกข้อ ในแบบสอบถามภาษาไทยหรือภาษาอังกฤษ เพียงชุดใดชุดหนึ่ง และส่งแบบสอบถามที่สมบูรณ์กลับคืนมาในซองจดหมายที่แนบมาพร้อมนี้ ภายในวันที่ 10 กรกฎาคม 2549 หากท่านมีคำถามหรือข้อสงสัยประการใดเกี่ยวกับการวิจัยนี้ กรุณาติดต่อผู้วิจัยที่ baker.ayoun@okstate.edu หรือหมายเลขโทรศัพท์ 405-332-2527

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

Baker Ayoun

Doctoral Student
School of Hotel & Restaurant Administration
210 HESW
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075 U.S.A
baker.ayoun@okstate.edu

สถานที่ติดต่อในประเทศไทย:
Ms. Wanlanai Saiprasert
Department of Management
Faculty of Business Administration
Chiang Mai University
239 Huay Kaew Rd., Muang District
Chiang Mai 50200

ส่วนที่1:แบบสำรวจในส่วนนี้จะเป็นชุดของข้อความ

กรณาวางกล้อมรอบระดับความคิดเห็นของท่านในแต่ละข้อความ โดยเลือกเพียง 1 คำตอบในแต่ละข้อความ

1 = ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

2 = ไม่เห็นด้วย

3 = เฉยๆ

4 = เห็นด้วย

5 = เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

เป็นเรื่องยากที่จะสอนให้บุคลากรสามารถจัดทำกลยุทธ์ธุรกิจที่โดดเด่น	1	2	3	4	5
ผลการปฏิบัติงานของแต่ละผู้จัดการควรเป็นเรื่องหลักในการประเมินผลเชิงกลยุทธ์	1	2	3	4	5
ผู้บริหารระดับกลาง ผู้บริหารระดับล่าง และพนักงานควรมีส่วนร่วมในกระบวนการ กำหนดกลยุทธ์ของโรงแรม	1	2	3	4	5
ปัญหาและความต้องการด้านต่างๆของพนักงานมีความสำคัญเทียบเท่ากับการปฏิบัติงานให้บรรลุผลสำเร็จ	1	2	3	4	5
การประเมินกลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจของโรงแรมควรมุ่งเน้นการวัดผลงานในระยะสั้น	1	2	3	4	5
การจัดทำกลยุทธ์เป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับกระบวนการของการวิเคราะห์มากกว่าเป็นเรื่องเกี่ยวกับสัญชาตญาณ	1	2	3	4	5
กระบวนการจัดทำกลยุทธ์ควรมีการควบคุมโดยผู้บริหารระดับสูง	1	2	3	4	5
ควรมีการทบทวนในระหว่างการปฏิบัติงานเพื่อปรับกลยุทธ์ของโรงแรม	1	2	3	4	5
สำหรับผู้บริหารโรงแรม การมีทักษะด้านการวิเคราะห์มีความสำคัญมากกว่าการมีทักษะด้านบุคคล	1	2	3	4	5
กลยุทธ์ที่มีประสิทธิผลเป็นผลเนื่องจากการระบุรายละเอียด และกระบวนการของการกำหนดกลยุทธ์	1	2	3	4	5
วัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์ของโรงแรมควรมุ่งเน้นการพัฒนาสัมพันธภาพที่ดีทั้งภายในและภายนอกองค์กร	1	2	3	4	5
วิธีการที่ดีที่สุดในการในการพัฒนากลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจ คือ การมีขั้นตอนในการวางแผนอย่างเป็นระบบ	1	2	3	4	5
การประเมินผลงานเชิงกลยุทธ์ ควรมีการประเมินบนพื้นฐานของความสำเร็จจากการปฏิบัติงานของกลุ่ม และ การบรรลุเป้าหมายขององค์กร เช่น ผลตอบแทนต่อยอดขาย หรือ ผลตอบแทนต่อสินทรัพย์และทุน	1	2	3	4	5
ในระหว่างการปฏิบัติงานเชิงกลยุทธ์ ควรมีการนำผลงานนำมาเปรียบเทียบกับตัวชี้วัด	1	2	3	4	5

