Review Paper

When Japanese and Thai Cultures Meet in Thailand, What Does Literature Tell Us?

Agnieszka Wang* and Peraset Chompuming**
Thammasat Business School, Thammasat University

Abstract

Japan is Thailand's largest foreign direct investor. Thus, it is important to study the national and organizational cultures of Japan and Thailand, as well as Japanese companies in Thailand with their unique cultural characteristics. This paper, through a comprehensive literature review, reveals that in terms of national culture, Japan and Thailand have similar power distance. On the other cultural dimensions, generally speaking, Japanese are more masculine, individualistic, future-oriented and less willing to accept ambiguity than Thais. The cultures of international organizations can be more complicated than national cultures. This is because organizational cultures can be influenced by different national cultures when their employees are from different countries with different national cultures. Organizational cultures can also be shaped by the founders or managers of the organizations. This paper also reveals that a clear organizational cultural gap exists between Japanese managers and Thai subordinates in Japanese companies in Thailand. On the other hand, both Japanese managers and Thai subordinates in Japanese companies in Thailand have tried to adopt each other's national culture, albeit to a limited extent.

Keywords: Cross-cultural management, national culture, organizational culture, Japanese culture, Japanese manager, Thai culture, Thai subordinate

* Corresponding author e-mail: agnieszka.wang@gmail.com
** Corresponding author e-mail: peraset@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Thailand has been one of the top destinations for foreign direct investment (FDI) in Asia. According to the United Nations (2012), Thailand was ranked 11th globally in attractiveness as an investment destination in 2010-2012. In a Bloomberg Markets ranking, Thailand is second only to China among the world's best emerging markets for investors (Bloomberg, 2012).

Japan is Thailand's largest foreign direct investor with a total investment value of over US$9 billion by 2013 according to Thailand Board of Investment (BOI, 2014), covering a range of industries such as automotive, electronics and chemical manufacturing sectors. Japan has also remained one of Thailand's premier trading partners since the 1980s (Ichikawa, Cusurmano & Polenske, 1990; Suehiro & Wailerdsak, 2014). In 2013, the Japan-Thailand trade value reached over US$63 billion (BOI, 2014).

Large investment from Japan in Thailand means a large number of Japanese managers need to live in Thailand and work with Thai subordinates. Research finding reveals that differences between Japanese managers and Thai subordinates on several work-related issues such as attitudes toward organization and work ethics do exist and these differences are influenced by cross-cultural factor (Keeley & Siengthai, 2009:332-336). Thus, it is important to examine Japanese and Thai cultures at both national and organization levels to identify plausible antecedents of the differences perceived by Japanese managers and Thai subordinates, and analyze how the organizational culture is adjusted in Japanese companies in Thailand. After all, notwithstanding the cultural difference, Japanese managers and Thai subordinates need to find a way to work together as a team.

Through a comprehensive literature review, this paper compares the national and organizational cultures of Japan and Thailand in Section 2. It also examines the organizational cultures in Japanese companies in Thailand in Section 3. Finally, the conclusion is presented in Section 4.

2. National Cultures of Japan and Thailand

National culture refers to a set of shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common collective experiences of the members and are transmitted across age generations (House, 1999). Hofstede (1981) argued that each culture can be described in terms of four dimensions – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs. collectivism and masculinity vs. femininity.

A fifth dimension called Long-Term Orientation was added in 1991 based on research carried out by Michael Harris Bond, supported by Hofstede. Interestingly, some literature has pointed out that the usefulness of Hofstede's fifth dimension should be doubted

given the fatal flaws and other methodological weaknesses (Fang, 2003). Despite these weaknesses, considering the fact that the fifth dimension has been widely quoted in existing literature, it is therefore included in this paper for discussion.

The power distance index (PDI) presents the degree to which unequal distribution of power within a country is expected and accepted (Hofstede, 1991). A high score of PDI means a country is highly hierarchical. A high 'individualism' index indicates a society is more individualistic and individuals are expected to take care of only themselves and their immediate families. A high 'masculinity' index represents a preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness and material rewards for success. Society at large is more competitive. A high 'uncertainty avoidance' index represents a society that feels uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity. A high 'long-term orientation' index shows a society is more long-term oriented.

