# INSTRUMENTAL AND HUMANISTIC VALUES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF PEOPLE: A Seven Nation Study

Communication No. 174
Revised and resubmitted to
11th AGRH conference
16-17th November 2000 Paris

TERENCE JACKSON

Centre for Cross Cultural Management Research
ESCP-EAP European School of Management
12 Merton Street, Oxford OX14JH, England
Tel: (44) 1865 263212
Fax: (44) 1865 251960
e-mail: tjackson@eap.net

&

CINDY DAVID, EAP European School of Management, Oxford
SATISH DESHPANDE, Western Michigan University, U.S.A.
JANICE JONES, The Flinders University of South Australia
JACOB JOSEPH, University of Alaska - Fairbanks, U.S.A.
K.F. LAU, Lingnan College, Hong Kong
KEN MATSUNO, Babson College, U.S.A
CHIAKI NAKANO, Reitaku University, Japan
HUN-JOON PARK, Yonsei University, South Korea
JOANNA PIORUNOWSKA-KOKOSZKO, University of Lodz, Poland
IWAO TAKA, Reitaku University, Japan
HIDEKI YOSHIWARA, Kobe University, Japan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Yasuaki Kido, Sangyo Noritsu University, Japan; Tadeo Miyakawa, Reitaku University, Japan; Yukihiro Okawa and Toshihiro Yono, Japan Productivity Centre; Akihiro Okumuru, Keio University, Japan; Tomoaki Sakano, Waseda University, Japan; Lee Chong-Yeong, Korea Industrial and Development; Paula Tidwell, University of Southern Queensland, Australia; and, Robert Markus, Babson College, USA.

# INSTRUMENTAL AND HUMANISTIC VALUES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF PEOPLE: A Seven Nation Study


ABSTRACT

The nature of the value which is attached to people may be an important component of national culture. In the context of work organizations, this may affect the legitimacy and effectiveness of transferring people management practices from one country to another. This may be particularly the case in 'non-western' emerging economies which are increasingly coming into contact with western human resource management practices. It is proposed that a major difference in the locus of human value is between an instrumental view of people as a means to an end, and a humanistic view of people as an end in themselves. The exploratory study reported in this paper of managers in seven diverse countries, seeks to investigate the nature and implications of these two loci of human value. In particular, it discovers significant differences among countries which may have implications for future research, as well as people management practices across cultures.



Key words: Cross-cultural management – International HRM – Emerging countries


## CONCEPTUALIZING HUMANISM AND INSTRUMENTALISM

Although the importance of cultural values to the conduct of organizational life is well established in the literature, the way that cultural values influence the regard for people in organizations, whilst implicit within the cross-cultural values literature has been insufficiently articulated. There is, in particular, a growing interest in the relationship between indigenous and foreign (mainly western) cultures in the practice and development of management and organization in emerging countries in the transitional economies of the former Soviet bloc (Shekshnia, 1998; Koubek & Brewster, 1995; Lawrence, 1994), in China (Wang, 1994; Sergeant & Frenkel, 1998; Jackson & Bak, 1998; Huo, and Von Glinow, 1995) and to a lesser extent in the so called 'developing' countries of South Asia, Africa and Latin America (Jaeger and Kanungo, 1990; Blunt and Jones, 1992). This literature by and large challenges the assumptions upon which the management of people is based in the 'developed' western world, and its applicability to managing people in countries whose economies have recently been launched into the global market place.

These assumptions have already been challenged within the context of 'western' human resource management (Legge, 1989). Hence a distinction has been made in the strategic human resource management literature between the 'hard' perspective reflecting utilitarian instrumentalism which sees people in the organization as a mere resource to achieve the ends of the organization, and the 'soft' developmental humanism approach which sees people more as valued assets capable of development, worthy of trust, and providing inputs through participation and informed choice (Beer and Spector, 1985; Tyson and Fell, 1986; Hendry and Pettigrew, 1990; Storey, 1992; Vaughan, 1994). Tayeb (2000) quite rightly states that the concept of human resource management is itself a product of a particular Anglo-American culture. It is likely that both the 'hard' and 'soft' approaches taken within western organizations are both a reflection of an inherent cultural concept which perceives human beings in organizations as a means to an end (Blunt and Jones, 1997, uses the term 'functionalism'). If this is the case, then it is likely that when western companies, or managers educated in the western tradition, try to implement 'western' human resource practices in cultures which have a different concept of people, and a different regard for people in organizations, then incompatibilities will be manifested through lack of motivation and alienation leading to low productivity and labour strife.

