**Case study**

**Gringo management, south of the border**

Answer Sheet

Answering format

* Please use this answer sheet to answer the three questions below **following the proposed**

**format.**

* **Bullet point answers** are fine as long as you provide thorough answers.
* **Correct statements without citation from the text won’t lead to points**.
  + Citing the lines concerned and the beginning and end of the paragraph is enough.
* **Vague answers or too general comments will lead to no point**.
* Points will be given roughly 50% for the analysis part and 50% for the recommendation part.

**PART ONE: ANALYSIS**

**Question 1 – What happened? Why did the situation turned from being a rosy picture into being a nightmare? What mistakes did Ted make?**

*Instructions for question one*

* **Please decide which characters and/or group of characters play a key role** in the issue linked to the case study. List them in the chart below.
* **Replace ‘NAME’ with the exact name of each character / group of characters**.
* List in the chart below **the positioning of each character** (ex: independent).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions / characters | Character # 1 Ted Dorman | Character # 2 Kim Dorman | Character # 3 Manuel Angel Menendez | Character # 4 Supplier | etc |
| Independent to interdependent | Independent |  | Interdependent |  |  |
| Egalitarian to status | Egalitarian |  | Status |  |  |
| Risk to certainty | Risk | Risk |  |  |  |
| Direct to indirect | Direct |  | Indirect |  |  |
| Task to relationship | Task |  | Relationship | Relationship |  |
| Low to high context | Low Context |  | High Context |  |  |
| Monochronic to polychronic | Monochronic |  | Polychronic |  |  |

Use as many characters or group of characters as necessary. The numbers indicated below (#1, #2 etc.) are given only as an example.

**Cite as many proofs (text excerpts) as possible from the case study for each dimension (If you don’t have enough evidence, say so). Cite the lines concerned, including the beginning and the end of the text.**

**Character #1: Ted Dorman**

**Dimension independent to interdependent**

Ted is definitely independent. He does not trust Manuel’s work (Line 71) and so decisions were not mutually agreed because he was deciding only for himself.

**Dimension Egalitarian to status**

Ted is egalitarian and prefers to wear casual wear than formal wear. (50) And on top of that, Ted is egalitarian because he calls Manuel as Manny. And Ted wanted to be called just by his first name and not Mr. Dorman. (56)

**Dimension Risk to certainty**

Ted wants to fire employees immediately, not considerate about Mexico's high unemployment rate (108) What I wanted to say here is that, he does not care about the effects of his actions so definitely risk oriented.

**Dimension Direct to indirect**

Ted is definitely on the direct side; he wants to get things done so he’s very direct about what he wants. He does not want to do small talks and wants to get down to business right away. (84)

**Dimension Task to relationship**

Task oriented as I mentioned in his directness, he wants to get things done and wants to get down to business as soon as possible. (84)

**Dimension Low to high context**

Concise and Clear; he did what he wanted but he explained it first to Manuel the changes he wanted to happen like in (97) he proposed to manual that an incentive pay system be introduced.

**Dimension Monochronic to polychronic**

In (60-67) it shows how monochronic Ted was because he wanted everything to be smooth sailing and does not want delay so he clearly said that he was worried about the opening of the plan but Manuel said everything is in order when clearly it was not really the case.

**Character #2: Kim Dormal**

**Dimension Risk to certainty**

I think in Line (16-21) it shows that Kim is a risk taker. Kim had reservation about the move. She was not really confident about it but she thought more about the opportunity for her husband and believed that her 3 years of Spanish language exposure in high school would help them survive but it reality it is not really enough because it is not just the language you are going to learn, the culture as well. So for me it is a risk.