ที่ได้มีการกำหนดไว้ล่วงหน้า เพื่อวิเคราะห์ความสำเร็จหรือความล้มเหลวของ การปฏิบัติงานในระยะยาว					
การประเมินกลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจระยะยาว (3ปีหรือมากกว่า) มีประโยชน์กว่า การประเมินกลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจระยะสั้น	1	2	3	4	5
ในการพัฒนากลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจของโรงแรม ข้อมูลด้านความคิดเห็นมีประโยชน์ มากกว่าข้อมูลที่เป็นเรื่องของข้อเท็จจริง	1	2	3	4	5
ผู้บริหารระดับสูงมีหน้าที่รับผิดชอบในการสร้างบรรยากาศในองค์กร ที่สนับสนุนการควบคุมเชิงกลยุทธ์	1	2	3	4	5
ผู้บริหารระดับสูงควรเป็นฝ่ายกระตุ้นกระบวนการสร้างกลยุทธ์ เนื่องจากเป็นกลุ่มที่มีประสบการณ์มากที่สุด	1	2	3	4	5
วัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์ของโรงแรมควรมุ่งที่การบรรลุผลงานในภาพกว้าง รวมทั้ง ความก้าวหน้าในองค์กรของผู้จัดการ	1	2	3	4	5
วัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์ของโรงแรมควรมุ่งที่การบรรลุผลในเป้าหมายและ วิสัยทัศน์เป็นเรื่องหลัก	1	2	3	4	5
การกำหนดกระบวนการจัดทำกลยุทธ์ที่มีประสิทธิผลเป็นเรื่องที่ไม่ยาก	1	2	3	4	5
การบรรลุเป้าหมายด้านการผลิต และความสามารถในการทำกำไร มีความสำคัญมากกว่าการพัฒนาความสัมพันธ์กับบุคลากร	1	2	3	4	5
วิธีการที่ดีที่สุดในการรักษาข้อมูลลับขององค์กร คือ ผู้บริหารระดับสูงควรหลีกเลี่ยง การสนทนาเกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจของโรงแรมกับบุคลากรอื่นๆของโรงแรม	1	2	3	4	5
การกำหนดรายละเอียดของกฎและกระบวนการในการควบคุมเพื่อปฏิบัติตาม กลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจของโรงแรมเป็นเรื่องที่มีความสำคัญ	1	2	3	4	5
ในการกำหนดวัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์ธุรกิจควรมีการคำนึงถึงผลประโยชน์ของ ผู้จัดการแต่ละคน	1	2	3	4	5
ความยืดหยุ่นในการปฏิบัติตามแผนเชิงธุรกิจของโรงแรมเป็นเรื่องที่สำคัญมาก	1	2	3	4	5
ข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณ หรือข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับตัวเลข เช่น ข้อมูลด้านการเงิน ข้อมูลด้าน เศรษฐกิจ เป็นข้อมูลที่ดีที่สุดในการจัดทำกลยุทธ์เชิงธุรกิจของโรงแรม	1	2	3	4	5

กรุณาลือคาคำตอบเพื่อระบุถึงความเกี่ยวข้องของท่านกับการวางแผนและการปฏิบัติแผนในแต่ละประเภทในโรรงแรม ของท่าน

- 1 = ไม่ได้ใช้ความพยายาม
- 2 = ใช้ความพยายามเล็กน้อย
- 3 = ใช้ความพยายามบางส่วน
- 4 = ใช้ความพยายามมาก
- 5 = ใช้ความพยายามมากที่สุด

- แผนระยะเวลาสั้นกว่า 1 ปี	1	2	3	4	5
- แผนระยะเวลา 1 ปี	1	2	3	4	5
- แผนระยะเวลา 2 – 4 ปี	1	2	3	4	5
- แผนระยะเวลา 5 ปี	1	2	3	4	5
- แผนระยะเวลา 6 – 10 ปี	1	2	3	4	5
- แผนระยะเวลายาวกว่า 10 ปี	1	2	3	4	5

ในฐานะที่ท่านเป็นผู้จัดการ โปรดเลือกระดับการวัดค่าห้าปีจ้ดดังต่อไปนี้:

- 1 = ไม่มีค่า
- 2 = ระดับเล็กน้อย
- 3 = ระดับปานกลาง
- 4 = ระดับมาก
- 5 = ระดับมากที่สุด