In a study by Jackson (1998) of different cultural influences on managers in South Africa, a difference between 'western' and 'non-western' perceptions of people in organizations was postulated

as representing a difference between 'instrumental' and 'humanistic' values. Respectively, these values were defined in terms of regarding people as a means to an end (a resource for the organization), and regarding people as an end in themselves (the organization should serve the ends of its people). Certainly the popular management literature in South Africa has suggested that an indigenous, rather than a 'western' style of management should more appropriately address the needs and expectations of African people by being structured on more 'humanistic' lines (Koopman, 1991, Lessem, 1994 and Saunders, 1998).

Literature which compares eastern (normally Japanese) people management styles and western styles often allude to these differences in regard to people. For example Allinson (1993) extols the virtues of the Japanese regard for people in dealing with the avoidance of major disasters in western organizations, and Ishido (1986) examines the limits of transferring Japanese human resource practices to a western situation. Much of the original work on Human Resource Development in India addresses the need to reconcile these two approaches to managing people in a context of strong western management influence interacting with Indian concepts of what it means to be human (Rao, 1996).

Although the literature reviewed above indicates conceptualised differences between ways of viewing the locus and worth of people within the organization, there has been little attempt to operationalize these concepts, and to frame them within the broader socio-cultural context, and to try to understand their significance for adapting and adopting people management practices across cultures, and particularly in the context of emerging countries which increasingly are coming into contact with western 'instrumental' ideas of human resource management. However, the importance of these concepts, we believe, goes beyond simply understanding how to affectively manage people in emerging and other non-western cultures. A humanistic approach, as defined and developed below, may represent the contribution which can be made by many emerging and non-western countries, to the practice of global management.

## DEVELOPING A CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE LOCI OF HUMAN VALUE IN ORGANIZATIONS

We define 'humanism' as a regard for people as an end in themselves, and having a value for themselves and of themselves within an organizational context. Hence the locus of value or worth of persons in a work organization is towards those persons in themselves rather than towards organizational objectives as an appropriate end in themselves. We define 'instrumentalism' as a regard for people as a means to an end, where the locus of value or worth is towards the ends (objectives) of the organization. However, this definition requires an examination of the term 'objective'. Logically the objective of an organization could be towards fulfilling the needs and requirements of persons within that organization. The term 'objective' therefore carries with it the implication of a predominant functionalist or 'systems' approach to conceptualising organizations (Silverman, 1970): that is an objective seeking organization. Here the objective is defined by the executive, and is deemed to represent the aim of a (reified) 'organization' which is somehow separate from the persons working within it. Under an 'action' or phenomenological view (Silverman, 1970) of organizations persons construct the reality of an organization through a process of negotiation, albeit within a number of power relations. Logically, therefore, the two loci of a person's worth may not be incompatible. For example if persons in the organization are perceived by organizational members as key stakeholders to which the ends of the organization are directed, then we could logically expect that cultures which are high in humanism could also be high in instrumentalism. However, level of humanism does not predict level of instrumentalism. This logical assumption, however, indicates that humanism and instrumentalism are not negatively correlated (although they could be positively correlated), and that one is not a predictor, nor an explanation of the other. Hence:

*Proposition 1:* humanism and instrumentalism will be moderately positively correlated.

Having defined these terms, and provided an indication of the logical relation between the two loci of human value, we now turn to their constituency. If we are to operationalize these concepts, we need an idea of what they consist. The Anglo-American literature provides a concept of humans as a 'resource.' Whether as an 'expense of doing business' or 'the only resource capable of turning inanimate factors of production into wealth' (Tyson and Fell, 1986: 135), the emphasis is on the pre-eminence of the results of the organization, productivity, the value of a person to achieve such results,

and, because the worth of a person is in their productivity and achieving results, that employees should be rewarded as such. Questionnaire items representing the 'instrumental' construct which are derived from this content, and used in the current study are later shown in Table 2. In terms of people management practices, this concept is manifested in the competencies approach to human resource management. Constable (1988) following Boyatzis' (1982) definition of a skill, defines competency as 'the ability to demonstrate a system or sequence of behaviour as a function related to attaining a performance goal'. As such the required competencies are determined by operational objectives which are related to strategic objectives, and link the various human resource functions such as selection, training and reward, in seeking organizational objectives (Jackson, 1991). It is also underpinned by a systems concept of organizations, as we noted above.

