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ABSTRACT

There is both empirical and anecdotal evidence suggesting differences in American and English approaches to communication, which are creating misunderstandings and stereotyping in Anglo-American organisations (Brown, 1994; Dunkerley & Robinson, 2002). As Triandis (1994) suggests that misunderstandings and stereotyping occur when one group uses their values as a guideline when interpreting the behaviour of another, the first study examines the similarities and differences in American and English value systems, and asks each group for their stereotypical views of each other. The results of the first study indicate there are no reported differences in values between the two groups, although there is evidence suggesting both groups have stereotypical views of each other. As this implies that misunderstandings and conflict may be occurring in this context, the second study uses a one-to-one interview design to ask American and English managers for their descriptive and evaluative opinions about their approaches to decision-making, performances appraisals, and leadership. The results indicate the English and Americans prefer different styles of decision-making, with the American style reflecting efficiency concerns, and the English style associated with relationships and consensus. In the third study, the participants are asked to complete two leadership questionnaires. The results suggest that stereotyping is occurring in this context: Americans view English speech as indirect, and inherently inefficient and confusing, while the English see Americans as task-orientated and authoritative. However, it cannot be concluded that stereotyping is resulting in conflict, as this was not measured directly in this context. These results are consistent with research suggesting there may be underlying differences in US and UK values, which may be associated with differing approaches to communication. However, corporate culture and the expectations and assumptions of one group concerning another may be other factors involved in the cognition of organisational events. These factors are addressed in the proposed model of cognitive processing, and discussed in a case study. It is concluded that studies of cross-cultural differences are important as they provide knowledge about social practices and language styles of other cultures. This may provide international managers with realistic expectations about their expatriate assignments.
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Chapter 1:
Approaches to Communication in the Workplace

Summary

This chapter will present an overview of the psychological issues, which are associated with the general aims and objectives of this study. These issues include discussions of cross-cultural communication, values, cultural adaptation, and cognitive theory. The overall aims of the research will be discussed. Specifically, this research will examine similarities and differences in American and English values. Similarities and differences in the American and English approaches to three organisational processes will also be addressed, e.g. decision-making, performance appraisals and leadership, to determine whether stereotyping and misunderstandings are occurring in these contexts. This research will examine other variables, e.g. expectations and assumptions, which may influence style of speaking and approaches to organisational events.
1.1. Introduction

1.1.1 Background

Most Americans and British who have worked or lived in each other's countries have recognised some truth in the adage that Britain and the United States are truly "two nations divided by a common language." Certainly the Americans and the British use different spellings of words such as "tyre" and "tire." There are also obvious differences in the use of words such as "pavement" and "sidewalk." However, beyond phonetical, and semantic differences, anecdotal evidence implies there are more serious, less obvious differences in the American and the English use of the language. Casual conversations with both American and British nationals working in Anglo-American organisations also suggested that these apparent differences in ways of speaking were resulting in miscommunications in the workplace. This anecdotal evidence suggested that many Americans described the British as "indirect" and said that the British tended to "beat around the bush." Some Americans felt that this approach was occasionally irritating and inefficient. Many British people suggested that Americans could be direct, and often "blunt" at times which they said could be occasionally rude and insensitive.

Aspects of speech and language, such as a preference for direct vs. indirect speech, are aspects of language usage defined by social psychologists as communication style. This concept has been defined by Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) as the underlying aspects of language usage, which are in effect "a meta-message that conceptualises how individuals should interpret a communication from a member of another culture (p.100)." Cultural misunderstandings occur when a culture uses its own set of guidelines when interpreting the messages of another culture, and subsequently see the other group as offensive and exhibiting inappropriate behaviour (Smith & Bond, 1993; Triandis, 1994). Misunderstandings, it should be noted, are often associated with denigrating the 'out-group'
and maintaining the normality of the 'in group' (Tajfel, 1981). According to Triandis (1994), misunderstandings are also an example of stereotyping, which has been defined by Smith and Bond as over generalised and homogenising beliefs that one group holds about another, and which can often result in organisational conflict (Campbell, 1967).

As well as pointing to differences in American and British preferred styles of communication, anecdotal evidence has suggested there are differences in American and English beliefs and attitudes towards work, which are also related to misunderstandings and stereotyping in this bi-cultural context. For example, informal reports suggested that Americans tended to be more concerned than the British with efficiency, "getting the job done" in the most expedient way possible, an approach that reflected the use of words and expressions that revealed the speaker's intentions, goals and ideas. This approach seemed to be misunderstood by many British colleagues who felt that this over-riding concern for efficiency precluded necessary attention to important issues such as thoroughness and fair play.

A review of the popular press also suggested that Americans and the English are experiencing difficulties when working together in bi-cultural organisations. Wall (1994, p. 2A) referred to a "culture clash" between American and English co-workers, citing a survey (Bennett, 1994), which concluded that England has one of the highest attrition rates for US expatriate assignments in the world. Bennett attributed these failures to differences in communication, with the British described as less direct than their American counterparts, which made it difficult for the Americans to interpret the British messages. Bennett concluded the differing styles of speech are leading to misunderstandings in this bi-cultural setting. Bennett points out that the expectation of similarity in terms of language and culture is at the centre of American expatriates' relocation problems with English assignments, i.e. while expatriate managers expect a number of language and
cultural similarities, they are not prepared for the culture and communication differences that exist between the two cultures.

1.1.2 Research on Anglo-American Work Environments

Although anecdotal evidence suggested that misunderstandings and stereotyping were taking place in Anglo-American work environments, there seems to be little written in the social or organisational psychology literature about differences in communication styles, misunderstandings and stereotyping in this setting. Prior research by the author (Dunkerley, 1997) investigated differences in communication styles and the types of misunderstandings and misinterpretations that seemed to be occurring between American and English managers. The study of Anglo-American organisations seemed particularly timely as there was an increasing mix of Americans and Britons in the workplace, which partially related to the number of American takeovers of British companies since the mid-1990s. This included the Southwest's gas and electricity supplier, SWEB, located in the Bristol area. A number other American companies also had overseas offices in the Bristol area, including Hewlett-Packard, the US computer giant.

To investigate the anecdotal evidence of cross-cultural differences in the American and English styles of communicating, the views of American and British managers in a number of Anglo-American companies were collected with a view to categorising and classifying any cross-cultural differences that may be occurring (Dunkerley & Robinson, 2002). Based on earlier work (Dunkerley, 1997), this study also aimed to identify British and American differences in social conventions and approaches to various processes and organisational systems. It was predicted that the American style of communication reflects an overriding concern with efficiency and that misunderstandings and misinterpretations are occurring in Anglo-American workplaces.
The results of studies focusing on differences and similarities in American and British communication (Dunkerley & Robinson, 2002) indicated the British and Americans have a different style of humour, with the British describing their own sense of humour as an indirect form of self-expression based on sarcasm, irony and understatement. The Americans and British both believed the British preferred indirect speech and tended to wander around issues and use more words than Americans to describe similar issues. The British said that they use indirect speech to deal indirectly with issues such as avoiding conflict and easing social interactions. The Americans did not recognise that the British use indirect speech to deal with sensitive issues, but agreed that Americans get to the point much more quickly. Misunderstandings were occurring between Americans and the British in two different situations,

1. Optimism vs. Pessimism. While the Americans and the British agreed that the Americans are more optimistic than the British, each thought their own style was more beneficial in organisational settings. The British said that because the Americans are so optimistic and confident of their eventual success, they tend to proceed to the action stage without weighing the pros and cons of the issue carefully enough. This optimistic desire to complete the task means that too many problems are created down the line that decreased personal and organisational effectiveness. The British said that they, at times, felt frustrated with the American approach.

The Americans, on the other hand, said that the British seem to be far less willing to take risks and are too accepting of limitations. Thus the British, it was thought, appeared complacent and resigned, which the Americans believed, caused confusion, frustration and conflict in the workplace.
2. Criticism. The British and Americans seem to misunderstand each other’s approach to dealing with criticism. The British see the Americans as too direct in dealing with criticism of work colleagues. The American approach, it was said, is often too harsh and offended and angered people on the receiving end of this criticism. The Americans, on the other hand, said that their more direct approach to criticism was far more efficient and less ‘nasty’ than the indirect approach preferred by their British colleagues, and left less room for misunderstandings. Both cultures felt frustrated, confused and annoyed with the other culture’s approach.

3. Problem-solving. This was not an area explored directly in the study and the results are not significant. However, a number of both Americans and British volunteered the opinion that Americans prefer ‘brainstorming’ to a greater extent than the British. It was also suggested that the British are interested to a greater extent than the Americans in ensuring that the process of solving problems was thorough and that everyone had a say in reaching a conclusion. The Americans, it was agreed, tend to focus more on ‘getting the job done’ quickly and expediently.

The results of Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) indicated that British and American colleagues are misunderstanding each other’s ways of communicating and are annoyed, frustrated and angered by each other’s approach. It is suggested that these misunderstandings can adversely affect organisational effectiveness and work satisfaction among employees. It is suggested that the expectation that the American and British ways of communicating are more similar than they actually are may be at the root of these misunderstandings. This was consistent with Bennett (1994), who suggested that it was the expectation of similarity that contributed to the high failure rate of US expatriate
assignments to Great Britain. Therefore, it was proposed that if cultural groups become more knowledgeable about other groups and their ways of communicating, this should increase harmonious inter-group relations, reduce conflict and ultimately enhance organisational effectiveness.

Thus, Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) suggested that at least in this specific context, Americans and British working together in a cross-cultural environment are misunderstanding each other's messages and are experiencing some feelings of frustration, annoyance or irritation when the other cultural members use their own communication style in the workplace. These results seem consistent with the idea that people with differing value systems will approach communication style, and organisational systems and processes dissimilarly (Smith & Bond, 1993, 1998). This dissimilarity of approaches to communication and organisational processes within the organisation may create inter-cultural conflict as these bi-cultural groups interact within the workplace. This may have serious implications for the effectiveness of the organisation and the reported levels of work satisfaction; cross-cultural conflict can ultimately result in the failure of the cross-cultural working relationship (Gudykunst, 1996).