The scores of these cultural dimensions of the selected countries in Asia and the USA, Australia and New Zealand are shown in Table 1. It indicates that Malaysia has the highest power distance index whilst Australia and New Zealand represent the lowest power distance index. Thailand lies in the middle of the ranking, whilst Japan's score is lower than those of Thailand and South Korea and higher than those of the United States, Australia and New Zealand.

Table 1

Cultural Dimension Index of Selected Countries

Country	Power Distance	Individualism	Masculinity	Uncertainty Avoidance	Long Term Orientation
Malaysia	104	26	50	36	
Philippines	94	32	64	44	19
China	80	20	66	40	118
Indonesia	78	14	46	48	
India	77	48	56	40	61
Singapore	74	20	48	8	48
Thailand	64	20	34	64	56
South Korea	60	18	39	85	75
Japan	54	46	95	92	80
United States	40	91	62	46	29
Australia	36	90	61	51	31
New Zealand	22	79	58	49	30

Source: Retrieved November 17, 2014 from http://www.clearlycultural.com/geert-hofstede-cultural-dimensions/

Japan and Thailand score 46 and 20 in 'individualism', respectively, indicating that Japan is more individualistic than Thailand. Japan and Thailand scores 95 and 34 in 'masculinity', respectively, indicating Japanese value more success and challenge. It can also be argued that the importance of avoiding conflict in Thai culture is perhaps stronger than it is in Japanese culture. In terms of uncertainty avoidance and tolerance for ambiguity, Thais are more willing to accept ambiguity (with a score of 64) than Japanese (with a score of 92). The last dimension, long-term orientation index shows that Japanese (with a score of 80) are more future-oriented than Thais (with a score of 54).

Using a questionnaire survey methodology, after analysing 560 responses from Japanese managers and their Thai subordinates using factor analysis, Onishi (2006) found that Japanese score higher than Thais in power distance, masculinity and uncertainty avoidance and lower on individualism and long-term orientation. House et al. (2004) find that Thais have higher societal values than Japanese on all dimensions but the differences are small. Only power distance remains the same for both countries.

Aside from those well-researched cultural dimensions, researchers have also included paternalism as another dimension of culture (James, et al., 1996; Aycan, 2000). Paternalism plays an important role especially in Asian countries. In highly paternalistic societies such as China and India, people in society are expected to act like parents and take care of their subordinates.

Thai paternalism is related to "doo lae" culture, meaning "take care of". Kamoche (2000) finds that Thai managers and supervisors constantly mention the need to take care of their staff. Moreover, "jai dee", meaning "good heart" which reflects the importance of human relations and social harmony, is also related to Thai paternalism. Japanese paternalism ("onjoshugi"), a very distinctive feature of Japanese management, also grew from the cultural heritage and reflects traditional values of "groupism, feeling of dependency and high regard for harmony" (Tsutsui, 1997).

The gender egalitarianism dimension has not been studied extensively. Gender egalitarianism represents the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies minimize gender role differences and gender discrimination. According to Komin (1991), the most important issue for women surveyed is family happiness-security and "everything inside home" whilst men value more self-esteem and success.

Similarly, traditional Japanese society is male-dominated, where a strong sex role division encourages women to be homemakers. A statement: "A husband should go to work and wife should stay at home and take care of the family" was agreed by 30.7-40.2% of women of the age group of 20-60 and 38.1-52.6% of men of the age group of 20-60

surveyed (Cabinet Office, 2009).

The educational system in Japan and Thailand can also show the level of gender inequality. Japanese men predominate in tertiary school whilst this is less true in Thailand. Women in Thailand are often better prepared to take managerial positions than women in Japan (WEF, 2010). Thailand and Japan were ranked 60th and 98th respectively out of 135 countries according to the Global Gender Gap Report (2011). This further confirms that there is a great difference in gender egalitarianism between Thailand and Japan.