Humanism may be more difficult to identity as it is not clearly manifested in a coherent management body of thought. It represents a belief that people are not merely objects of organizational aims, and that an organization should be concerned for its people and should seek to benefit them. This makes its people the organization's most important factor, with the organization's main objective being the fulfilment of its people. It is therefore likely that people will be consulted in a democratic process, or at least be consulted about important decisions which affect them (Jackson, 1998; Allinson, 1993). Questionnaire items representing the 'humanism' construct which are derived from this content, and used in the current study are later shown in Table 2.

In considering the socio-cultural antecedents of these two loci of human value within organizations, conceptually it may be tempting to subsume 'instrumentalism-humanism' under an *individualism-collectivism* dimension. There seems to be a simple split between the individualistic western cultures and collectivistic non-western cultures mentioned above. The life-time protection of people which collectivism affords (Hofstede, 1980) would seem to indicate a valuing of people in their own right, and as part of a collective. The expectation of people in individualistic cultures in looking after themselves (Hofstede, 1980) would indicate a more instrumental view of people in organizations. Confounding this simplistic view is first the target specific and obligatory nature of collectivism (Hui, 1990). Japanese men may be more psychologically involved with their organizations, and Chinese more involved with their families, but at the expense of those outside the collective. Hence those outside the in-group may be regarded instrumentally. Secondly the work of Schwartz (1994) and Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars (1996) contrasts 'conservatism' and 'egalitarian commitment'. The former correlating negatively with Hofstede's (1980) individualism, and the latter correlating positively with it. Whilst the socio-centric values attached to 'conservatism' are those which would be expected to be associated with collectivism, 'egalitarian commitment' expresses a transcendence of selfish interest (loyalty, social justice, responsibility and equality: Schwartz, 1994), but places a voluntary aspect on this rather than an obligatory one towards the in-group.

We therefore suspect that the loci of human value which we have termed instrumentalism and humanism do not relate in a direct way to the level of individualism and collectivism in a society, as there may be different propelling cultural influences in different societies which lead to a humanistic and/or instrumental view of people. For example, Australia is an individualistic (Hofstede, 1980), 'western' culture, yet has also been seen as having a 'humanistic' orientation (England, 1975, 1978; Westwood & Posner, 1997). We therefore propose a more complex relationship of antecedent socio-cultural values to loci of human value within organizations, and this reflects a view that these two loci may only be partially related to each other.

When we consider the extreme form of instrumentalism of the 'hard' human resource management approach, it is likely that this has been modified towards the 'soft' approach, of which most of the Anglo-American literature reflects (as we reviewed above). This trend is most highly developed in the Anglo societies, for example where the 'human relations school' has had influence for many years in North America, UK and Australia. A moderating affect on instrumentalism may also reflect the higher levels of 'egalitarian commitment' in these countries and in Western Europe (Schwartz, 1994; Smith et al, 1996). This may not be the case in countries which have not been directly exposed over long periods to the 'softer' approach of the human relations school and other movements in organizational behaviour and human resource management, such as the transitional economies of the former soviet bloc, and East Asia. Here we may expect to find higher levels of instrumentalism. As Schwartz (1994) notes a positive relationship between egalitarian commitment and individualism, there may well be a relationship of instrumentalism to individualism, but not in a simplistic way. It may also be a reflection on the level of development of human resource management in western (individualistic) society, where, through various socio-political pressures, the extreme form of seeing people merely as a

means to an end (that is, pursuit of company objective, often meaning pursuit of profit or shareholder value) has been substantially curbed (we could term this 'post-instrumentalism'). Hence:

*Proposition 2*: the level of instrumentalism will be negatively related to the level of maturity of human resource management approaches.