While value systems may contribute to a person's preferred communication style, it is recognised there are many variables that may influence a style of speaking, such as a person's attitudes toward work, the company culture, their experience in cross-cultural organisations, their profession or their educational background. However, the literature and the results of this study suggested that cultural values, norms, and attitudes seem to provide an excellent basis for following up the results of the previous research. Thus, one of the first objectives of this thesis will be to measure the value systems of Americans and English managers working together in Anglo-American organisations.
1.1.3 Values Systems

Values have been defined in a number of ways. Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) viewed values as beliefs that go beyond specific situations and prescribe culturally appropriate behaviour. Lane, DiStefano, and Maznevski (1997) have defined values as the elements of culture that describe the value-holder and are motivators of individual behaviour. Bales and Cohen (1979) defined values at the individual level, suggesting that a person’s value system develops through a process whereby people apply their past experiences, learning and deliberate thought to the development of a set of abstract rules, which influence how they will interact with other individuals in the future. According to Bales and Cohen, social evaluation involved the application of abstract concepts, attitudes, values and feelings that arise when people evaluate their own behaviour in a social context. Through this process, an abstract set of rules is developed, which shapes and guides future behaviour and provides a basis for judging the behaviour of others. Thus, it appears that values are culturally determined, and are associated with people’s behaviour.

1.1.3.1 Culture and Cultural Orientation

As values are said to be culturally determined, it is also important to understand the meaning of the term culture, and the relationship between culture and cultural values (Triandis, 1994). However, as Triandis has suggested, there has not been consensus on a definition of the term culture, nor is there agreement on how and why cultures vary. Hofstede (1980) defined culture as a collective programming, which distinguishes one culture from another. According to Segall, Berry, Dasen, and Poortinga (1990), culture referred to the Man-made elements of the environment: these included homes and methods of transport, as well as social institutions such as marriage, education and employment. Dresser and Carns (1969) stated that culture performed a number of functions including: (a) the ability to communicate with others, (b) the ability to predict how others will respond to us, (c) the provision of standards of right and wrong, (d) the provision of skill
and knowledge for meeting everyday needs, and (e) the ability to identify with other similar people. Other theorists (Rohner, 1984) have proposed that culture is defined by the meaning that people place on the elements of culture; an important aspect of cultural elements, or artefacts, is that they are regulated by societal value, norms and rules.

Theorists have also pointed to the difference between culture and cultural orientations. As proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), cultural orientations differ from culture in two ways: (a) while culture defines how a person would like the world to work, (b) cultural orientation included and described assumptions that people had about how the world really does work. According to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, cultural orientations were found in all societies; however, societies were likely to rank these cultural orientations in order of importance. Erez and Earley (1993) stated that cultural orientations are really assumptions held by individuals concerning the social organisation and elements of the society in general. Cultural orientations help people to filter information about their environment; they do not motivate people's behaviours, as this is the role of social values. According to Erez and Earley, people identify their behavioural choices through their cultural orientation, but they prioritise their choices according to their individual value systems.

According to Maznevski, DiStefano, Gomez, Noorderhaven, and Wu (2002), the distinction between values and value orientations is important because research that addressed values will contribute to different levels of understanding than research focussing on value orientations. A study of values, they concluded, will contribute to an understanding of individual motivations and will address elements of individual behaviour. Studies of cultural orientations will contribute to an understanding of social behaviour, organised systems and decision-making.
1.1.3.2 Large Group Value Studies

Hofstede's (1980) well-known cross-cultural value research comparison was an example of a large group study focussing on cultural orientations at the society level. He surveyed over 100,000 managers in 40 countries, using a databank of existing survey results collected within a large, international computer company. He subsequently identified four dimensions on which country cultures varied: (a) Individualism-Collectivism, (b) Masculinity-Femininity, (c) Uncertainty Avoidance, and (d) Power Distance. Hofstede was also able to cluster countries into groups that shared similar value patterns. These dimensions were conceptualised as:

1. Individualism vs. Collectivism. Individualism was empirically derived to conceptualise a society's preference for activities that centred on individual goals, while the concept of collectivism was empirically derived to denote a society's preference for group goals. Hofstede concluded that the Individualism vs. Collectivism dimension was an important method of differentiating cultures, further suggesting that America was the most individualistic country in the world.

2. Masculinity vs. Femininity. These constructs were empirically derived to denote either a society's emphasis on power and assertiveness (masculine) or the emphasis on fluid sex roles and interdependence (femininity).

3. High or low Uncertainty Avoidance. These were deduced conceptually by Hofstede and referred to a society's preference for avoiding conflict by having a greater need for formal rules and procedures, and for consensus (high), or for accepting risks and dissent (low).

4. Power Distance. These were deduced conceptually by Hofstede and referred to whether people accept that power will be distributed unequally among members.
of that society (high); or (low) where people accept that power should only be used in limited circumstances.

Similarly, Bond (1987) in conjunction with the Chinese Culture Connection project investigated the possibility that Hofstede's (1980) questionnaire, which was designed by Westerners, may have been biased toward Western values. The Chinese Culture Connection asked a group of Chinese people to identify a set of fundamental values, which they believed were important to Chinese culture. A questionnaire based around these core values was developed, which they used to survey 50 male and 50 female university students in each of 23 different national cultures. Four constructs of country cultural variation were subsequently developed. Although the Chinese Culture Connection used a different values questionnaire and sampled an entirely different group of people, three of the Chinese Culture Connection constructs were similar to Hofstede's value dimensions and included: (a) Integration (similar to Hofstede's Collectivism); (b) Human heartedness (similar to Hofstede's Masculinity); and (c) Moral Discipline (similar to Hofstede's high Power distance and Uncertainty Avoidance dimensions). The fourth dimension, Confucian Work Dynamism, was unique to the Chinese Culture Connection research and referred to whether cultures emphasised taking a long term view, or whether the emphasis was on the present and the past.

Trompenaars (1993) identified seven dimensions of cultural variability. Trompenaars' Individualism vs. Collectivism dimension was similar to the one proposed by Hofstede (1980). Trompenaars designed a questionnaire, which was based on the ideas of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) and considered how different cultures find solutions to problems associated with: (a) relationships with other people; (b) the passage of time; and (c) environment. Trompenaar's other six value orientations included:
1. Time perspective orientation. This referred to whether cultures emphasised the present and future or whether they focussed on what has been achieved in the past.

2. Universalism vs. Particularism. The Universalism approach centred on the idea that there were societal codes which prescribed what was good and right in all circumstances, while the Particularist approach was associated less with abstract societal codes.

3. Neutral or Emotional. These referred to the extent that personal relationships and interactions were emotional or detached.

4. Specific vs. Diffuse. These referred to the extent that business relationships were specific to a work situation or whether the relationship was defined by emotional involvement.

5. Achievement vs. Ascription. These referred to the extent to which people were judged on their achievements, or whether their status was attributed by birth, gender, age, or kinship.

6. Attitudes to the Environment. These referred to the extent to which people believed that values and motivations came from within or whether they were imposed by a force more powerful than themselves.

Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) later re-analyzed Trompenaar's (1993) data, using a multi-dimensional scaling procedure. They concluded that Trompenaar's original dimensions could be conceptualised as: (a) conservatism vs. egalitarian commitment; and (b) loyal involvement vs. utilitarian involvement. Conservatism vs. egalitarian was related to Schwartz (1994). The second dimension, loyal involvement vs. utilitarian involvement, was conceptually similar to Hofstede's individualism vs. collectivism.

After reviewing a number of cross-cultural studies carried out in both Western and non-Western countries, Schwartz (1994) concluded that the only way to establish whether these studies had tapped into all possible value dimensions was to determine the fundamental biological, social and welfare needs that defined all cultures. After
identifying 56 values that he proposed were associated with the fulfilment of these basic needs, Schwartz studied the value preferences of individuals in 25 countries using a questionnaire asking participants how much they relied on each of these 56 values as a guiding factor in their lives. Schwartz found that the results could be summarised in terms of two dimensions: (a) Openness to change vs. Conservation, which was similar to Hofstede's (1980) Individualism vs. Collectivism dimension; and (b) Self-enhancement vs. Self-transcendence, which was similar to both Hofstede's Masculinity-Femininity and Power Distance dimensions. After studying the results, Schwartz later concluded that all of the meanings of the 56 values addressed in the earlier study were not consistently held across all samples. He subsequently undertook a culture-level analysis, and concluded that the value dimension structure was conceptualised more accurately by a seven value structure; two of the value schema which emerged, conservatism vs. autonomy, and mastery and hierarchy vs. egalitarian commitment, were similar to Hofstede's Individualism vs. Collectivism and Power Distance dimensions, respectively.

Like Hofstede (1980), Grey and Thone (1990) studied the beliefs and value systems of 47,000 managers and professionals working in more than 200 companies in North America on nine core corporate values that related specifically to organisational situations in America and in Europe. They used a quantitative approach, using a questionnaire design, combined with a qualitative approach, using interviews, focus groups, and observation techniques. The questionnaire included 61 items answered on a seven-point response scale. The survey was designed to measure manager perceptions about corporate values, and management practices, and reflected nine factors of cultural values: (a) clarity of direction; (b) effectiveness of decision-making; (c) organisation integration; (d) management style; (e) performance orientation; (f) organisation vitality; (g) compensation; (h) management development; and corporate image. Grey and Thone found
that when compared to Europe, American values tended to reflect stronger performance orientation, management conservatism and rigidity. Conversely, Europeans were more orientated towards venturesome goal-setting, greater responsiveness to change and greater cross-company involvement in decision-making.

1.1.3.3 GLOBE Research

Another example of a large group study focussing on cultural orientations was the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program) study (Ashkanasy, Trevor-Roberts, & Earnshaw, 2002). Researchers collected data from 1800 managers in 62 countries concerning cultural values and leadership practices. Their schema consisted of nine dimensions, which expanded on Hofstede's (1980) schema to include:

1. Assertiveness. The extent to which a society encourages people to be tough, confrontational and competitive.

2. Future Orientation. The extent to which society encourages future-related behaviours.

3. Gender Differentiation. The extent to which societies maximise gender differences.

4. Uncertainty Avoidance. The extent to which society places values on norms which help to alleviate the unpredictability of an uncertain world.