3. Organization Cultures of Japan and Thailand

Organizational culture is inevitably influenced by national culture because organizations embedded within countries and organizations have to interact with their national environment. For example, House et al., (2004) found that a large percentage of the variance in the organizational cultural practices represented by cultural dimensions can be explained by the societal system.

Organizational culture can be measured using the same index to measure national culture. High power distance in an organization means the organization is highly hierarchical with a structured and formalized process of making top-down decisions. Subordinates do not question decisions made by the leaders and do not disagree with them. Onishi (2006) found contrasting results in Japanese organizations, Japanese employees are more involved in the decision-making process but Japanese managers tend to use scolding as a management tool.

Both Japan and Thailand belong to the collectivistic countries given the low 'individualism' index scores of the two countries. The family connections play an important role when choosing new employees to maintain good relationships within the group (Onishi, 2006; Petison&Johri, 2006). However, Jaivisarn (2010) argued that Thais are more individualistic than Japanese because they are not keen to sacrifice their personal time for the company's achievements. Japanese in organizations support collectivism by unique Japanese practices: unionism, consensual decision making, and quality circles (Onishi, 2006). They prioritize organizational goals over their own. They often sacrifice personal time to achieve a common goal (Jaivisarn, 2010).

In terms of decision making in an organization, in order to provide harmony and understanding in the organization, Japanese companies tend to involve employees at every level in the decision-making process (Onishi, 2006). In contrast, Thais tend to avoid making decisions and taking responsibility. Rather, they preferclear instructions and directions to avoid ambiguity and future conflict (Thanasankit, 2002).

Japanese organizational culture is often long-term oriented. The seniority system

and life-time employment in organizations clearly reflect this value in organizations (Onishi, 2006). They provide long-term employment and extensive training. The whole business is based on long-term group achievement and commitment to the organization (Jaivisarn, 2010). Thais, unlike Japanese, focus mainly on short-term gains and have limited job preparation or scheduling prior to the assigned task (Petison, 2010).

In terms of paternalism, Japanese management treats the company as "family." In Japanese companies, manager stend to listen to employees' problems and concerns, both work-related and personal (Laws & Tang, 1999). Onishi (2006) argued that Japanese collectivism is strongly related to paternalism with the concept of "ie" meaning "household" or "family" where employees are household members and the employers are their heads. Paternalism in the context of Thai social relations and hierarchy in the workplace is understood as "subordinates looking up for guidance and care from their supervisors who in turn must show consideration and dominant leadership" (Kamoche, 2000).

Apart from the above-mentioned cultural dimensions, Hofstede, et al., (1990) argued that founders of the organization are immersed in their own societal culture. These founders establish the initial organizational culture and influence the behaviour of their subordinate leaders (Schein, 1992; House, et al., 2004). Later, the attributes and behaviours of leaders influence subordinates in the organization. This is often the case in Japanese companies where strong role modelling is required.

Table 2 summarizes the comparison of national and organizational cultures and some of the management practices reflecting cultural values in Japanese and Thai companies. The national power distance, individualism, and uncertainty avoidance dimension results come from Hofstede's research (1991). The long-term orientation dimension results are based on House et al. (2004). The gender egalitarianism dimension score comes from the Global Gender Gap Report (WEF, 2010). The results for paternalism dimensions for Japan and Thailand are not available. The description of the organizational cultural dimension is based on various sources (e.g. Onishi, 2006; Siengthai&Vadhanasidhu, 1991; Thanasankit, 2002; Petison, 2010; Niratapattanasai, 2005; Jaivisarn, 2010; Laws & Tang, 1999; Kamoche, 2000; Cabinet Office 2009; WEF, 2010).