If organizations are regarded as fulfilling collective social needs such as providing full employment (as in the case of the former Soviet bloc), or serving the needs of people as part of a collective in-group (as in the case of Japan and Korea), this may reflect in the level to which people see their organization as fulfilling the needs of its people. A perception of contractual obligations only within individualistic societies may militate against this type of view. In a society with such collectivistic socio-cultural values, individuals may only be valued in their own right as part of the wider collective. This may be different from the values implicit within 'egalitarian commitment' and the 'human relations school' in western society where, a consideration of the 'valuing' of people may still be oriented towards a particular end which is separate to the individual. In a collectivist society, the 'end' may not be separate from the individual. Hence:

*Proposition 3*: the level of humanism will be positively related to the level of collectivism in a society

## THE STUDY

Despite the complex socio-cultural antecedents to these concepts of people in organizations, we believe an understanding of the way people are seen, and see themselves, in organizations, is fundamental to effective people management across different cultures, and is particularly relevant to management in emerging economies where conflicts between indigenous and foreign practices (based on conflicting views of human beings) may come to the fore. As a result of the possible complex relationships of socio-cultural antecedent, it was necessary to build an exploratory empirical investigations among a number of countries which could be considered as differing on these two loci of human value in organizations.

Seven countries were selected to provide this diversity (Table 1). Thus the United States and Japan vary on a number of value dimensions including individualism-collectivism (Hofstede, 1980). We would expect Australia to cluster in an Anglo group (Ronen and Shenkar, 1985) with the United States, although with some differences. For example Australia is lower on 'mastery' and higher on 'harmony' in Schwartz's (1994) study. Although we may expect Korea to cluster with Japan in a Far Eastern group, Ronen and Shenkar (1985) regard Japan as an 'independent' country in their synthesis of findings in the cross-cultural literature. Bae and Chung (1997) have shown these two countries to be different in terms of the level of solidarity shown towards co-workers. Although Korean employees expect a higher level of commitment from their companies towards them, and from them to the company, they shown a lower level of solidarity to workers than both their Japanese and American counterparts. Although Ronen and Shenkar (1985) place Hong Kong in a Far Eastern cluster, we believe that Hong Kong society may be more complex than this, as it has been at the interface of Eastern and Western society for many years. The evidence in the literature, particularly in terms of its level of individualism-collectivism and the way this is changing, is contradictory (Ho & Chiu, 1994). We believed, therefore, that it was important to include Hong Kong in the study as a society in 'transition'. Poland and Russia in our study represent countries of the former Soviet bloc which are undergoing rapid economic transition, including greater 'western' management influence. Smith Dugan and Trompenaars' (1996) study place these two higher than our other countries on utilitarian commitment (as opposed to loyal involvement) indicating less prior loyalty to the group or organization, and more utilitarian considerations. The two countries differ on Smith et al's (1996) conservatism-egalitarian commitment dimension with Russia showing a higher level of conservatism. However, Schwartz's (1994) study shows Poland high on conservatism and relatively low on egalitarian commitment (the study does not include Russia). Hence, results from these two studies are somewhat contradictory.

The sampling frame included only managers in full-time managerial positions who work in their home country. Data collection was by questionnaire administered by an international team of researchers in their respective countries to part-time attendees of management programmes within their locality. Whilst it is recognised that the convenience nature of the samples may have implications for

the interpretation of results, data were obtained from participants in a number of different institutions in each country in order to minimise the effects of samping error, although not always providing a comprehensive geographic spread. Of particular note are the samples from Russia which were drawn from Siberia and the Russian far east: from the gold mining area around Magadan and the city of Yakutsk. However, sampling from these populations of managers was seen as legitimate and pertinent to this study as it provides matched samples across the countries surveyed (van de Vijver and Leung, 1997) of similarly educated individuals who have the potential to occupy key positions of influence in their organizations. It also avoids self-selection by companies and individuals which can often militate against matching of sample across countries. Summary descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**
**Descriptive Statistics**

| *Nationality* | *N* | *% female* | *Mean No. of Subord-inates* | *Management position %* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Junior* | *Middle* | *Senior* |
| American | 105 | 33.3 | 5.35 | 49.0 | 39.6 | 11.5 |
| Hong Kong | 34 | 79.4 | 6.97 | 55.9 | 44.1 | 0 |
| Japanese | 137 | 5.1 | 64.58 | 45.7 | 31.8 | 22.5 |
| Korean | 40 | 2.5 | 233.23 | 9.8 | 19.5 | 70.7 |
| Polish | 50 | 38.0 | 19.20 | 48.0 | 30.0 | 22.0 |
| Russian | 115 | 67.0 | 24.35 | 49.5 | 40.2 | 10.3 |
| Australian | 39 | 28.2 | 20.37 | 33.3 | 46.2 | 20.5 |
| Total | 520 | 34.0 | 48.88 | 44.2 | 35.9 | 20.0 |