- ท่านเห็นว่าการเปลี่ยนแปลงวิธีการในการทำงานเป็นเรื่องยาก	1	2	3	4	5
- ท่านพร้อมที่จะทดสอบระบบต่างๆและฝึกฝนที่จะพัฒนาศักยภาพการทำงาน	1	2	3	4	5
- ท่านพร้อมที่จะยอมรับข้อแนะนำสำหรับการเปลี่ยนแปลงในแผนงานที่ทางโรงแรมเสนอ	1	2	3	4	5
- ท่านยอมรับผลของความเสีงกับผลลัพธ์ที่ไม่แน่นอน	1	2	3	4	5
- ท่านตอบสนองความคิดเห็นใหม่ๆ สำหรับการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหตุการณ์ภายนอก	1	2	3	4	5

โปรดระบุขอบเขตที่ท่านเห็นด้วยหรือไม่เห็นด้วยในประโยคต่อไปนี้:

1 = ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

2 = ไม่เห็นด้วย

3 = เฉยๆ

4 = เห็นด้วย

5 = เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

- ฉันวัดความสำเร็จโดยพิจารณาถึงการบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์
ของโรงแรม

1 2 3 4 5

- ฉันปรารถนาที่จะทำงานมากกว่าที่โรงแรมคาดหวังเพื่อการบรรลุ
วัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์ของโรงแรม

1 2 3 4 5

- ฉันสนับสนุนคนอื่นในโรงแรมให้ทำงานบรรลุเป้าหมายและวัตถุประสงค์ของโรงแรม

1 2 3 4 5

- สิ่งที่โรงแรมของฉันพยายามจะบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์เชิงกลยุทธ์
เป็นสิ่งสำคัญต่อฉัน

1 2 3 4 5

ส่วนที่ สอง: ข้อมูลส่วนบุคคล

เพศ

ชาย

หญิง

อายุ:

25 หรืออ่อนกว่า

26 – 35

36 – 45

46 – 55

56 – 64

65 หรือมากกว่า

อายุการทำงานในโรงแรมแห่งนี้:

น้อยกว่า 6 เดือน

6 เดือน - 1 ปี

1 - 2 ปี

2 - 4 ปี

4 - 6 ปี

6 - 10 ปี

10 - 15 ปี

มากกว่า 15 ปี

อายุการทำงานในธุรกิจโรงแรม:

น้อยกว่า 6 เดือน

6 เดือน - 1 ปี

1 - 2 ปี

2 - 4 ปี

4 - 6 ปี

6 - 10 ปี

10 - 15 ปี

มากกว่า 15 ปี

ตำแหน่งงานปัจจุบัน:

- ผู้จัดการทั่วไป

- รองประธาน

- อื่นๆ(โปรดระบุ)

โปรตรระบุสายงานของท่าน

- ฝ่ายขายและการตลาด
- ทรัพยากรบุคคล
- ลูกค้าสัมพันธ์และบริการ
- ฝ่ายงานช่าง เทคนิค
- ฝ่ายการเงินและบัญชี
- อื่นๆ(โปรตรระบุ)

การศึกษา

- มัธยมศึกษาดอนปลาย หรือ น้อยกว่า
- อนุปริญญา
- ปริญญาตรี
- ปริญญาโท
- ปริญญาเอก
- อื่นๆ(โปรตรระบุ)

เชื้อชาติ

สัญชาติ (ประเทศที่เกิด)

จำนวนพนักงานในโรงแรม

- พนักงานประจำ
- พนักงานชั่วคราว

จำนวนห้องในโรงแรมที่ท่านทำงานอยู่

ประเทศที่โรงแรมท่านตั้งอยู่

อายุการทำงานในอุตสาหกรรมการโรงแรมในต่างประเทศ?

ขอบคุณสำหรับความร่วมมือของท่าน

Appendix D

Survey Instrument - Turkish Version

Sayın Yetkili,

Ben, Baker Ayoun, Oklahoma Eyalet Üniversitesinde Otel ve Restoran Yönetimi Bölümünde doktora öğrencisiyim. Şu anda değişik ülkelerden otel yöneticilerini içeren uluslararası bir anket düzenliyorum ve sizin de bu ankete katılmanızı istirham ediyorum.