Table 2

National and Organizational Cultures with Management Practices

Dim.	National Culture		Organizational Culture and Management Practices	
	Jap.	Th.	Japanese	Thai
Power Distance	Moderate	High	• Support lower hierarchy by involving people in consensual decision making or quality circles (Onishi, 2006) • Managers are frequently rotated to offer them experience in various departments and divisions as well as in order to promote coordination and teamwork in the firm (Keeley, 2006) • Use scolding as a tool (Petison, 2010)	• Support a highly hierarchical system with top down communication style (Siengthai&Vadhanasindhu, 1991: 225-227) • Tall organizational structures with the top decision making (Thanasankit, 2002) • Subordinates do not question decisions made by the manager and do not disagree with him (Thanasankit, 2002) • Leader as controller rather than a colleague (Thanasankit, 2002) • Places and ranks assigned to employees (Thanasankit, 2002) • Highly structured and formalized process of making decisions (Thanasankit, 2002) • Public scolding of the supervisor in front of his subordinates causes loss of face (Petison, 2010) • Show respect to seniors (Jaivisarn, 2010)
Individualism	Moderate	Low	• Support collectivism by unionism, consensual decision making, and quality circles (Onishi, 2006) • Maintain harmony in a team by humility and refraining from expressing pride and priority of a group over individual goals (Onishi, 2006) • Sacrifice personal time to achieve common goals (Jaivisarn, 2010) • Individual's success is measured by the group's success (Jaivisarn, 2010), and each of the employees shares responsibility for all tasks (Jaivisarn, 2010) • Solving problems in a group (Swierczek and Onishi, 2003)	• They do not sacrifice their personal life for corporate achievements. They do not work long after normal business hours (Jaivisarn, 2010) • Choose workers and people to cooperate with based on the relationship, e.g. family ties (Onishi, 2006; Petison, 2010)

Table 2

National and Organizational Cultures with Management Practices (Cont.)

Dim.	National Culture		Organizational Cultureand Management Practices	
	Jap.	Th.	Japanese	Thai
Uncertainty Avoidance	High	Moderate	• Consensual decision making to support harmony and avoid misunderstanding of the lowest level employees (Onishi, 2006) • Great respect to the elders to avoid conflict and losing face (Onishi, 2006) • Accepted public scolding as a tool to prevent mistakes in the future (Onishi, 2006) • Strict, specific and unchangeable rules (Swierczek&Onishi, 2003) • Avoidance of possible conflicts (Onishi, 2006)	• Avoid making decisions and taking responsibility by subordinates and even by managers who have the power to make those decisions (Thanasankit, 2002) • Avoid ambiguity by waiting for clear instruction, procedures and directions from the leader (Niratapattanasai, 2005: 29-30) • Criticism avoidance to save face (Thanasankit, 2002) • Employees accept uncertainty especially during delays due to long process in decision making (Thanasankit, 2002)
Future Orientation	Long term	Short term	• Seniority system and life-time employment reflect long term orientation (Onishi, 2006) • The whole business in based on long-term group achievement and commitment to the organization (Jaivisarn, 2010) • Value hard work and goal achievement in order to achieve more in the future Understanding of standards-higher quality expectations to the final result (Petison, 2010) • Company plans for the period of at least 3 years (Swierczek&Onishi, 2003) • Expected promotion three-to-five years (Swierczek & Onishi, 2003)	• Focus on short term gains (Sienghtai & Vadhanasindhu, 1991, 223) • Low degree of preparation or scheduling in prior to the assigned task (Imai, 2005) • Required time for work often is extended even if they say task will be finished on time (Thanasankit, 2002) • Understanding of standards-lower quality expectations for the final result (Petison, 2010) • Expect promotion in one year (Swierczek & Onishi, 2003)

Table 2

National and Organizational Cultures with Management Practices (Cont.)

Dim.	National Culture		Organizational Cultureand Management Practices	
	Jap.	Th.	Japanese	Thai
Paternalism	Lack of Empirical Evidence		• Managers always listen to work related and personal employee's problems and concerns (Laws & Tang, 1999), • Managers have a paternalistic relationship with younger staff, "ie" concept-employees are like household or family, employer is the head of it (Onishi, 2006)	• Managers have a strong need to take care of subordinates (Kamoche, 2000)
GenderEgalitarianism.	Low	Moderate	• Emphasize masculinity, and employ more men than women on all posts (WEF, 2011; Cabinet Office, 2009)	• In comparison with Japan, Thai companies employ more women as professional staff, technical workers, legislators, senior officials and managers (WEF, 2010)

4. Culture of Japanese Companies in Thailand

"Public self" and "private self" of Japanese often make it difficult for other nationalities to understand them. The public-self (soto, tatemae) represents the group norms and the way Japanese should behave in public. The private-self (uchi, honne) represents the individual desires and goals. Thais also create three types of circle in which they act differently, these are: family circle, "official" circle, and the outside circle (Onishi, 2006). These distinctions of Japanese private/public self, groups and Thai circles make it more difficult for Japanese and Thais to understand each other and work in the same company.