## RESULTS

Despite the choice of sampling method, problems were still encountered in matching samples by sex and seniority. The predominance of males in Japanese and Korean samples reflects the predominance of males in the general managerial population for these countries. The predominance of one sex in managerial positions is also part of the management culture in different countries. Hence Japan and Korea are male dominated management cultures. This may be the case also for the predominance of females in the Russian sample, but may be a characteristic of the sample only for Hong Kong. Over 70% of Korean managers describe themselves as senior managers, while the Japanese managers may be understating their level of seniority compared with other national groups.

Two hypothesised scales were constructed for *instrumentalism* and *humanism*, partly with items from those used by Jackson (1999) in South Africa and partly derived from the literature outlined above (see discussion of the constituency of concepts above, and Table 2). Questionnaires were translated into the respective language by a native speaking team member and subsequently independently back-translated into English to check on accuracy. Respondents were asked to respond to each item on a Likert-type scale on the basis of ‘what I think’ (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree).

Initially Cronbach’s Alpha for the *instrumental* scale was below conventionally accepted levels. Exploratory factor analysis provided a three factor solution with the first two factors readily interpretable as *humanism* and *instrumentalism* (Table 2). Item 1, which was assumed to be a key concept in instrumentalism loaded highly on a third factor, and relatively low on factor 2. Expecting that the statement had induced a social acceptability response set and a facile item tending to a score of 1, item analysis revealed a highly discriminating item (mean for all = 3.55, SD = 1.47; ANOVA for national groups: $F = 25.68$, $p < .001$).

**TABLE 2**
**Factor solution for Humanism and Instrumentalism**

| | FACTOR | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Scale 1: Humanism (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.798)* | | | |
| 12. | An organization should be mainly concerned with people (H) | .711 | | |
| 8. | It is the people in an organization which are the most important factor (H) | .686 | | |
| 2. | The main objective of any organization should be the fulfilment of the people within it (H) | .676 | | |
| 6. | A person in an organization should be valued mainly as a person in her or his own right (H) | .668 | | |
| 15. | Organizations should be completely democratic (H) | .657 | | |
| 10. | The whole point of an organization is to benefit its members (H) | .618 | | |
| 4. | An organization should be seen primarily as a means of obtaining the objectives of the people who work in it (H) | .563 | | .219 |
| 13. | Employees should always be consulted about important decisions which affect them (H) | .524 | | -.320 |
| | *Scale 2 Instrumentalism (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.692, excluding items 16. & 20.)* | | | |
| 7. | It is the results of an organization which are the most important factor (I) | | .688 | |
| 11. | An organization should be mainly concerned with productivity (I) | | .641 | |
| 17. | Organizations should be primarily concerned with results (I) | | .605 | |
| 5. | The main value of a person in an organization is to achieve results for the organization (I) | | .601 | |
| 9. | The whole point of an organization is to make money (I) | | .538 | |
| 3. | An employee in an organization should be seen primarily as a means of obtaining the objectives of the organization (I) | | .504 | |
| 19. | People should be rewarded in organizations for achieving results (I) | .207 | .491 | |
| *16.* | *There is no place for democracy in organizations (I)* | *-.269* | *.302* | |
| *20.* | *People should be rewarded in organizations according to their loyalty (H)* | | *.273* | |
| 14. | It is always best to tell employees about decisions which will affect them (I) | | .190 | -.727 |
| 1. | People should be regarded primarily as a resource in an organization just like any other resource, such as money, machinery or buildings (I) | | .210 | .620 |
| 18. | Organizations should be seen primarily as a network of human relations (H) | .323 | | .515 |

Note: Items indicated by (H) were written for a *humanistic* scale, and (I) for an *instrumental* scale. Items 16. & 20. Have been excluded from the final *instrumental* scale.