**Character #3: Manuel**

**Dimension independent to interdependent**

Interdependent because of the staff that Ted wanted to fire, he did not fire them because he was related to them and did not want to burn bridges so it showed interdependency because of the protection he provided. (142-143)

**Dimension Egalitarian to status**

Manual is status oriented because he wants to look more like a boss so he wears formal wear. (50) and Manny is status oriented because during meetings outside, he would want to wear suit and tie. (54)

**Dimension Direct to indirect**

Manual insisted that plant would be ready but it was not ready actually (60) This is a sign of being indirect.

**Dimension Task to relationship**

In line (32) to (35) It showed a very Mexican culture which is their hospitality. They invest more in relationship. Manuel and his wife helped them get settled in Mexico so they get familiarized in their new home.

**Dimension Low to high context**

Manuel admitted that there were work permit problems. Plant was opened five weeks past the schedule date (66) He did not admin right away about the issue.

**Dimension Monochronic to polychronic**

Polychronic I think because I he was trying to convince himself that the plant will open on time when in his mind he was not confident and he knew that it was not going to happen (66)

**Character #4: Supplier**

**Dimension Task to relationship**

Ted offended the Mexican suppliers by attempting to get down to business quickly. I think in Mexico, it is important to not talk about business right away, maybe about life first or how the day is going so this is a sign of relationship status (76) Another point is that in line (79) Representatives were offended when Manuel offered them a tour and Ted refused to come along. They would’ve appreciated more if Ted came.

**Dimensions that play a key role in this case study.**

* Obviously in the beginning, it was more a problem with Egalitarian and Status. Manuel wanted to be on the formal side while Ted wanted to be on just a casual side. I think it is one of the dimensions worth mentioning because it was the beginning of their cultural differences.
* I would say Direct and Indirect. Sometimes, being direct is good but could also put you at risk when the other person is indirect. There is a possibility that you might be misunderstood.

**Values from the two cultures at stake that could place a role in the case study**

* I would say in the US the values at stake would be their career growth, they always wanted to be on top and because of this they are more like hungry for success so they do everything whatever it takes to reach that stage. Ted fired some of the employees because he though it would be more beneficial for him and the company in terms of productivity but it did not help him.
* In Mexico, I guess relationship between colleagues is what they value more. It is not just about work always; I think they want a work-life balance. They care more about the people than the work so they do not do business right away, they ask how is the day going or things like these before they get down to business.

**Other elements from class content that could add value to the analysis of the case study:**

**N/A**

**PART TWO: RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Question 2 (Recommendations level 1) – What could Ted have done differently in the beginning to change the face of things?**

* *Please come up with culturally-intelligent recommendations based on your analysis in question 1. Put yourself in the shoes of a consultant who would advise Ted on what to do.*

I would advise his company to invest on pre-onboarding seminar to discuss about how Mexican people work, their work ethics, how they value relationship, what is more important for them so that he could easily adapt to this big change. For Ted part, he could have done researches or go to forums online to ask questions and get himself ready before he arrives in Mexico. Prevention is even that cure. This situation could have been prevented had Ted developed a change management plan or adaptation plan.

**Question 3 (Recommendations level 2) – What could Ted do in the situation at the end of the case to improve it? Make recommendations in a culturally intelligent way.**

* *Come up with recommendations linked to the dire situation at the end of the case study and do not repeat what you said in question 2. Imagine what could be done now that it is too late for the recommendations you suggested in question 2.*

Now that everything is done. What Ted should do is to learn the art of “Style Swtiching”. He has to work according to the style of Mexican people, in order for him to adapt to work culture and ethics much faster. He should teach himself how to be more relationship oriented so he could easily get along with his colleagues, develop relationship that could help him survive in Mexico. Do not just focus on work, focus the life after work, make friends with colleagues. In terms of work responsibility, always consult Mexican people, in the case study for example, consult Manuel because he is Mexican and he knows how it works in Mexico. Always ask when you are not sure, do not decide on your own especially if you are new to the environment. Go to a more certain part instead of taking risk right away. I think it is better to be risk taker when you are more familiar with the environment but in Ted’s case, he was new an he was already implementation a lot of changes that could put him and the company at risk.