5. Power Distance. The extent to which people in a society expect power to be unequally shared.

6. Collectivism vs. Individualism. The extent to which individuals in societies are encouraged to be in groups.

7. Performance Orientation. The extent to which societies reward individuals for excellent performance and improvement.
8. Humane Orientation. The extent to which societies reward people for being fair and altruistic.

9. In-Group Collectivism. The extent to which people like to be members of small groups, such as families and close friends.

Although the results of the GLOBE (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) project indicated that there were a number of similarities between the US and England in terms of their orientation on these nine dimensions, these results pointed to slight variations in the values of American and English managers in three areas: assertiveness, performance orientation and uncertainty avoidance. The results of the GLOBE research indicated that in terms of assertiveness, Americans scored higher than most other countries in the world. However, it must be emphasised that the GLOBE project did not test whether these differences in country mean scores were statistically significant. The GLOBE project defined the Anglo-Cluster as a group of seven countries, which had previously been part of the British Empire, and included the US, England, Australia, Ireland, English-speaking South Africa, English- speaking Canada, and New Zealand. They suggested that although these countries shared some common history, differing political and historical factors had resulted in some variation in the value systems within the Anglo Cluster. The GLOBE research results indicating that Americans and the English differed on the three dimensions of assertiveness, performance orientation and uncertainty avoidance, were consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson (2002). This suggested that:

1. Americans preferred an efficient style of problem-solving that emphasised quick and measurable results. The American managers said that this orientation translated into a task style of decision-making that was action-orientated and focussed on task completion. This appeared to be consistent with the findings of the GLOBE researchers concerning America's high score on performance orientation.
2. Americans said that as a nationality they were assertive; the GLOBE study also concluded that Americans appeared to score higher on assertiveness than any country in the world. The researchers (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) concluded that this value orientation has translated into America’s 'can-do' attitude with its emphasis on achievement, particularly in terms of material wealth, and into its direct style in terms of speech and leadership style, which was consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson (2002).

3. Americans said that as a nationality they were optimistic; this optimism was reflected in their preference for a task-related style of decision-making that emphasised quick task completion, rather than thorough debate and discussion. This was in contrast to the process approach, preferred by the English managers, which centred on consensus and thorough debate which, they believed, avoided the problems associated with proceeding to the action stage too quickly. As an English participant commented in Dunkerley and Robinson (2002, p. 400), “the English view possible failure as a reason not to take risks: Americans view failure as a way forward.” This view, that the English preference for a process approach to decision making was associated with a reluctance to take risks, was consistent with the GLOBE research findings. These findings indicated that England scored higher on Uncertainty Avoidance (defined as the tendency for cultures to put structures and processes in place that reduce the uncertainty of daily life) than the Americans.

Schwartz and Bardi (2001) suggested that while past values research has tended to focus on differences in societal values throughout the world, these studies (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994) have also pointed out that individuals vary both within and across societies in terms of their value priorities, and these differences are related to differences in genetic heritage, personal experience, social locations, and enculturation. For example, Schwartz and Bardi contrasted the norms of the US with Western Europe, and concluded that in the US there were higher levels of achievement, which appeared to reflect the frontier nature of early America, and the capitalistic character of modern times. They also suggested that the relative importance of tradition and conformity in the US compared to
Western Europe, reflected the continuing influence of Puritanism and religion in American life.

1.1.3.4 Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty Avoidance refers to the extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguous situations and put into place structures that help them deal with these uncertainties (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994). This value orientation seems to be particularly relevant to a study of differences and similarities in American and English communication styles, as Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) suggested that the Americans and English appeared to vary in terms of their propensity to avoid uncertainty. The avoidance of uncertainty was related to the English style of speech, which was associated with avoiding risk and minimising embarrassment. The Americans favoured a direct style of speech, which did not similarly reflect these concerns. The differences in Americans' and English attitudes toward risk were consistent with the results of the GLOBE (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) project, and Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988), which similarly suggested that conversational patterns are related to tolerance for uncertainty, which varies cross-culturally. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey supported the view that avoidance of risk can be associated with speech and conversational patterns. They proposed that cultures with higher levels of anxiety associated with new situations, i.e. those with higher levels of uncertainty avoidance, will tend to use more elaborate words and understatement to manage their uncertainty in unfamiliar, ambiguous situations. In contrast, cultures with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance, theoretically, have lower levels of anxiety when confronting unfamiliar situations. As a result, people with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance are able to be direct and exacting in their speech style, as they have little need for the understatement and elaborate language used by those individuals characterised by higher levels of uncertainty avoidance.
1.1.3.5 Individualism vs. Collectivism

Individualism vs. collectivism has been described as the most utilised value dimension for intercultural research (Gudykunst & Lee, 2000). It appears to be associated with differences in American and English language styles found in Dunkerley and Robinson (2002), and thus seems pertinent to a study of communication differences in this context. Most cross-cultural studies have indicated that England and the United States are predominately individualistic cultures and tend to emphasise the goals of the individual over group goals; collectivist countries tend to emphasise the predominance of group goals over those of the individual (Parsons & Shils, 1951; Schwartz, 1994; Triandis, 1986; Trompenaars, 1993). Hofstede (1980), Schwartz and Trompenaars found the US and England have a number of cultural similarities, concluding the US and Great Britain tend to be categorised as individualistic countries where people prioritise the goals of individuals over those of the group. Smith and Bond (1998) reviewed a number of cross-cultural studies and concluded they all have in common a factor that is related to individualism-collectivism. They have similarly suggested that individualism-collectivism is the most important social psychological construct to date for understanding the differences and similarities between national cultures.

Vandello and Cohen (1999) also concluded that the individualism-collectivism dimension has been particularly successful when describing the behaviour of cultural groups, particularly in terms of behaviours, attitudes, values, norms and goals. However, they concluded that most research centring on individualism vs. collectivism has involved comparing Asian (collectivist) samples, with US or European samples (individualistic). Vandello and Cohen decided to: (a) investigate whether there were differences in American values in terms of the individualism-collectivism continuum; and (b) whether there are various ecological, historical and social factors, which are associated with
regional differences in this dimension in the context of the United States. They recognised the inherent individualistic character of the US, but hypothesised that, nevertheless, there would be variations throughout the various geographic regions of the US, which could provide greater insight into the concept of individualism vs. collectivism in general. The first stage of the project involved the development of an eight item index measuring individualistic tendencies. This index was based on state level data concerning social, political, occupational and religious behaviours. The results indicated there were regional differences in collectivism throughout the US.

In the second stage of the project, Vandello and Cohen (1999) compared the results of a survey undertaken in 1990 by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, with the collectivism-individualism index developed in the first stage of the project. The University of Michigan survey was selected because it had investigated a wide range of social issues with a nationally representative sample. The results indicated the survey responses correlated highly with the collectivism index. The researchers concluded that the results of the survey provided further support for the validity of the collectivism index, at the level of measuring individual attitudes.

The third stage of the Vandello and Cohen (1999) project involved testing a number of hypotheses surrounding the individualism vs. collectivism dimension. These hypotheses comprised a total of ten items, which included the following: (a) is affluence related to individualism; (b) is population associated with collectivism; (c) do historical factors related to agriculture create conditions for collectivism; (d) do the percentage of minorities relate to collectivism; (e) is residential stability correlated with collectivism; (f) will suicide correlate with individualism; (g) will binge drinking correlate with individualism; (h) will individualism promote artistic creativity; (i) is gender equality and racial equality correlated to individualism? To determine how various historical, social,
and political factors had influenced modern day values and behaviours, these hypotheses were tested using historical records, 19th and 20th century Census data, for example. They then compared this data with the collectivism index developed in stage one. For example, Vandello and Cohen compared the results of the 1860, 1880, and 1900 Census agricultural statistics, including the number of people involved in various agricultural pursuits, with the collectivism index. The study supported the view that the US, which has been described by Hofstede (1980), Schwartz (1994) and Trompenaars (1993) as individualistic, nevertheless may show regional differences in collectivism, which may be associated with historical, political and social factors. They found support for this hypothesis in nine of the 10 predictions listed previously, concluding there was no support for the idea that individualism promoted artistic creativity. While the study was limited to one nation, Vandello and Cohen concluded the methodology provided an "ecological framework" (p. 290) for analysing other cultures, using a combination of historical and ecological factors, which may similarly show regional variations on the individualism vs. collectivism dimension.

Other researchers (Kapoor, Hughes, Baldwin, & Blue, 2003) have also concluded that individualism-collectivism will vary within cultures similarly clustered along Hofstede's (1980), Schwartz' (1994) and Trompenaars' (1993) dimensions. Kapoor et al. concluded there are historical, social, and demographic features inherent in all cultures, which limit the applicability of previous findings concerning country differences in individualism vs. collectivism. As described in Section 1.1.3.3, the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) found that although the English-speaking Anglo Cluster showed similar scores on the nine value dimensions used in this study, it was similarly suggested that differing political and historical factors had resulted in some variation in the value systems within the Anglo Cluster.
1.1.3.6 Predicting Individual Behaviour

A number of studies (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; Trompenaars, 1993) have concluded that countries can be categorised along a number of dimensions of cultural variability. However, Hofstede has suggested that value dimensions, as defined by large cross-cultural studies, may not be valid in predicting and capturing behaviour at the individual level. "Cultures are not individuals, they are wholes, and their internal logic cannot be understood in the terms used for the personality dynamics of individuals" (p. 31). Although, Hofstede concluded his results may only be valid at the aggregate level, Maznevski and Peterson (1997) have noted that some researchers have nevertheless tried to use Hofstede's indexes to describe behaviour at an individual or company level of analysis. According to Maznevski and Peterson, these types of studies erroneously imply that country-level scores reflect an individual's set of values. For example, research has shown that some characteristics, which have previously been found to reflect individualistic societies, do not necessarily indicate actual differences between individualistic and collectivistic countries; indeed, the value patterns appeared to be much more complex (Erez & Somech, 1996). The view that value patterns within countries are complex was consistent with Vandello and Cohen (1999) who similarly suggested the pattern of Individualism vs. Collectivism in the US varied by geographical region, due to historical and economic reasons. Vandello and Cohen also concluded that it is difficult to draw general conclusions about behaviour at the individual level from aggregate-level data and information about value dimensions. Thus, if considered in this research context, the behaviour of English and American managers may not be consistent with their Individualistic, low Uncertainty Avoidance values, as predicted by Hofstede, Schwartz and Trompenaars. As suggested by Vandello and Cohen, while individuals hold values, and are influenced by them, the behaviour of these individuals is complex and may be
influenced by a number of factors. This will be discussed in the context of Cognitive Theory, which suggests there are a number of elements that affect behaviour, including values, as well as expectations, previous knowledge, and experience. This is discussed in Section 1.1.5.