The structure of the two scales used in subsequent analysis is shown in Table 2 which indicates coefficients for scale internal consistency across all respondents. The *humanism* scale is robust within each national group (Alphas for each national group are American = .758, Hong Kong =

.684, Japanese = .726, Korean = .764, Polish = .766, Russian = .685, and Australia = .778). The *instrumental* scale is not as robust when all nine items (Table 2) are included. Exploratory factor analysis for each national group shows that item 20 ('people should be rewarded in organizations according to their loyalty') loads either on an *instrumental* factor (American, Hong Kong and Russian groups) or on a *humanistic* factor (Korean groups), or on a third factor (Japanese, Polish and Australian groups). Similarly item 16 ('there is no place for democracy in organizations') loads either on an *instrumental* factor (American, Korean, Polish and Russian groups for which it loads positively, and Australian group for which it loads negatively), and a *humanistic* factor (Hong Kong and Japanese groups). Cronbach's Alphas for our subsequent 7 item scale for *instrumentalism* (Table 2) for each national group are as follows: American = .729, Hong Kong = .643, Japanese = .721, Korean = .514, Polish = .729, Russian = . 615, Australian = .501.

Comparisons may be made among national groups on the basis of these revised scales (Table 3). Significant differences exist between male and female for the *humanism* scale (F = 4.27, sign. = .039; mean female = 3.71, mean male = 3.52) although an analysis of covariance reveals no interaction effect for sex and nationality (F = 0.877, sign. = .511, df = 6, 512), and no significant differences are indicated among management positions. No significant difference exists between male and female, nor among management positions for the *instrumental* scale. There is a significant positive correlation ($p<.01$) of .193 between the two scales at the individual level and an indication of association of the two scales ($r = .729$, $p = .063$) at the national level.

**TABLE 3**
**Results for Humanism and Instrumentalism by National Groups**

| **Humanism** | | | **Instrumentalism** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *SD* | | *Mean* | *SD* |
| All | 3.59 | 0.70 | All | 3.73 | 0.61 |
| American | 3.09 | 0.65 | Polish | 3.52 | 0.57 |
| Australian | 3.18 | 0.69 | American | 3.56 | 0.63 |
| Polish | 3.21 | 0.58 | Japanese | 3.62 | 0.62 |
| Hong Kong | 3.51 | 0.61 | Australian | 3.70 | 0.47 |
| Korean | 3.70 | 0.68 | Hong Kong | 3.86 | 0.58 |
| Japanese | 3.78 | 0.53 | Korean | 3.99 | 0.52 |
| Russian | 4.11 | 0.52 | Russian | 4.00 | 0.54 |
| *F. Stat.* | 36.81 | | *F. Stat.* | 9.02 | |
| *Sign.* | .000 | | *Sign.* | .000 | |
| *Tukey* | Am Au Pol < Kor Jap Rus<br>Am < HK Kor Jap Rus<br>HK < Rus | | *Tukey* | Pol Am Jap < Kor Rus | |

## DISCUSSION

An inspection of the items contributing to the humanism scale indicates a dimension which reflects a valuing, fulfilment and involvement of people by the organization: seeing people as an end in themselves (particularly items 6, 2, 10 and 4). The items contributing to the instrumental scale indicate a results orientation as well as an instrumental view of people in achieving organizational results. Hence this scale represents a value placed on people in organizations as a means to the ends of the

organization (particularly items 5. and 3). Results indicate that these two loci of human value have a small yet significant correlation, and this supports our proposition 1. Hence Russian and Korean managers are both relatively high on humanism and at the same time relatively high on instrumentalism. American and Polish managers are both relatively low on instrumentalism and humanism, and Australian managers are relatively low on humanism and relatively moderately low on instrumentalism. Hong Kong managers have relatively moderate scores on both humanism and instrumentalism. It is only our sample from Japan which goes against this trend as they are relatively high on humanism, but at the same time relatively low on instrumentalism.

The two Anglo countries, which are high on egalitarian commitment (Schwartz, 1994; Smith et al, 1996), and, we can assume, have relatively mature human resource management concepts and systems, score relatively low on instrumentalism. Russia, which we can assume not to have mature human resource management concepts and systems steeped in human relations theory (Shekshnia, 1998), and which is very low on egalitarian commitment (Smith et al, 1996), scores high on instrumentalism. Korea also is low in egalitarian commitment (Smith et al, 1996) and scores high on instrumentalism. Hong Kong scores relatively moderately on instrumentalism, and also scores moderately on egalitarian commitment on both Smith et al (1996) and Schwartz's (1994) study. It is also likely that it combines some of the human resource management traditions and innovations of western companies, together with obligation-based employee relations in Hong Kong organizations. Scores on our instrumental scale therefore support the assumption of our proposition 2. However, the score for our Japanese sample on instrumentalism, which is relatively low, needs further explanation, as the scores for egalitarian commitment on both the cited studies are also relatively low. It may be here that we are presented with the interaction effect between collectivism with its concern for human beings through an obligation based commitment and a longer term commitment rather than a direct result-oriented organization, and an egalitarian, voluntary-based commitment to people.