Bu araştırmanın sonuçlanmasıyla otel yöneticileri, farklı kültürlerdeki yöneticilerin iş hayatındaki stratejik seçimlerini nasıl yaptıklarını ve kültür-stratejik seçim ilişkisini anlamış olacaklardır. Bu sayede otel yöneticilerinin kültür farklılıklarından kaynaklanan yanlış anlaşılmaları ve kaygıları en aza inerken, değişik stratejik davranışlara karşın tolerans düzeyleri artacaktır.

Ekteki anket iki dilde de yazılmıştır ve anketteki soruları cevaplamak tamamen isteğe bağlıdır. İstedığınız dilde anketi cevaplayabilirsiniz. Katılımcıların isimleri ve buna benzer kimliklerini belli edici hiçbir bilgi sorulmayacaktır. Bu çalışmanın ardından sonuçlara dayanarak bir makale yazılacak ve ilgili akademik dergilere basılması için gönderilecektir. İstemeniz halinde, bu anketin sonuçları tamamlandıktan sonra size gönderilecektir. Lütfen sonuçların size gönderilmesi için e-mail adresinizi yazmayı unutmayınız.

Ankette sorulan sorular için herhangi belirlenmiş doğru ve yanlış cevap söz konusu değildir. Daha çok ilgilendiğimiz nokta, cevaplardaki farklılıklardan yola çıkarak kültürel etkileri tespit etmektir.

Anketin toplam süresi 10 dakikadır. Lütfen anketteki bütün sorulara 29 Temmuz 2006 tarihine kadar cevap vermeye çalışınız. Anketi tamamladıktan sonra lütfen paketin içinde bulunan üzerinde adres yazılı zarfla gönderiniz. Bu çalışma ile ilgili bütün sorularınız için lütfen baker.ayoun@okstate.edu adresinden e-mail ile benimle irtibata geçiniz.

Şimdiden katılımlarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla,

Baker Ayoun, MBA

Doktora öğrencisi
School of Hotel & Restaurant Administration
210 HESW
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Ok 74075 U.S.A
baker.ayoun@okstate.edu

Türkiye sorumlusu

SORAY II SITESİ, A BLOK, KAT:
8 NO: 92
DAVULTEPE,
MERSİN, TÜRKİYE

Bölüm A: Anketin bu bölümünde bir takım ifadeler göreceksiniz. Lütfen bu ifadelere ne kadar katılıp katılmadığınızı ifadenin yanındaki seçeneği yuvarlak içine alarak belirtiniz...(Lütfen her cevap için aşağıdaki seçeneklerden birisini kullanınız):

- 1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
2 = Katılmıyorum
3 = Kararsızım
4 = Katılıyorum
5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum

Bir kişiye çok iyi bir iş stratejisini formüle etmeyi öğretmek zordur.	1	2	3	4	5
İdarecilerin kişisel performansları, strateji performansı değerlendirilmesinde temel odak olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Orta ve alt seviye idareciler ve diğer çalışanlar otel strateji formülasyonu aşamasında önemli katkılar yapmalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
Çalışanların problem ve/veya ihtiyaçları başarılacak görev kadar önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel ticari strateji değerlendirmesi, kısa dönem performans değerlendirmelerine önem vermelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
Strateji belirleme, bir sanat veya öngörü olmanın ötesinde analitik bir işlemdir.	1	2	3	4	5
Strateji formülasyon işlemi üst düzey yöneticilerin kontrolü altında olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel stratejisine ara ayarlamalar yapmak ve stratejik programın sonlandırılıp sonlandırılmayacağına karar vermek için revizyonlar yapılmalıdır	1	2	3	4	5
Bir otel yöneticisinin nicel ve analitik becerilere sahip olması, şahsi becerilere sahip olmasından daha önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5
Etkili stratejiler, genelde, detaylı ve sistematik formülasyon ile elde edilir.	1	2	3	4	5
Otelin stratejik hedefleri, başlıca, iş dahilinde ve haricinde iyi ilişkiler geliştirilmesi ile ilgili olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Bir iş stratejisi geliştirmede en iyi yol sistematik planlama basamaklarını kullanmaktır.	1	2	3	4	5
Strateji performansı, öncelikle, grup başarıları ve örgütsel hedeflere ulaşılma temel alınarak değerlendirilmelidir. (Örneğin, satışlarda iade, mal varlığında gerileme)	1	2	3	4	5
Stratejik programın ara sonuçları, programın önceden tanımlanmış uzun dönem başarı ve başarısızlık göstergeleri ile kıyaslanmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Otelin uzun dönem (3 veya daha fazla yıl) ticari strateji değerlendirmeleri, kısa dönem değerlendirmelerinden daha değerlidir.	1	2	3	4	5