While Maznevski, DiStefano, Gomez, Noorderhaven, and Wu (2002) have pointed to the important role that large group studies such as Hofstede (1980) have played in the conceptualisation and measurement of culture, they suggested the large, value orientation studies have hindered international management research in two ways: (a) they have limited cross-cultural studies to the country-level of analysis; and (b) they have limited the analysis of cross-cultural issues to the countries that have been included in these studies. While, Maznevski et al. concluded that national cultural orientation may influence an individual’s values system and social behaviours, they have suggested that more cross-cultural studies need to be focussed at the individual or company level of analysis.

1.1.4 Cross-Cultural Communication

1.1.4.1 Language Style

As previously discussed in the context of Anglo-American workplaces, value systems guide the behaviour of individuals by providing a framework for selecting and evaluating appropriate behaviour (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Values are also related to cultural misunderstandings, as people will use their set of may subsequently see the other group, who have their own values and ways of communicating, as offensive and exhibiting inappropriate behaviour. Social psychologists have defined communication style as these underlying aspects of language usage, including elements such as the preference for direct vs. indirect speech. For example, Norton (1978, p. 99) defined communication style as "the way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered or understood." Importantly, according to Norton, communication style is dependent on time, context and situation, and the style can vary
within the same group of individuals on the basis of these three variables. Style of speech includes a preference for direct vs. indirect speech, for instance. With direct speech, the intent of the speaker is revealed explicitly in the message; with indirect speech, the true needs or intents of the speaker are left implicit (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988, 1996; Smith & Bond, 1993; Triandis, 1994).

According to Johnson and Johnson (1975), for example, Americans employ a direct style of speech, which reflects the American values of individual worth, assertiveness, and an egalitarian approach to relationships. Although Maznevski et al. (2002) pointed out that value orientations may not predict behaviour at the individual level, social psychologists (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1993, 1998) have associated value orientations, such as individualism vs. individualism as conceptualised by Hofstede (1980) and Schwartz (1995), with language and communication style. For example, Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey suggested that Americans, who are described as valuing individualism rather than collectivism, reflected this individualism in their direct style of speech. They also suggested that a direct style of speech reflects values associated with assertiveness and self-concern, and indirect speech reflects values associated with saving face and maintaining group harmony.

McClelland (1987) similarly suggested that styles of language and communication are adopted as a result of specific socialisation practices that take place in the family. He appeared to offer an explanation as to why the Americans and the English, who appear to have similar values, prefer different styles of speech. McClelland used a particularly innovative methodology to develop his theories. He measured the levels of collective motivation of 39 countries by reading the stories read by children in public schools, and coding them on the basis of achievement themes running through these stories. He surmised that children's stories appeared to reflect cultural themes and ideas that
represented the views of people within a country, at any given time, and were roughly comparable from country to country. He then compared these levels of motivation with a measure of economic growth, electricity usage. He suggested the levels of nAchievement in any country, at any given time, predicted subsequent economic growth. For example, he concluded the US had high collective levels of nAchievement, i.e. the incentive to achieve, which was associated with long periods of economic prosperity in America. He contrasted this with Great Britain, which had experienced long periods of economic deprivation, caused by two world wars fought close to its shores. McClelland suggested these economic, and related political and social factors, had contributed to low levels of nAchievement in the British population. He concluded that groups characterised by higher levels of nAchievement, e.g. the US, would be more comfortable with taking risks, which would be reflected in their direct speech style. This was consistent with the views of Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) who suggested that people with lower levels of Uncertainty Avoidance, i.e. those with a high tolerance for risk, could afford to be direct and exacting in their speech. This is in contrast to individuals characterised by higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance, i.e. those who tend to avoid risky situations, who may tend to use understatement and elaborate language (See Section 1.1.3.4).

Trompenaars (1993) also suggested countries that appeared to be similar in terms of cultural values, could nevertheless differ in terms of their style of communication. For example, he concluded that the US and Great Britain varied in terms of their preference for direct (US) vs. indirect speech (UK). Trompenaars concluded that the US is a large culturally diverse society and a direct style of speech has evolved that enabled individuals to break down social barriers and communicate with strangers. The UK, it could be theorised, is in comparison a more homogeneous society and does not have the same need for direct speech. Trompenaars also concluded the US and UK differed in their style of
humour, with the British more likely to use humour as an indirect means of releasing emotions. This was consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson (2002).

While a number of researchers have devised schemas for defining dimensions of cultural variability in value systems among organisational employees (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; Trompenaars, 1993), other researchers have attempted to differentiate cultures along dimensions that are related to usage of preferred language styles (Hall, 1976; Parsons & Shils, 1951). Hall differentiated cultures as to whether they preferred low-context speech, i.e. when the true meaning of the message is revealed explicitly in the communication, or high-context speech in which much of the true message is left implicit by the speaker. Hall (2000) subsequently argued that cultures are not exclusively at one end or the other of the context scale, and concluded there are elements of both high- and low-context communications in all cultures. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) concluded that the individualistic vs. collectivist dimension, common to a number of values schemas, and Hall's low vs. high context communication schema, were parallel constructs and could be summarised by the prediction that a person's orientation on the individualism vs. collectivism dimension would predict a preference for either high or low context speech. Levine (1985) suggested that the individualistic values of American people are reflected in their direct style of speech, i.e. they “don't beat around the bush” (p. 28). Like Levine (1985), Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) similarly found that Americans preferred a direct style of speech, e.g. as an American participant commented: “Americans are more direct, we get to the point” (p. 398). Evidence has also suggested that people vary as to their preferred method of dealing with conflict, and these differences can be classified on a directness vs. indirectness continuum (Falbo, 1977). Direct strategies involve direct confrontation and assertive presentation of one's views, while indirect strategies involve non-confrontational behaviour, evasion, and other indirect means. Ting-
Toomey (1988) suggested there are cultural differences in styles of confrontation, which appear to be associated with differences in individualistic vs. collectivistic societies. Ting-Toomey, like Dunkerley and Robinson, found that Americans preferred a direct style of confrontation, while the English preferred a more indirect approach. This evidence suggested that cultural misunderstandings were occurring in this context, within Anglo-American organisations.

1.1.4.2 Cultural Misunderstandings

Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) have suggested that despite the fact that both American and English participants had cross-cultural experience, miscommunications and stereotyping were continuing between English and American colleagues working together in Anglo-American organisations. As Burgoon and Walther (1990) suggested, people's expectations about appropriate behaviour are influenced by their norms, attitudes and values. Misunderstandings or misattributions occur when individuals then use their own set of values when interpreting the messages or behaviour of people with differing cultural values (Smith & Bond, 1993; Triandis, 1994).

According to Holtgraves (1997), however, language-based misunderstandings are mediated by the extent to which the perceiver's language style matches the language style of the speaker. For example, people using a direct style of speech will view more favourably other people similarly using a direct style. Conversely, indirect speakers will look on direct speakers less favourably. Holtgraves and Yang (1990) also found that individuals believed that direct speakers were thought to have higher status and were judged as having a closer relationship with the listener. However, this situation, too, may result in misunderstandings, as the listener may believe he or she has a closer relationship with the speaker than exists in reality. They also concluded that level of directness can have an impact on the effectiveness of the communication. While indirect speech may be
considered polite, the message may be incomprehensible to some people, which may intensify the level of misunderstandings.

Bandura (1986) suggested that when people misjudge their own and other people's behaviour, adverse effects can be created that may create interpersonal conflict. In the context of Dunkerley and Robinson (2002), as the English tended to value indirect speech while the Americans were inclined to value direct speech, each culture negatively evaluated the speech of the other cultural group. Both Americans and the English believed that the other cultural member was using an inappropriate style of speech. Therefore, the more direct communication style of the Americans can be interpreted by the English as rude and insensitive, while the less direct English style was seen as inefficient and obscure by the Americans.

Samovar and Porter (1991) developed a theory of culture that stated members of a society or nation are seen to have a common culture with a shared set of values that influence behaviour within organisations. Hence, members of different national backgrounds acquire different views of formal structures within organisations, and the informal patterns of behaviour by which business is accomplished. These expectations colour the way members of national cultures respond to members of unfamiliar cultures within organisations. This implies that cross-cultural interactions may result in misinterpretations and negative evaluations of the out-group's behaviour.

Maznevski and Peterson (1997) similarly suggested that members of cross-cultural groups, who have differing value systems, may subsequently develop different viewpoints and frames of references concerning organisational events. These conflicting viewpoints create different expectations concerning group processes, which mean that cross-cultural members will inevitably interpret organisational events in an entirely dissimilar manner. They pointed out that these misunderstandings can inhibit organisational effectiveness.
According to Maznevski and Peterson, in order to change expectations and reduce cultural misunderstandings, people need a knowledge base of differing value systems; this base will enable people to bridge cultural differences and maximise organisational performance and cultural harmony. Smith and Bond (1998) have suggested that cultures do vary in their approaches to problem-solving, and either employ a task approach, whereby the focus is on the structure of the task; or a process approach, whereby the focus is on relationship-building.

In Dunkerley and Robinson's (2002) study of differences and similarities in ways of communicating between American and English managers, it was found that misunderstandings and miscommunications were occurring in this context in three different situations: (a) direct criticism (US) vs. indirect criticism (UK); (b) optimism (US) vs. pessimism (UK); and task (US) vs. process (UK) approach to problem solving (this difference did not reach statistical significance). The evidence also suggested each group was feeling frustrated or annoyed with the other approach.