Multinational organizations often need to adapt their management practices to the national cultures in which they operate in order to achieve enhanced business performance. Hofstede (2001) recognized that 'there have been examples of multinationals successfully reforming local cultural traits' but he cautioned that 'this is a difficult task', and 'for best results a multinational's management practices should fit the local culture'. Organizations that cooperate in many countries therefore have to decide how much they need to adjust to the local context and how much standardization or consistency should be maintained (Rosenzweig & Nohria, 1994).

Generally, Japanese managers retain a Japanese management style in their overseas branches and are often reluctant to adapt to the host country in their foreign bases. Japanese managers are unwilling to adapt the local practices, and in most cases follow their headquarters' approach because their own culturally endorsed management practices are perceived as more effective. Additionally, Japanese managers are expected to act as if they were in Japan, thus they resist changes and transplant their management practices without adapting them (Jaivisarn, 2010; Changsorn, 2010; Swierczek & Onishi, 2003).

Such observations are echoed by Keeley (2001, 2006), who proposed three salient national cultural factors: nihonjinron, a tight collectivist culture and ethnocentric as well as xenophobic behaviour. He observed that Japanese tend to stress differences rather than similarities between their culture and non-Japanese cultures.

However, Swierczek and Onishi (2003) found that to some extent, Japanese managers adapt to Thai culture, and at the same time Thai subordinates adapt to the Japanese style of management. For example, in terms of organizational and work behaviors, Thais working in Japanese companies perceive work punctuality and role clarity as important factors which are traditional Japanese organizational cultural characteristics, while Japanese managers consider themselves to have a good sense of humor because "Thais prefer managers with more of a fun orientation" (Swierczek & Onishi, 2003).

5. Summary and Conclusions

The literature review in this paper reveals that in general, Thailand and Japan differ dramatically in 'masculinity'. Japanese value more success and challenge whilst Thais attach more importance to comfort and cooperation. Japanese are more individualistic, more future-oriented and less willing to accept ambiguity than Thais.

Organization cultures are generally more complicated than national culture. For instance, Japanese staff tends to be involved in decision making, indicating low power distance. However, Japanese managers can scold staff in public as a management tool, indicating high power distance. Such contrast makes evaluation of culture dimensions less straightforward.

Based on the relevant existing literature, this paper reveals that a clear organizational cultural gap exists between Japanese managers and Thai subordinates in Japanese companies in Thailand. Japanese managers tend to retaina Japanese management style in their overseas branches and are often reluctant to adapt to the host country in their foreign bases. On the other hand, literature also shows that Japanese managers and Thai subordinates tend to adapt to each other's cultures, albeit to a limited extent.

The key findings of the paper provide a solid basis for further studies. For instance, one can argue that the conclusions and observations in this paper are to some extent generalized. In specific organizations, these conclusions may not always hold true. Future research should be more focused on empirical analysis and case studies to further examine the conclusions in the paper and shed more light on the organizational culture of Japanese companies in Thailand.

References

Aycan, Z. (2000).Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology: Contributions, past developments, and future directions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*, 110 - 128.

Bloomberg (2012). *Thailand proving best after China among emerging markets.* Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-22/thailand-proving-best-after-china-among-global-emerging-markets.html.

BOI (2014). Thailand: Investors' gateway to ASEAN. *Thailand Investment Review, 24*(2).Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://www.boi.go.th/tir/issue/201404_24_4/cover.htm.

Cabinet Office (2009). *White papers on gender equality.* Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://www.gender.go.jp/whitepaper/ewp2009.pdf.

