GLOBALIZING THE TRAINING DESIGN PROCESS

Directions: Review the polarities in each stage of the design process and consider your current process and its range of inclusiveness. Check off which box best describes your current and/or preferred response. Consider how you might adjust your process by reconciling the differences to become more inclusive of diverse perspectives.

1. What We Might Need (Assumed Problem)
   - Information stems from senior managers or those who hold influential or authority positions; data-collection tools use corporate HQ language and approved categories; formats are low-context (check-off boxes, scales, and so on); limited quantifiable data collected through e-mail/pulse surveys sent off to unknown evaluators.
   - Information globally sought for individuals crossing levels and reflecting diversity of nations, regions, and civilizations; respondents use their first or most expressive language to communicate; high percentage of face-to-face interviews surfacing in-depth data; balance of qualitative and quantitative data; information provided to trusted staff.

2. What We Have Found (Analysis and Confirmation)
   - Headquarters or departmental leadership directs/controls analysis; reviews data for conformity to standards of global training objectives or models; seeks universal issues facing the company and less the particularistic issues of a nation, division, or unit; convergence preferred.
   - Analysis process always incorporates different and broad national perspectives and regionalized objectives; divergence valued; analysis widely shared, seeking additional feedback before completion; modes of interpretation are broad; analyzed through multiple national cultures to discover nuances of similarities, differences, and specialized perspectives.

3. What We Will Do (Intervention Identification)
   - Range of possible interventions parallel headquarters’ established plan; “We don’t do that type of training in this company”; issues discovered by worldwide (HQ) guidelines and lenses; fiscal restraints set by corporate; regional interventions are massaged by expatriates to conform to “back home” models, weakening local impact and supporting mono-cultural training orientation.
   - Identification processes balance corporate with national training needs and are open to different requirements; local resources highly valued in intervention identification and may be more valued than headquarters.’

4. How We Will Design It (Design)
   - Designed internally or by headquarters-endorsed vendors in country other than country of delivery; driven by worldwide vendor contracts and cost containment; focus on tangible outcomes linked with economic results; reflects mandated headquarters learning style, which is seen as an absolute so that all employees are exposed to the same data and act the same way.
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Locally designed and adapted programs reflecting national or regional preferred presentation styles and their subcultural constituents; creates a both/and learning style that responds to the tools, processes, and behaviors that best enable participants to learn; adjusts to local learning style as well as components that reflect the corporate global style; uses local case studies and role plays in addition to program–appropriate global material; reconciling process of local and corporate culture always a part of the design process and in-session design.

5. **How We Will Organize (Administration)**
   - Training only involves authorized training staff; walk in, set up, walk out; low-context announcements of events, e-mail needs assessments, no personal contact before training; limited prework—people are too busy; disconnected with the business.
   - Senior managers are present and supportive; out-of-session time (coffee time, formal meals, evening social events) as important as in-session time; interpersonal component highly valued through selective telephone interviews and personalized invitations; high-context data gathered through interviews; close alignment of sending managers and training subordinates with accountability to manager, business goals, or learning goals.

6. **Who Will Do It (Staffing)**
   - Training conducted by headquarters staff in official language only or by approved consultants and vendors who have been endorsed.
   - Training conducted by diverse staff from multiple locations capable of communicating in the most effective language and other necessary languages.

7. **What We Say About It (Reporting, Level I, II Evaluation)**
   - Reports data points fitting the needs of global training reports (headcounts, number of programs, cost per person); pictures presented in glossy training document/company newsletter that indicate what “we” did; participants report they learned what was in the training box.
   - Reports on global diversity intellectual capital and what was the enhanced learning from the training event; align new learnings with the global diversity context of participants, generating a spectrum of insights related to the individuals and processes in company that illustrate diversity of thought and behavior; “We learned what they wanted, but we also discovered vital learnings outside the training box because we are different and listen to each other.”

8. **Was It Worth It? (Level III, IV Evaluation)**
   - Training costs fit global targets; six-month outcomes show individuals using prescribed skills.
   - Training applied global diversity intellectual capital from another region and is being introduced in new region with positive, measurable results.