Maznevski and Peterson (1997) proposed that groups characterised by differing value systems, inevitably will have different expectations about cross-cultural encounters. They suggested that these differing expectations may create cultural misunderstandings. Miller (1995) similarly concluded that differences in communication styles in themselves may not be creating misunderstandings between members of different national cultures. Miller suggested that misunderstandings may occur because each cultural group has different expectations or assumptions about a cross-cultural encounter or communication task, which in turn influences their expectations about culturally appropriate behaviour. In other words, it is the pragmatic understanding each individual brings to a cross-cultural encounter that affects the expectations and the assumptions about that encounter, i.e. how each individual assesses the purposes of an organisational activity or event. Therefore,
even if an individual is aware of style differences in indirect vs. direct speech, for example, he or she may not be aware that members of a different cultural group have entirely different expectations or assumptions about a cross-cultural encounter or communication task. This in turn will influence their expectations about culturally appropriate behaviour. Miller concluded that researchers need to look at specific organisational events to identify how individuals were interpreting events, and to determine if people were consistent with their assumptions and expectations about appropriate behaviour. Thus, Maznevski and Peterson’s and Miller’s views suggested that differences in American and English communication styles, i.e. the levels of direct vs. indirect speech, could produce cross-cultural misunderstandings even if each culture is aware that Americans and the English prefer different styles of speech.

1.1.4.3 Stereotyping

Miller (1995) suggested that misunderstandings occur when groups have differing expectations about speech styles. According to Triandis (1994), misunderstandings are also an example of stereotyping, which occur when one cultural group applies its own value systems when interpreting the messages from members of another cultural group. Stereotyping involves over generalised beliefs that one group holds about another (Scollon & Scollon, 2001). Stereotypes can focus on attributes such as gender or ethnicity, and it is believed that stereotypes serve several important functions in cross-cultural encounters: these functions include the reduction of uncertainty inherent in cross-cultural interactions, and the enhancement of in-group members’ self-esteem (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995; Tajfel, 1978). Stereotypes can create cultural misunderstandings as each cultural member has generalised beliefs about people or groups, which sometimes may be erroneous.

Scollon and Scollon (2001) identified two forms of stereotyping. Negative stereotyping was defined as an "obstruction" to successful cultural relations because it precluded recognition of the real differences that exist between groups (p. 171). They
identified three aspects of negative stereotyping: (a) two cultures are contrasted on the basis of some single dimension; (b) there is a focus on this cultural difference, rather than the relationship or communication itself; (c) it places a negative value on one group, and a positive value on another; and (d) the stereotype is generalised to the entire group. As a result, each group appears to be at the opposite ends of the spectrum on any dimension. As a result of stereotyping, cultural groups may have a negative view of the other, which has implications for positive intercultural relationships. Positive stereotyping, on the other hand, involves labelling different groups as identical, on the basis of a single measure, even though the groups, in reality, may be very different. Unlike negative stereotyping, where the basis of comparison is negative, positive stereotyping involves associating positive characteristics with the stereotyped group. However, Scollon and Scollon concluded that both negative and positive stereotyping may inhibit successful communication. This is because both types of stereotyping: (a) over-generalise similarities and differences between people, (b) focus on only the simplest contrasts between groups, and (c) exaggerate the positive and negative aspects of these stereotypes.

Dunkerley and Robinson (2000) found the English believed Americans were loud and brash, while the Americans believed that the English were inscrutable, implying that cultural stereotyping was occurring in this Anglo-American organisational context. While stereotyping described in Dunkerley and Robinson was associated with national cultural differences, Macrae, Bodenhausen and Milne (1995) suggested that in reality, people belong to multiple categories, i.e. they may vary in terms of age, sex and ethnic background. According to Macrae et al., any of these competing categorisations can influence how individuals perceive and evaluate other people. In particular, these researchers suggested there are several factors that determine which of many competing categories will dominate social impressions, i.e. sex, age group or ethnicity. These factors
may include: (a) the salience of the particular categorization; (b) the perceivers' processing objectives; (c) and the perceiver's level of prejudice towards certain groups. These researchers also concluded that early conditioning may influence which cues trigger a particular response; these stereotypical attributes may become more accessible to people in later life. It may also be the case that people may form complex, accurate impressions of people, while avoiding simplistic impressions of people based on a single category. Macrae et al. suggested the automatic processing of categorisation cues, i.e. stereotyping that is not in the conscious control of the perceiver, in many instances may facilitate the processing of complex social situations. This may be particularly true in situations involving people who can be categorised along a number of dimensions, each of which may trigger a particular stereotypical response. Macrae et al. concluded that as well as being automatic, the process whereby people categorise information associated with social perception involves the interaction of both excitatory and inhibitory mechanisms. These are both associated with the necessity of being selective when processing information and described the dual process by which categorical information is processed. For example, if an American encountered a female English manager, would the American activate the female or the English categories? If the English category is activated, the female category is inhibited, not ignored, through an active process which suppresses the irrelevant category, and eliminates distracting elements from the mental representation of the target. Conversely, excitation describes the process whereby relevant information, i.e. relating to the nationality of the target, gains sufficient activation to enter the consciousness of the perceiver. Macrae et al. concluded that at any given time, people may have an awareness of more than one categorisation cue, and it may be the conjunction of social cues that influence individual's perceptions of one another, i.e. American managers may have a different reaction to female English managers than they do with male English managers.
In an earlier experiment, Macrae, Milne, and Bodenhausen (1994) studied whether or not stereotyping is an effective, adaptive process that plays a central role in social cognition, i.e. are stereotypes efficient, or are there costs to be paid by both the perceiver and the stereotyped individuals? In a series of experiments designed to test these hypotheses, the participants performed a number of impression-forming tasks. One group drew on stereotypical information to aid them in the completion of the tasks; in the other condition this stereotypical information was not available. Macrae et al. concluded that while earlier research has tended to focus on the costs involved in using stereotyping, to both the perceiver and the stereotyped target, their results suggested that stereotyping played a central role in cognition. Thus, the stereotyping described by Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) may not be associated with conflict in this setting. Consistent with Macrae et al., through the application of stereotyping, Americans and the English may be "economising" cognition, which will enable them to better manage the demands made on their general cognitive processing ability. By applying stereotypical thinking, each group can then redirect their mental capacities into more conscious, complex reasoning strategies.

Macrae et al. (1994) pointed out that stereotyping thinking does not involve people's conscious, deliberate thought, and individuals are probably not aware they are involved in stereotypical thinking and behaviour. In a series of experiments similarly focussing on automatic influences in social perception, Bargh, Chen and Burrows (1996) found there may be automatic, nonconscious social behaviours, which may be triggered on the basis of salient situational features in other, unrelated contexts, without the perceiver being aware of his or her behaviour. For example, by priming participants with a series of scrambled word tasks, which included words related to the elderly, Bargh et al. found that words linked to this particular stereotype nonconsciously influenced behaviour in another, unrelated context. They also suggested there may be an automatic, nonconscious basis for
self-fulfilling prophecy effects, i.e. if a perceiver's automatic stereotype activation causes the perceiver to behave in a manner that is consistent with that stereotype, the stereotyped individual may well behave in an equally hostile manner. This may in effect produce a behavioural confirmation of the perceiver's stereotype. For example, if a stereotype is activated by the physical aspects of a target, i.e. skin colour, age, or speech accent, the perceiver behaves in a manner consistent with the stereotype. Subsequently, the target may similarly behave in a hostile manner, which could produce behavioural confirmation of the stereotype for the initial perceiver. Bargh et al. pointed out that people may not even be aware of the role their initial hostility had played in this scenario.

Research has also focused on the enduring nature of social stereotyping, (Macrae, Milne & Bodenhausen, 1997). This resistance to change stereotypical thinking was associated with a number of cognitive factors, which lessen the impact of information which may disconfirm the stereotype. There are also a number of facets of memory that inhibit stereotypical change, i.e. stereotypical-consistent information is more easily retained and is very difficult to forget. However later research (Castelli, Macrae, Zogmaster & Arcuri, 2004) has questioned the automatic nature of stereotypical thinking, concluding that stereotyping is far from an evitable mental process. They concluded the activation of a stereotype can be bypassed or eliminated under certain conditions. These moderating influences can include internal factors such processing goals, i.e. are people motivated to change, or chronic beliefs, i.e. highly prejudiced individuals may activate stereotypes regardless of moderating factors. Also moderating the stereotype activation are factors relating to the complexity of the task, with greater stereotype activation associated with targets that are easier to process. In more complex social situations, stereotypes are only activated by stimuli that are easy to process, i.e. these stimuli will have higher levels of activations. The context in which the target is located was also shown to affect the
activation of stereotypes, i.e. if a target, perhaps with an ethnic background, is standing outside a church, the perception and affective reaction to the target may be modulated.

1.1.4.4 Self-Concepts and Group Membership

Stereotyping has also been linked to an individual's need to boost their own self-image. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978) predicts that the stereotyped self-concept is related to membership in a social group or groups. People attach a positive value to this group, which is based on a shared set of values (Doise & Sinclair, 1973). In a bid to affirm a positive view of their behaviour, Tajfel suggested that people will compare themselves to out-group members, using their own set of values and norms, in a way that places them in a positive light. Dunkerley and Robinson's (2002) findings were consistent with Tajfel in suggesting the Americans and the English were interpreting the 'out-group's' behaviour negatively, i.e. the English believed American speech was rude and brash, while the Americans believed the English were inscrutable. These appeared to be examples of out-group denigration, and in-group normalisation. Several studies have been carried out in the past to determine how and if social identities operate in different situations, although the results appear to be inconclusive (Brewer, Ho, Lee, & Miller, 1987; Bond & Hewstone, 1986).

Huczynski and Buchanan (2001) stated that there are instances when an individual may reject or distance him or herself from their own group; this may happen when a person believes the in-group is not characterised by values and beliefs that enhance his or her self-image. Taylor and Brown (1994) have put forward a similar idea when referring to 'positive illusions.' This referred to the idea that people will inevitably regard themselves in a more favourable light than they do other people. By having high self-regard, individuals are able to maintain a state of psychological well-being and positive self-image.
1.1.5 Cultural Adaptation

Cushner and Brislin (1996) suggested that experience in interacting in cross-cultural situations will enable managers to adapt their behaviour, suggesting that people would be less likely to experience negative emotions associated with stereotyping and cultural misunderstandings. Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) concluded that stereotypes and cultural misunderstandings are not necessarily phenomena that are eliminated through cross-cultural experience. Despite the length of time that the Americans and English worked together in a cross-cultural setting, the participants admitted that at some point, they had been annoyed, uncomfortable or frustrated by the other culture's approach. As Campbell (1967) believed that there is a strong relationship between conflict and negative stereotyping, this is a situation that cannot be conducive to either inter-group harmony or organisational effectiveness.

