MB-123C

Sl.No. : **Total No. of Pages : 3**

Fourth Semester M.B.A. Degree Examination, May - 2025
(SLM Scheme) (Non CBCS)
MANAGEMENT
Elective - C : Human Resource
International Human Resource Management

Time : 3 Hours **Max. Marks : 80**

SECTION - A

Answer any five questions. Each question carries three marks. **[5 × 3 = 15]**

Q1) a) Define International Human Resource Management.

b) What is Buffet Approach?

c) What is global integration?.

d) What is E–recruitment?

e) Who is an expatriate?

f) What are hard goals?

g) Define international training.

SECTION - B

Answer any four questions. Each question carries five marks **[4 × 5 = 20]**

Q2) State the reasons for the firms going global.

Q3) Distinguish between Mexican and U.S management styles.

Q4) Explain major functions of international human resource management.

Q5) Explain the stages of Culture Shock.

Q6) What are the external methods of recruitment explain in detail?

Q7) What are the objectives of performance management?

SECTION - C

Answer any three questions. Each question carries Ten marks. [3 × 10 = 30]

Q8) Explained the advantages and disadvantages from various types of employees in an international firm.

Q9) Elicite the stages of internationalization.

Q10) Discuss the hofstede's model of culture.

Q11) Write an analytical note on Third Country Nationals.

Q12) What are the advantages and disadvantages of different selection methods.

SECTION - D

Q13) **Case (Compulsory)** **[1 × 15 = 15]**

Measuring individual performance and tying consequences to the appraisal will be more acceptable in cultures that are individualistic than in culture that are collectivist. Employees from countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands and Australia tend to be more individualistic in their orientation than employees from Egypt. Mexico, India, Japan and France who are more likely to prefer performance to be measured at an aggregated level, since they believe results require collective effort. This is not to suggest that individualistic cultures are blind to the importance of group results, nor that collectivist cultures ignore individual performance and its relationship to group results. Reconciling different perspective will require the recognition that both individual and collective results are critical to success.

Holding the individual totally accountable for meeting performance standards will be more acceptable in cultures that believe in internal control than in cultures that believe in external control.

Employees from countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands more readily accept Personal responsibility for results than would employees from countries such as Venezuela, China, Russia. Kuwait, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and India, who are more likely to believe outcomes are due to forces at least partially outside of their control. Reconciling differing perspective requires recognition that both internal and external factors impacted results and that both must be considered in appraisal.

Evaluating individuals based on what they accomplish rather than who they are, will be more acceptable in cultures that are achievement–oriented than in cultures that are ascription–oriented. Employees from countries such as the United States. Australia, Canada, United Kingdom and the Netherlands are more likely to accept evaluation based on what people have accomplished than are employees from countries like Egypt. Japan, China, Russia, Mexico and France, who are more likely to believe the status/qualifications of the individual should be a consideration in evaluating performance. Reconciling differing perspectives requires recognition that performance must be defined in terms that reflect all types of contribution. A well–connected person who is the key to disseminating needed knowledge through his or her network may be recognized for that contribution, while the person who succeeded individually as a result of applying that knowledge should be credited for his or her contribution. An appraisal process that allows for excellence in different types of contributions can help resolve this dilemma.

Employees from universalistic cultures will believe that the same policies, methods, processes and standards should apply to appraising all employees, as opposed to those from particularistic cultures. Employees from countries such as Canada, United States, Sweden, United Kingdom, Australia, the Netherlands and Germany are more likely to believe in one set of rules that apply to everyone under all circumstances than employees from Venezuela, Russia, China, India, Japan and France, who accept that the identity of the person and the circumstances should be considered. Reconciling different views requires that those who adapt policies factor processes to make the best of unanticipated circumstances should be credited for their initiative and good judgement even in a control-based culture, while those who ignore policies and factor friends to the detriment of the organization should be admonished, even in a particularistic culture.

Employees from countries with low power distance cultures will expect to participate in setting performance standards and debating ratings with the supervisor 150 more than those from high power distance cultures. Employees from the Netherlands, United Kingdom. Australia, Canada and United States tend to be more active in the process and challenge the superior when there is disagreement on performance level, while this would be less likely among employees from countries such as Mexico, Venezuela, France and China.

Questions :

a) List the 5 learnings that seem to have been identified as appraisal considerations in a cross cultural organization.

b) Differentiate between achievement-oriented culture and ascription-oriented culture. Provide examples.