Changsorn, P. (2010). Intangibles loom large in M&A. *The Nation.* Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://www.nationmultimedia.com/home/2010/03/12/business/Intangibles-loom-large-in-M&A-30124598.html.

Fang, T. (2003). A critique of Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 3* (3), 347-368.

Global Gender Report (2011), *World economic forum.* Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://www.weforum.org/issues/global-gender-gap.

Hofstede, G. (1981). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 10*, 15-41.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind.* New York: NYM McGraw-Hill.

House, R. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organisations: Project GLOBE. In W.H. Mobley (Ed.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (pp. 171-233). Stamford: JAI Press Inc.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations. *The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Ichikawa, N.,Cusurmano, M. and Polenske, K. R. (1990). *Japanese investment and influence in Thai development.* Working paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

James, K., Chen, D.L. and Cropanzano, R. (1996). Culture and leadership among Taiwanese and US workers: Do values influence leadership ideals? In M.N. Ruderman, M.W. Hughes-James and S.E. Jackson (Eds.), *Selected Research on Work Team Diversity* (pp: 33-52), Washington, DC:American Psychological Association/Center for Creative Leadership.

Jaivisarn, V. (2010). How organizational culture of Japanese multinationals in Thailand influences Japanese-speaking Thai employees' organizational commitment. *Journal of International Business & Economics, 10*(1), 106-120.

Kamoche, K. (2000). From boom to bust: The challenges of managing people in Thailand, *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 11*(2), 452-468.

Keeley, T. D. (2001). *International human resource management in Japanese firms: Their greatest challenge.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.

Keeley, T. D. (2006).Cultural and structural impediments affecting localization of management in Japanese overseas subsidiaries. Kyushu Sangyo University, *KeieigakuRonshu (Business Review), 17* (2), 77-89.

Keeley, *T. D. and Siengthai, S. (2009). International human resource management in Japanese firms in Thailand.* Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press (in Thai).

Komin, S. (1991). *Psychology of Thai people: Values and behavioural patterns.* Bangkok: National Institute of Development Administration.

Laws, J. and Tang, T. (1999). Japanese transplants and union membership: The case of Nissan Motor Manufacturing Corporation. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 64* (2), 16-26.

Niratapattanasai, K. (2005). *Bridging the gap: Managing the cross-cultural workplace in Thailand.* Bangkok: Asia Books.

Onishi J. (2006). *Working Japanese: Conflict, cultural difference, and the Japanese multinational in Southeast Asia.* CRC, the Philippines.

Petison, P. (2010). Cross cultural relationship marketing in the Thai Context: The Japanese buyer's perspective. *International Journal of Trade, Economics, and Finance, 1*(1), 17-23

Petison, P. and Johri, L. M. (2006). Driving harmony: Philosophy of Toyota Motor Thailand, *Strategic Decision, 22* (11), 3-5.

Rosenweig, P.M. and Nohria, N. (1994). Influences on HRM practices in multinational corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 25*(2), 229-251.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership,* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Siengthai, S. and Vadhanasindhu, P. (1991). Management in the Buddhist society. In J.

Putti (Ed.), *Management: Asian Context* (pp. 222-238), Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Suehiro, A. and Wailerdsak, N. (2014). Thailand: Post-developmentalist capitalism. In M.Wittand G. Redding (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Asian business systems* (pp. 260-282), London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Swierczek, F.W. and Onishi, J. (2003). Culture and conflict: Japanese managers and Thai subordinates. *Personnel Review*, 32 (1/2), 187-210.

Thanasankit, T. (2002). Requirements engineering: Exploring the influence of power and Thai value. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *11* (2), 128-41.

Tsutsui (1997). Rethinking the paternalist paradigm in Japanese industrial management. *Business and Economy History*, *26* (2), 561-572.

United Nations (2012). *World investment prospects survey 2010-2012.* Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://unctad.org/en/pages/publications/World-Investment-Prospects-Survey.aspx.

WEF (World Economic Forum) (2010). *Global gender gap report.* Retrieved July 3, 2014, from http://www.weforum.org/en/Communities/Women%20Leaders%20and%20Gender%20Parity/GenderGapNetwork/index.htm.