Otelciliğin gelişmesi için, insanların düşüncelerine dayanan bilgiler gerçek olaylara dayanan bilgilerden daha faydalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Stratejik kontrol çabalarına işlerlik kazandırmak otel yöneticilerinin vazifesidir.	1	2	3	4	5
En tecrübeli olduklarından dolayı, otel üst düzey yöneticileri yönetim stratejisini planlamakla görevli olmalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel yönetimi stratejisi, yöneticilerin kariyer yükselişlerini kapsayacak kadar geniş olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Otelin stratejik amaçları genel itibariyle belirli noktalara ulaşmayı hedef tutmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel yönetim stratejisi geliştirildiği sırada etkin işlem sıralamasını belirtmek zor değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
Verimlilik ve karlılık hedeflerini tutturmak işçilerle iyi münasebetleri kurmaktan daha önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5
Gizliliğin korunması için, otel idarecileri yönetim stratejisini oteldeki diğer çalışanlarla tartışmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel yönetim strateji planını gerçekleştirmek için belirli kural ve işlemler belirlemek zorunludur.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel yönetim strateji planlarının kurulması sırasında idarecilerinin şahsi kararlarını dikkate alınması zorunludur.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel yönetimi iş stratejisini uygulamada esnek davranmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
Otel yönetim strateji planların kurulması sırasında kullanılan bilgiler nicel analize (finansal, iktisadi) bağlı olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5

Aşağıda belirtilen otel planlarının hazırlanması için ne kadar çaba harcadığınızı uygun seçeneği belirterek gösteriniz.

1= Hiç çaba harcamıyorum
2= Çok az çaba harcıyorum
3= Çaba harcıyorum
4= Fazla çaba harcıyorum
5= Çok çaba harcıyorum

- Bir seneden az süresi olan plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 1 Senelik plan	1	2	3	4	5
- Seneden 4 seneye kadar süresi olan plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 5 Senelik plan	1	2	3	4	5
- 5 Seneden 10 seneye kadar süresi olan plan	1	2	3	4	5
- Süresi 10 seneden fazla olan plan	1	2	3	4	5

Aşağıdaki faktörleri sizin için önem derecesine göre numaralandırınız:

- 1 = Önemsiz**
2 = Biraz önemli
3 = Oldukça önemli
4 = Çok önemli
5 = En önemli

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| - Yeniliklere karşı açık olmama. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - İş performansını artırmak için değişik yöntemleri deneme. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Otelin stratejilerinin gerektirdiği değişimlere ayak uydurabilme. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Neticesi belli olmayan riskli çözümleri kabul edebilme. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Değişen dış etkenlere ayak uydurabilmek için çabuk fikirler üretebilme. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Aşağıdaki yargılara katılıp katılmadığınızı belirten size en uygun seçeneği işaretler misiniz?

- 1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
2 = Katılmıyorum
3 = Kararsızım
4 = Katılıyorum
5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| - Kendi başarıımı otelin stratejik hedeflerini gerçekleştirmesiyle ölçerim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Otelin stratejik hedeflerini gerçekleştirmesi için benden beklenenin üstünde bir çaba sarf etmeye hazırım. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Otelin stratejik hedeflerine ulaşması için otel çalışanlarını teşvik ederim. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Otelin başarmaya çalıştığı stratejik hedeflere önem veririm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Bölüm B: Kişisel Bilgiler

Cinsiyet :

- Erkek
 Bayan

Yaş:

- 25 ve altı
 36 – 45
 56 – 64
 26 – 35
 46 – 55
 65 ve üstü

Bu oteldeki çalışma süreniz :

- 6 aydan az 6 ay -1 yıl
 1 yıl - 2 yıl 2 yıl - 4 yıl
 4 yıl - 6 yıl 6 yıl - 10 yıl
 10 yıl -15 yıl 15 yıldan fazla

Otelcilik endüstrisindeki tecrübeniz :

- 6 aydan az 6 ay -1 yıl
 1 yıl - 2 yıl 2 yıl - 4 yıl
 4 yıl - 6 yıl 6 yıl - 10 yıl
 10 yıl -15 yıl 15 yıldan fazla

Yöneticilikteki Statünüz :

- Genel Müdür
 Genel Müdür Yardımcısı
 Diğer (belirtiniz)

Aşağıdaki alanlardan hangisi sizi en iyi tanımlar ?