There are several reactions that result from an unfamiliar cross-cultural situation. People may experience a negative emotional reaction when the expectations of a new cultural situation are not met by reality. Thus, each group may incorrectly interpret the intentions of the other speaker, believing that the other cultural member is behaving in an inappropriate manner (Mullavey-O'Bryne, 1994; Oberg, 1960; Rogers & Ward, 1993), or people may begin to learn about the behaviours of other cultural members and adapt their behaviour accordingly (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). Cushner and Brislin concluded that if people increased their knowledge of other cultures, they should be able to adapt their behaviour in order to avoid and overcome any negative emotional response.

Guthrie (1975) and Taylor (1994) suggested that people have to develop an appropriate skill and knowledge base if they are to cope successfully with and adapt to unfamiliar cultural situations and avoid negative emotional responses. Concluding that many of the previous models of cultural adaptation were too simplistic, Anderson (1994) proposed that the cultural adaptation process involved a complex number of stages and a
number of outcomes. People may adapt readily to their new surroundings. They may avoid any cross-cultural contact. People may adapt outwardly but still experience stress and anxiety, or they may completely integrate into the new culture.

Berry (1999) defined cultural adaptation as the process of cultural change that occurs when people from different cultures come into contact with one another. Berry developed a framework for understanding the process of cultural adaptation, which focused on two main issues people must address when entering into new, cross-cultural situations: (a) cultural maintenance, which are aspects of the new culture that need to be retained; and (b) contact and participation, which referred to those aspects of one's own culture that need to be maintained at any cost. People subsequently use one or a combination of four strategies when adapting to a new culture: (a) assimilation, where non-dominant groups do not wish to maintain their own culture; (b) separation, where people want to hold onto their own values, and avoid contact with other groups; (c) integration, where the non-dominant groups maintain some of their cultural identity, while still participating in the larger cultural group; and (d) marginalisation, where there is no interest in cultural maintenance or relations with other groups. Berry proposed there are two psychological outcomes associated with any attempt at acculturation, and these outcomes begin very early in the acculturation process: behavioural shifts and acculturative stress. These two psychological outcomes will subsequently influence which acculturation strategy will be adopted. It was concluded that if the level of conflict is low, the psychological outcome will be a behavioural shift, and people will tend to yield to the norms and values of the new group. Assimilation is the probable outcome of this scenario. If, however, the individual concludes that the issues are problematical, but not insurmountable, they will experience acculturative stress, or 'culture shock.' At this point people will consider their options, and will subsequently follow either: (a) an integration strategy, which is the less stressful of the
two options, or (b) a marginalisation strategy, which is more stressful and is associated with dysfunctional behaviours. In summary, the views of Anderson, Guthrie, Taylor and Berry suggested that successful cultural adaptation, which avoids negative emotions, is a complex cognitive process involving an appropriate level of skills and cross-cultural knowledge. The adaptation process also involves maintaining aspects of a person's own culture and values, while adopting elements of the new culture that are necessary to adaptation.

1.1.6 Cognitive Theory

A number of cognitive theories have been proposed to explain how values, experience and expectations affect how people interpret the behaviour of other people, and develop an appropriate behavioural response. These models also describe how people subsequently develop ideas about future behaviour based on the outcomes from past experiences, i.e. these ideas will affect their cultural adaptation strategies, as described in the previous section. Cognitive theory suggests that when interpreting and processing information, people use a number of structures that simply cognition and help them to organise information efficiently. These structures include values, as well as past experience, and company information.

Redding (1980) concluded that while culturally patterned experiences were the most important influences on an individual's cognitive and affective processes, past experiences and organisational factors also affected cognition. He also suggested that rewards, or valued outcomes from behaviour, will influence how individuals develop ideas about what is important to them; these ideas subsequently serve as guidelines for future behaviour. In his model, Redding proposed that in the first stage of the cognitive process, an individual receives information from the organisational environment and selects relevant aspects of that information. He or she then interprets the information using
culture, past experiences, organisational factors, etc. The second stage of cognition involves the processes of imagination, reasoning and decision-making. The results of this stage of the process will form a series of cognitive systems or paradigms; these will remain fairly stable over time and act as the main guides to organisational behaviour. Redding concluded that culture ultimately influences behaviour by affecting the structure of the cognitive system and by influencing an individual's value systems. This is shown in Figure 1.1.

If considered in the context of Dunkerley and Robinson (2002), Redding's model (1980) suggests that while American and English managers relied on their culturally determined values when interpreting information about their work environments, they also relied on their past experiences, i.e. has the strategy worked in the past. The model also suggested there may be organisational factors that influence how people interpret cues from their workplace environment, i.e. people may consider behavioural outcomes in the context of corporate policy that dictates the style and form of acceptable behaviour. The Redding model assumes that people take these factors into account when processing information, which will ultimately influence future behaviour. If certain behaviours are reinforced, through appraisals and reviews, it is more likely these behaviours will occur in the future. For instance, if an indirect English manager is rewarded for using direct speech, he or she will be more likely to speak directly in the future, even if this style is not the preferred approach to communication. This implies that if people are not rewarded or reinforced for behaviour that is consistent with their cultural values, they may adapt their behaviour accordingly, and will subsequently behave in a manner, which appears to inconsistent with their cultural values.

Also looking at behaviour at the individual level, Lord and Kernan (1987) defined cognitive structures as scripts that help people to organise data relevant to a number of
typical organisational activities, i.e. meetings, problem-solving, and performance appraisals. Fisher (as cited in Shaw, 1990) stated that differences in schemas or scripts between cultural groups may cause disagreements and conflicts in performance appraisals as each side has a different set of criteria for defining good and bad performance. Adler, Doktor, and Redding (1986) concluded that progress in cross-cultural management research depends to a large extent on understanding the relationship between culture and cognition. Rosch (1975) suggested that people are inundated with so much information in their daily lives that they have the need to develop a cognitive structure, e.g. schemas and scripts that help them to process and organise information efficiently.
Maznevski and Peterson (1997) concluded that culture affects the schemas and scripts into which individuals place information about their environments. Culture also affects the criteria by which an individual evaluates a response preference. They suggested that in organisational settings, individuals must make sense of and respond to events in their environment. For example, culture affects whether or not individuals recognise the
task implications within an organisational activity, the process implications of that activity, or whether they recognise both the process and task implications of an organisational event or process.

Maznevski and Peterson (1997) noted that sometimes people will respond to the culture-related aspects of their cognitive schemas. At other times, people will be inclined to respond to the person or situation related aspects of their environments. Maznevski and Peterson used Mischel's (1973) concept of 'strong' vs. 'weak' situations, to differentiate circumstances where social and environmental cues are clear and people do not rely on their cultural scripts to evaluate and execute a behavioural response (clear), with 'weak' situations, which are normally related to relationships with people from different cultures. In weak situations, the framework for interpreting and responding to events is not clear, and people refer to cultural guidelines to aid in the interpretation of unfamiliar events. Rosch (1975), Maznevski and Peterson, and Mischel suggested the differences in American and English problem-solving styles, as described by Dunkerley and Robinson (2002), can be explained by cognitive theory. Thus, in unfamiliar or 'weak' cross-cultural situations, when the cues for appropriate behaviour are unclear, each group will rely to a greater extent on their own set of cultural guidelines when interpreting and processing organisational events. Americans, who value efficiency, may emphasise the task implications of an event. The English, characterised by higher levels of uncertainty avoidance, may emphasise the process implications. However, in situations in which the environmental cues are clear, both groups may rely more on situational or person-related cues, than their cultural guidelines, when interpreting behaviour.

Researchers (Gioia & Sims, 1986; Lurigio & Carroll, 1985; Sullivan & Nonaka, 1988) have noted a link between cognitive processes and behaviour. For example, Sullivan and Nonaka found that Japanese and Americans differed as to whether they
labelled organisational situations as opportunities or as problems. Americans were far more likely to see a situation as an opportunity, and once labelled as such, they were far more likely to deal with the situation successfully. This was very similar to Dunkerley and Robinson's (2002) findings that the English and the Americans differed in their orientation to either a prevailing optimistic or a pessimistic view towards life and problem-solving, with both groups similarly describing Americans as more optimistic and the English as more pessimistic.

Shaw (1990) developed a cognitive categorisation model that suggested employees process and analyse information about specific organisational situation in which that employee must interact with a manager, i.e. a meeting or a performance appraisal. The employee then uses an appropriate behavioural script to analyse or process a specific situation (Gioia & Manz, 1985; Lord & Kernan, 1987). Shaw proposed, for example, that the behavioural script used by a manager to evaluate an employee will depend on the manager's own schemas about good leadership and employee behaviour, which have developed from the manager's own past experiences, and value systems. Lord (1985) suggested that when a manager does eventually appraise an employee's performance, he or she will recall information about the actual behaviour of the employee. However, the manager will also recall prototypical characteristics about what constitutes good employee behaviour, which are associated with the category into which the employee has been placed during the manager's cognitive processing. Thus, the manager will assess employee performance not only on the basis of actual performance, but in the context of his or her own pre-existing ideas of good and bad performance. This inevitably will have implications for the validity and reliability of the performance appraisal process. As Shaw (1990) concluded, there are a number of difficulties that arise when managers and subordinates from different cultures, who may have dissimilar value systems and ideas
about good and bad performance, interact in cross-cultural organisations. Arvey, Bhagat, and Salas (1991) suggested that people working in cross-cultural organisations may have different values and expectations about appropriate organisational practices and procedures. Therefore, researchers need to know more about the broad cultural values that limit or diminish the utility of various organisational systems. They pointed out that more theory development within the context of appraisals is needed in the cross-cultural context.