The Anglo countries which are low on collectivism (Hofstede, 1980), and the related dimension of conservatism (Schwartz, 1994: Smith et al, 1996) are relatively low on humanism. The East Asian countries of Hong Kong, Korea and Japan, which are collectivist (Hofstede, 1980) score higher on humanism. This largely confirms the literature reviewed above and supports the assumption of our proposition 3. Russian managers appear to be highly humanistic, but Polish managers relatively low on humanism. This may reflect the differences between Russia (high) and Poland (low) on 'conservatism' in Smith et al's (1996) study (Hofstede, 1980, study which includes the dimension of collectivism, lacks these two countries). Our Russian sample's high score on humanism may also be explained by it being drawn from Asiatic Russia. These results may reflect more on their Asian origins which may be more collectivist and humanistic than their European Russian counterparts, and certainly more so than our Polish sample. Although there is conflicting views in the literature on Poland's level of individualism-collectivism or related dimensions (Schwartz, 1994; Smith et al, 1996), historical evidence seems to indicate that Poland has a fairly individualistic socio-cultural orientation, and strong resistance to collectivisation measures (Glenny, 1993). Whilst not necessarily providing support for our proposition 3, it also does not negate it.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This exploratory study, which looks at the nature of the regard for people in organizations, has indicated that significant differences exist among seven countries on two loci of human value which are manifested in managers' expressed attitudes. It suggests that a post-instrumental Anglo group perceives a low instrumental locus of human value, and a low humanism locus. There is a suggestion that Poland clusters with that group, yet Russia does not. It may be more appropriate to introduce Anglo-America human resource management practices into Poland, with a higher historical level of individualism, and a lower obligation basis of people management practices. The opposite may be true of Russia, where traditions may be more collectivist. Practices which are not directly competency based, and taking a more holistic developmental approach, not focusing directly on results, and which focus on valuing people as part of the collective, may be more appropriate when western companies introduce management practices into Russia (Shekshnia, 1998; May et al, 1998). Distance is achieved between Japan and the Anglo group on the level of humanism. A 'softer' approach to the 'results' capabilities of people may be shared, but Japanese practices reflect a more holistic approach to developing people, and this distance may signify some of the problems in exporting aspects of Japanese people management practices to western countries (Ishido, 1986). Differences between Korean practices and western

countries may be greater. There is an indication that differences are in both instrumentalism and humanism which are both high for Korea. Compatibility problems may therefore be greater for Korean firms operating in Western countries (Chen, 1995, depicts Korean people management as being less consultative than Japanese, and a lower loyalty downwards, yet loyalty expected upwards, and representing a more authoritarian system than that of Japan).

Whilst the instrumentalism of western management may be softening (and we assume is different between different western countries), the main contribution to global management is a modified version of instrumentalism which may well be reflected in the human relations school. The contribution of non-western countries to global management may well be humanistic approaches to people management. Whilst the current study is restricted in the number of emerging countries included, it could well be that further study of countries in Africa, South Asia, and Latin America may reveal further contributions based on different forms of humanism, and different solutions to combining indigenous forms of humanism with the post-instrumentalism of western Europe and the Anglo countries.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Allinson, R. (1993) *Global Disasters: Inquiries into Management Ethics*, New York.

Bae, K. and Chung, C. (1997), Cultural values and work attitudes of Korean industrial workers in comparison with those of the United States and Japan, *Work and Occupations*, 24(1), pp. 80-96.

Beer, M. and Spector, B. (1985) Corporate wide transformations in human resource management , in R. E. Walton and P. R. Lawrence (eds) *Human Resource Management: Trends and Challenges*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, pp.219-253

Blunt, P and Jones, M L (1992) *Managing Organizations in Africa*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Blunt, P. and Jones, M. L. (1997) Exploring the limits of Western leadership theory in East Asia and Africa, *Personnel Review*, 26(1/2), 6-23.

Boyatzis, R E (1982) The Competent Manager, New York: John Wiley.

Chen, M. (1995) *Asian Management Systems*, New York: Routledge.