- Pazarlama ve Satış
 İnsan Kaynakları
 Otel İşleri (temizlik, restoran, oda servisleri)
 Mühendislik
 Finans ve muhasebe
 Diğer (belirtiniz)

Eğitim:

- Lise veya altı
 Önlisans veya yüksek lisans (2 yıl)
 Lisans (4 yıl)
 Master
 Doktora
 Diğer (belirtiniz).....

Milliyetiniz :

Doğustaki milliyetiniz (farklıysa) :

Yaklaşık olarak oteliniz kaç kişi çalıştırıyor?

- Tam zamanlı çalışanlar.....
- Yarı zamanlı çalışanlar

Otelinizdeki oda sayısı :

Otelinizin yeri (bulunduğu ülke) :

Yaklaşık olarak diğer ülkelerdeki otel işletmelerinde ne kadar çalıştınız?.....

Katıldığınız için çok teşekkürler !

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2006
IRB Application No HE0661
Proposal Title: The Influence of National Culture on Top Executives' Approach to Strategy Development: An Exploratory Investigation in a Multinational Hotel Organization
Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 4/17/2007

Principal Investigator(s)
Baker M. Ayoun Patrick J. Moreo
70 S. Univ. Place, Apt. 10 210 HES
Stillwater, OK 74075 Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 415 Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

Baker Mahmoud Helal Ayoun

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURE ON TOP EXECUTIVES' APPROACH TO STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL HOTEL INDUSTRY

Major Field: Hospitality Administration

Biographical:

Education: Graduated with a Bachelor of Business Administration degree from Mutah University, Karak-Jordan in February 1996, and a Master of Business Administration degree from Yarmouk University, Irbid-Jordan in September 1999. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in Hospitality Administration at Oklahoma State University in December, 2006.

Experience: Worked as instructor in the business administration departments at Yarmouk University (October 1999 - August 2000) and the University of Jordan (October 2000 - February 2002). Taught hospitality information technology courses at Oklahoma State University (August 2003 - May 2004). Employed as a foodservice supervisor in the Department of Residential Life, Oklahoma State University (August 2003 – Present).

- Professional Membership: The International Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education (I-CHRIE).

Name: Baker Ayoun

Date Of Degree: December, 2006

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CULTURE ON TOP EXECUTIVES' APPROACH TO STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL HOTEL INDUSTRY

Pages in Study: 218

Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Hospitality Administration

Scope and Method of Study:

This mail-based study empirically examined the potential influence of national culture on executives' approach to business strategy development. A total of 207 executives of upper-scale hotels from the U.S.A., Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey participated in the survey. Respondents were assigned their countries' status on Hofstede's five cultural dimensions of power distance, individualism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, and time orientation. In addition to the demographic and organizational characteristics of respondents, the instrument included items that measure several aspects that may differentiate between executives in the way they approach the task of strategy development. These aspects were: involvement in strategy development, content of strategic objectives, focus of strategic objectives, formality of strategic control, type of data used in strategic analysis, criteria for strategic evaluation, strategy evaluation time horizons, degree of rigorous analysis and rationality, strategic planning time horizons, openness to strategic change, and commitment to strategic decisions. Analysis of variance was used to test a set of hypotheses proposing that executives different in their national culture will express different beliefs toward these aspects. Hierarchical multiple regression was utilized to provide statistical control for the contextual variables.

Findings and Conclusions:

The findings of this study supported the notion that the strategic orientation and behavior of executives are culturally bound, and indicated that dissimilar approaches to developing business strategy are adopted by executives with dissimilar national cultural background. Among the five cultural dimensions investigated, the masculinity and long-term time orientation appeared to have the greatest influences, and uncertainty avoidance appeared to have little or no influence. Results for the other two dimensions, namely power distance and individualism, were not definitive and revealed interesting findings. Almost each aspect of executives' approach toward strategy development was affected to a greater or lesser extent. Implications for practice and suggestions for future research were discussed.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Professor Patrick J. Moreo, Ed.D., CHA