The cognitive categorisation model was developed by Shaw (1990) specifically for intercultural organisational situations. He proposed that culture influences behaviour by affecting the structure and content of employee/manager behavioural schemas and scripts, incorporating the ideas of previous cross-national comparative research on managerial values, beliefs, and styles. For example, he suggested that the prototype of a good vs. a bad worker is different across cultures because cultures may conform to different ends of the spectrum on a continuum provided by Hofstede's (1980) and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) value dimensions. Incorporating ideas generated by studies focussing on managerial values, beliefs, and styles into his cognitive theory, Shaw stated that these values and norms form part of the cognitive structure that people use to filter, organise and assess information pertaining to organisational life. Shaw concluded that the model emphasised that if members of different cultures hold different prototypical views of effective decision-making, they will have an impact on how these groups perceive and react to each other.

Shaw (1990) also suggested that there are a number of variables which influence these cognitive processes. These include situational cues in the out-group member's behaviour, and current demands being made on the individual that determine whether the individual's response is automatic, which means the person is unaware of the processes involved, or under the cognitive control of the individual. Also, affecting cognition
relating to a specific situation is how motivated employees are to change the existing structure of their schemas and scripts. Shaw concluded that aspects of national culture as outlined by cross-cultural researchers (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn & Strodbeck, 1961) will inevitably influence cognition, use of behavioural scripts and ultimately employee behaviour. These effects will be moderated by variables such as degree of exposure to the other culture, familiarity with the other culture and educational similarity.

1.1.7 Aims

As Adler et al. (1986) suggested, most cross-cultural studies have not investigated how societal values are reflected in ways of communicating within organisations. Neither did they investigate whether misunderstandings and miscommunications were occurring in organisations in which employees with different value systems worked together. In line with Adler et al., it is ironic that although interaction is the essence of organisational behaviour, little research has focused on intercultural interaction in the workplace. However, a number of researchers have attempted to ascertain whether organisational structure and culture determines employees' behaviour in organisations, or whether national or cultural conditioning limits the organisation's influence over employee behaviour. Adherents of the convergence perspective of inter-cultural behaviour believed that characteristics of all organisations throughout the world are more or less free of the effects of culture-specific peculiarities. Proponents of the divergence perspective believe that organisations are culture-bound and are remaining so. Adler et al. concluded that while organisations may be very similar in terms of structure, as behaviour is related to the national cultural orientation of these individuals, the behaviour of individuals based in cross-cultural organisations may be very different.
Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) appeared to support the divergence perspective of inter-cultural behaviour, which suggested that organisations are culture-bound and that the behaviour of individuals within the organisation is related to an individual's national cultural orientation. The results of their cultural study suggested that at least in this specific instance, Americans and English working together in a cross-cultural environment are misunderstanding each other's messages and are experiencing some feelings of frustration, annoyance or irritation when the other cultural member uses their own communication in the workplace. This has serious implications for both organisational effectiveness and employee work satisfaction. This out-group denigration appeared to be consistent with Tajfel's (1978) and Doise and Sinclair's (1973) view that each group was using their own set of values and social beliefs to both provide a basis for in- and out-group interactions. This was also in line with Smith and Bond's (1993) definition of cultural misunderstandings and Triandis' (1994) definition of stereotyping.

Although Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) found anecdotal and empirical evidence suggesting differences in language use associated with misunderstandings and stereotyping in Anglo-American work groups, little appears to have been written in the social psychological literature about this topic. Cross-cultural literature, e.g. Hofstede (1980), suggested that the US and Great Britain have a number of cultural similarities in terms of speech and value systems. The similarities, particularly those related to individualism vs. collectivism, would appear to suggest that both groups would share a similar style of speech. However, as discussed, Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) did not support this view. Dunkerley and Robinson found the Americans and the English appeared to have different attitudes toward uncertainty avoidance, particularly in the context of speech and decision-making. However, Hofstede had concluded that the US and Great Britain scored similarly on the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension, which was related to a society's preference for
avoiding uncertainties and risk. Although recent research has pointed to underlying value differences in societies similarly clustered along Hofstede's and Schwartz' (1994) dimensions (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Vandello & Cohen, 1999), it seemed logical to investigate the values of American and English managers to test for similarities and differences. Further, it seemed appropriate to study the interaction of these two groups, to determine if there are differences in the styles of language or approaches to organisational systems, and if these differences are creating misunderstandings and stereotyping in this cross-cultural context. Specifically, this study will:

1. Examine differences and similarities in value systems between American and English manager working together in cross-cultural groups.

2. Determine whether cultural stereotyping and cultural miscommunications are taking place in Anglo-American workplaces.

3. Investigate the similarities and differences in American and English approaches to three organisational events: performance appraisals, decision-making and leadership.

4. To examine other variables, e.g. expectations, that may influence style of speaking and approaches to organisational events.
Chapter 2:
Reported Values of American and English Managers. A Study of Misunderstandings and Stereotyping

Summary

It is proposed that stereotyping and misunderstandings observed in the context of Anglo-American work groups may be related to differences in personal value systems, which are reflected in American and English communication styles. Contrary to predictions, there were no reported value differences between the two groups. As hypothesised, both groups have stereotypical views of their own culture, which centre on efficiency, assertiveness and individualism. While previous research has suggested that Americans and the English have similar values (Hofstede, 1980), recent research (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001) has indicated there may be underlying differences in value preferences in groups with similar values, which may account for the styles differences in this context. However, as these results suggest the two groups did not differ in value preferences, it is proposed that the next study should focus on other variables that may influence speech and approaches to organisational systems.
2.1 Introduction: Study 1

2.1.1 Background

Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) suggested that Americans and English managers were misunderstanding each other's styles of communicating and their approaches to organisational systems and processes. They concluded that both the Americans and the English at times felt annoyed, or frustrated with each other's approaches. Although levels of disagreements were not measured in this context, researchers have associated cultural misunderstandings with organisational conflict (Lord & Kernan, 1987). This may have serious implications for the effectiveness of the organisation and the reported levels of work satisfaction. Cross-cultural conflict can ultimately result in the failure of the cross-cultural working relationship. Consistent with this view, evidence (Bennett, 1994) has indicated that American expatriate assignments to Great Britain have a high failure rate, which is related to differences in language styles. (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of values, culture, language styles, misunderstandings, cognitive theory and conflict).

2.1.2 Objectives of Values Research

It is proposed that American and English managers vary in terms of their personal values systems. It is also proposed that Americans and English managers hold stereotypical views of the other culture and of their own culture in general. Specifically, it is hypothesised that:

1. American and English managers vary in terms of their personal value systems. The first objective of this study will be to measure the value systems of Americans and English managers working together in Anglo-American organisations.

2. American behaviour will be associated with assertiveness. This was consistent with the results of the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002), which concluded that in terms of assertiveness, Americans scored among the highest of any country in the world. It was also consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson
(2002) who indicated that Americans have a ‘can-do’ attitude with its emphasis on achievement, particularly in terms of material wealth.

3. Americans will be associated with individualistic behaviour. As suggested by Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) and Levine (1985), this value preference is reflected in their direct style of speech.

4. American behaviour will be associated with efficiency, i.e. 'getting the job done' and performing tasks in the most direct and expedient way possible. While the English may have an equal concern for efficiency, they will be less likely to state these concerns to others.

5. Americans and English managers will have stereotypical views of the other culture. It is hypothesised that Americans, in general, will be described as having efficiency concerns.

6. American and English managers will also have stereotypical views about their own culture, i.e. they believe that, generally, their own cultural values differ from the value orientations of their national culture. It is hypothesised that these stereotypes will also centre on values of assertiveness, efficiency and material success.
2.2 Method

2.2.1 Participants

The participants were 35 American managers and 35 English managers who were working in a number of American-owned public companies in the Southwest of England and throughout the United States. See Table 2.1 for demographic details. All respondents had experience of working with members of the other culture in their organisation. Some of the American and English participants were known to the researcher; some were introduced by other participants in the study. The study used a volunteer sample.

In this study, participants were selected from different types of companies: manufacturing, sales, information technology, finance, and others including defence and consultancy. The manufacturing companies included household products, packaging, automotive and industrial products. In an attempt to control for variability in the results that may have resulted from regional differences in value systems between the North and South of England, 25 participants lived and worked in the South of England; 10 English participants were from the South of England but were on expatriate assignment in the US. All of the American participants worked in American-owned companies in the South of England, and throughout the US. As Vandello and Cohen (1999) have suggested, there may be regional differences between American managers in terms of style of communicating and approaches to organisational systems and processes. However, the sample included managers from all over the US to control for variability in the results which may be related to regional effects.
### Table 2.1
Age, Job and Company Type and Year of Cross-Cultural Experience of American and English Managers Participating in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience in Cross-Cultural Organisations</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Company</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in Company</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Managing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The participants were all male because there are not many female expatriate managers in the Southwest of England.

### 2.2.2 Design

The study used a questionnaire design to test for differences and similarities between American and English managers in their personal and corporate value systems.
The questionnaire was also designed to measure any cultural stereotyping that may have been occurring in this context; i.e. they were asked whether or not they had generalised views of their own culture, or generalised views of members of the other cultural group working in this bi-cultural context.

2.2.3 The Values Questionnaires
2.2.3.1 SYMLOG Values Measurement Instrument

Bales and Cohen (1979) developed a values measuring instrument known as SYMLOG (A SYstem for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups). SYMLOG was a systematic method for gathering information on group dynamics, and provided a detailed picture of the behaviour patterns of individuals within the group and their relationship to other group members. The 26 items were designed to assess the relationship between expectations for the values that should be exhibited for effective management performance, and the values that were actually exhibited in this context. (See Appendix A2 for definitions of Bales’ 26 value statements).

The SYMLOG system used an adjective rating form designed to help participants recall their own behaviour in a group situation, as well as the behaviour of other group members. In Bales' questionnaire, each of the 26 items was part of a three-dimensional representation of people's value systems. The three value spaces identified by Bales were:

1. UD. Active, dominant (upward) vs. inactive, submissive (downward).

2. PN. Friendly (positive) vs. unfriendly (negative).

3. FB. Accepting the task-orientation. Forward vs. opposing the task-orientation of established authority (backward).
2.2.3.2 The Comparative Emphasis Scale

The Comparative Emphasis Scale was developed by Ravlin and Meglino (CES, 1987) as an instrument designed to measure four workplace values: (a) Achievement/working hard; (b) Concern for others/helping others; (c) Fairness; (d) Honesty/Integrity. The four values measured in the Comparative Emphasis Scale originated from a study in which Cornelius, Ullman, Meglino, Czajka, and McNeely (1985) collected a number of statements representing different types of behavioural incidents. Ravlin and Meglino (1987) edited these statements by shifting the phrasing, gender and intensity, and subsequently created one hundred concise one-sentence phrases which each described a particular type of behaviour, i.e. achievement and doing whatever it takes to get ahead. The CES questionnaire includes 24 pairs of matched items, with each item in the pair reflecting one of the four core values with each core value appearing twelve times. The instructions on the instrument used a forced-choice format and asked participants to respond as to how they ought to behave in a given situation, rather than asking them to report how they would actually behave in that situation.