Constable C J (1988) Developing The Competent Manager in a UK Context, Report for the Manpower Services Commission, Sheffield: Manpower Services Commission.

England, G. W. (1975) *The Manager and His Values*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

England, G.W. (1978) Managers and their value systems: a five country comparative study, *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 13(2), 33-44.

Glenny, M. (1993) *The Rebirth of History: Eastern Europe in the Age of Democracy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hendry, C. and Pettigrew, A. (1990) Human resource management: an agenda for the 1990s, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1(1), 17-44

Ho, D. Y-F. & Chiu, C-Y., (1994) Component ideas of individualism, collectivism and social organization: an application in the study of Chinese culture, in U. Kim et al, *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Application*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 137-56.

Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hui, C. H (1990) Work attitudes, leadership styles and managerial behaviour n different cultures, in R. W. Brislin (ed.) *Applied Cross-cultural Psychology*, Newbury Park: Sage.

Huo, Y. P. and Von Glinow, M. A. (1995) On transplanting human resource practices to China: a cultural driven approach, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 16. No. 9, pp.3-15.

Ishido, H. (1986) Transferability of Japanese human resource management abroad, *Human Resource Management*, 25(1), 103-20.

Jackson, T (1998) Managing Change in South Africa: Developing People and Organizations, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, in press.

Jackson, T. (1991) *Measuring Management Performance*, London: Kogan Page.

Jackson, T. and Bak, M. (1998) Foreign companies and Chinese workers: employee motivation in the People's Republic of China, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 282-300.

Jaeger, A M and Kanungo, R N, *Management in Developing Countries*, London: Routledge, 1990.

Koopman, A (1991) *Transcultural Management*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Koubek, J. and Brewster, C. (1995) Human resource management in turbulent times: HRM in the Czech Respublic, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1995, pp. 223-47

Lawrence, P. (1994) German management: at the interface between Eastern and Western Europe, chapter 6 in R. Calori and P. De Woot (eds.) *A European Management Model: Beyond Diversity*, London: Prentice Hall, pp. 133-64.

Legge, K. (1989) Human resource management: a critical analysis, in J. Storey (ed) *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*, London: Routledge, 1989.

Lessem, R. (1994) Four worlds: the Southern African businessphere, in P. Christie, R. Lessem and L. Mbigi (eds.) *African Management: Philosophy, Concepts and Applications*, Cape Town: Knowledge Resources.

May, R., Bormann Young, C. and Ledgerwood, D. (1998) Lessons from Russian human resource management experience, *European Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 447-59.

Mbigi, L (1997), *Ubuntu: The African Dream in Management*, Cape Town: Knowledge Resources

Rao, T. V. (1996) *Human Resource Development: Experiences, Intervention, Strategies*, New Delhi: Sage.

Ronen, S. and Shenkar, O. (1985) Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: a review and synthesis, *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 435-54.

Saunders, E. (1998) Leadership the South African way, *People Dynamics*, February, 31-4.

Schwartz, S. (1994) Beyond individualism and collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values, in U. Kim, et al (eds.) *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications*, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1994.

Sergeant, A. and Frenkel, S. (1998) Managing people in china: perceptions of expatriate managers, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 33, No. 1., pp. 17-33.

Shekshnia, S. (1998) Western multinationals' human resource practices in Russia, *European Management Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 460-65.

Silverman, D. (1970) *The Theory of Organizations*, Aldershot: Gower.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. and Trompenaars, F. (1996) National culture and values of organizational employees: a dimensional analysis across 43 nations, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(2), 231-64.

Storey, J. (1987)

Storey, J. (1992) *Developments in Management of Human Resources*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Tayeb, M. H. (2000) The internationalisation of HRM policies and practices: the case of Japanese and French companies in Scotland, 11$^{éme}$ Congrés de l'AGRH, 16-17$^{th}$ November 2000, ESCP-EAP, Paris

Tyson, S. and Fell, A. (1986) *Evaluating the Personnel Function*, London: Hutchinson.

Vaughan, E. (1994) The trial between sense and sentiment: a reflection on the language of HRM, *Journal of General Management*, 19, 20-32.

Wang, Z M, (1994) 'Managerial psychological strategies for Chinese-foreign joint ventures', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 10-16.

Westwood, R. J. & Posner, B. Z. (1997) Managerial values across cultures: Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 14, 31-66.