2.2.3.3 The Combined Values Questionnaire

The Values Questionnaire included two separate instruments: the Comparative Emphasis Scale (CES; Meglino & Ravlin, 1987) and the System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups (SYMLOG; Bales and Cohen, 1979). As SYMLOG was originally designed as a workshop exercise, the format of the questionnaire has been revised to be consistent with the objectives and methodology of this study. Unlike the original SYMLOG instrument, which asked participants to describe their behaviour using a three-dimensional grid, the adapted questionnaire used a pencil and paper design, which was printed on A4 paper. Thus, the questionnaire could be easily sent by mail or e-mail and could be answered relatively quickly by each participant. The revised instrument assessed
people's perceptions of their own behaviour as well as their stereotypical views of their own and the other culture. (See Appendix A1 for the modified Bales Values Questionnaire). Specifically, in the revised instrument, the participants were asked how:

1. The English are viewed by:
   a. Americans
   b. The English

2. Their own behaviour is viewed by:
   a. Americans
   b. The English

3. The Americans are viewed by:
   a. Americans
   b. The English

2.2.4 Pilot Study

The two questionnaires used in the study were selected after a thorough review of the literature on values measurement. The revised Value Questionnaire was tested in a pilot study, which included three American and two English managers. The objective was to assess whether the participants would have difficulties in understanding the instructions or completing the measures. However, the participants indicated that: (a) the instructions were clear; and (b) the questionnaires could be completed in 15-20 minutes. This was viewed as an acceptable length of time, which would not conflict with other priorities. As participant fatigue did not seem to be an issue, it was decided not to counterbalance the values measures.

2.2.5 Materials

The CES and SYMLOG values instruments were both included in a Values Questionnaire used in this study. The combined questionnaire (see Appendix A1) was printed in A4 form, in landscape format. The questionnaire included a brief background to
the study, a statement that ensured the confidentiality of the responses, and a section whereby each participant was asked for personal details such as age range, years of cross-cultural experience, the type of company, and position in company.

2.2.6 Procedure

The instructions that prefaced the CES questionnaire asked participants to select one of a pair of behavioural statements, which represented the behaviour they would most likely emphasise in their work. The instructions for the Bales instrument indicated the participants should circle the response that signified the extent to which they felt that each of the value statements related to their own behaviour. The participants were then asked to select the response that best described how often English people in general displayed the type of behaviour described by each item. Finally, each participant was asked to select the item that best-described how often American people in general showed the type of behaviour depicted by each item. These responses were coded as follows, using the three point scale: (0) Not often, (1) Sometimes, (2) Often.

The newly developed questionnaires were administered in a number of different ways, which depended primarily on geographical considerations. In some cases, the researcher met up with the participant in person and described the background to the research and read the instructions aloud to each individual participant. However, when participants lived in America or were located outside the Bristol area, these participants were first contacted by telephone or by e-mail. They were told the purposes of the study, how to complete the instrument, and were guaranteed complete anonymity. The questionnaires were either mailed or e-mailed to the participants and then sent back when completed, either by post or by e-mail. The participants were then thanked and debriefed, either by telephone or by e-mail. Finally, each of the participants was posted or e-mailed a summary of Dunkerley's (1997) results; this summary was given to participants after they
had completed the questionnaire because knowledge of these results may have influenced how they responded to the items in the current questionnaire.

2.2.7 Data Analysis

In order to understand the Bales schema and to interpret his scoring system in the context of the results of this study, a summary of the definitions of the 26 items mentioned in the SYMLOG questionnaire is included in Appendix A2. Each of the letter codes were conceptualised by Bales and Cohen (1979) as representing a value statement that reflected a person's behaviour. The original SYMLOG questionnaire, as devised by Bales (1980), consisted of three bipolar dimensions with each item including indicators representing a position in a three-dimensional value space; this he said, was consistent with his view that people have behaviours, which are recognised to be opposite to each other, while other behaviours appeared to be very similar. However, as this three dimensional format was designed (a) for small groups, (b) to be scored by hand using a complex scoring procedure, and (c) not to measure stereotypical views that the participants had of their own and the other culture, it was decided that it was not feasible to use the three-dimensional scoring procedure as proposed by Bales.

The data was coded, and the results of the question responses and the personal data were entered into a SPSS data sheet. A frequency table was then generated for the CES instrument that included the personal profiles and details about the number of times that each of the four values were selected by the American and English participants. The median test was used to determine whether or not there were any significant differences in the median scores of the English and American managers in each of the four value measures; the median test is a non-parametric statistical analysis that is used on data that is at least at the ordinal level and indicates whether independent groups vary on measures of central tendency.

The data obtained from the Bales questionnaires was entered into a separate data sheet, and a frequency table was then generated, indicating how many times each of the
participants selected either a (0), (1), or a (2) answer. Independent and paired tests were used to compare the frequencies of responses. The tests were executed on SPSS Version 9.
2.3. Results

2.3.1 Results of the CES Questionnaire

Results of the CES instrument did not indicate any differences in value systems between American and British managers working together in bi-cultural organisations.

2.3.2 Results of Modified Bales Questionnaire

2.3.2.1 Summary of Results

1. An independent test indicated that there were no significant differences in how the Americans described their own behaviour compared to how the English described their own behaviour in terms of 26 value orientations included in the Bales and Cohen (1979) SYMLOG questionnaire.

Note: As multiple comparisons are made between differences between subsets of each group, the Bonferroni adjustment has been made, i.e. as three tests are made for each subset of data, the alpha level (.05) has been divided by three, with the new alpha level equalling .017.

The following results supported the stated hypotheses:

2. It was hypothesised that American behaviour is associated with Assertiveness:

American (M = 1.79, S.D. 0.50) behaviour, in general, is associated with assertiveness, to a greater extent, than with Americans (M = 1.03, S.D. 0.79) as individuals (t = 5.00, df = 34, p = .00002).

American (M = 1.77, S.D. 0.50) behaviour, in general, is associated with a greater concern for assertiveness compared to English (M = 0.94, S.D. 0.68) behaviour, in general (t = 5.76, df = 68, p = .0000002).

3. It was hypothesised that American behaviour is associated with Individualism:
American (M = 1.71, S.D. 0.46) behaviour, in general, is associated to a
greater extent with individualism than with American (M = 0.89, S.D. =
0.58) behaviour as individuals (t = 6.94, df = 34, p = .0000001).

American (M = 1.71, S.D. = 0.60) behaviour, in general, is associated with
individualism, to a greater extent, that the behaviour of the English (M =
0.74, S.D. = 0.66), in general (t = 6.71, df = 68, p = .00000005).

4. It was hypothesised that American behaviour was associated with efficiency:
American (M = 1.77, S.D. 0.50) behaviour, in general, is associated with
efficiency, to a greater extent, than English (M = 1.21, S.D. = 0.60) behaviour, in
general (t = 4.49, df = 68, p = .00003).

5. It was predicted that American and English managers will have stereotypical
views of each other's cultures, which will be associated with American's concern
with efficiency. This was confirmed in three situations:

   Fewer American (M = 0.71, S.D. = 0.67) than English managers (M = 1.11,
   S.D. = 0.40) said that English behaviour was associated with material
   success and power (t = 3.01, df = 68, p = .0037).

   Fewer American (M = 0.80, S.D. = 0.68) than English managers (M = 1.21,
   S.D. = 0.60) said that English behaviour was associated with efficient,
   strong management. (t = 2.65, df = 66, p = .01).

   More American (M = 1.80, S.D. = 0.41) than English managers (M = 1.21,
   S.D. = 0.49) said that English behaviour was associated with established
   values (t = 5.38, df = 66, p = .000001).

6. As predicted, American and English managers have stereotypical views of their
own behaviour, compared to the behaviour of their own nationality in general:

   The English (M = 1.51, S.D. = 0.61) reported their own behaviour reflected
efficiency and strong management to a greater extent than the English
behaviour (M = 1.20, S. D. = 0.60) in general (t = 5.38, df = 33, p = .021).
(Although this result was not significant at alpha level, 0.017).

The English (M = 1.63, S. D. = 0.55) reported their behaviour was more
associated with hard work than the English (M = 1.06, S. D. = 0.54) in
general (t = 6.16, df = 34, p = .000001).

The Americans reported that American behaviour (M = 1.86, S. D. = 0.36),
in general, reflects material success to a greater extent than their own (M =
0.89, S. D. = 0.68) behaviour (t = 7.69, df = 34, p = .00000007).

The Americans believed, however, that American behaviour (M = 1.77,
S. D. = 0.50), in general, and their behaviour (M = 1.54, S. D. = 0.51)
similarly reflected a concern for efficiency (t = 2.10, df = 34, p > 0.017).

The Americans reported that American behaviour (M = 1.79, S. D. = 0.50)
in general, reflected a greater concern with assertiveness than did their own
(M = 1.03, S. D. = 0.79) behaviour (t = 5.00, df = 34, p = .00002).

The Americans reported that Americans behaviour (M = 1.71, S. D. = 0.46)
reflected a greater concern for individualism than their own (M = 0.89,
S. D. = 0.58) behaviour (t = 6.94, df = 34, p = .0000001).

2.3.2.2 American and English Views of National Behaviour

A number of comparisons were made using the paired and independent tests. A
paired sample test was conducted to compare the Americans' views of their behaviour
compared to Americans in general (see Table 2.2). Table 2.3 is a comparison of the
English managers' views of their behaviour, compared to the English in general. An
independent test showed significant differences in how the Americans viewed English
behaviour in general, compared to how the English viewed English behaviour in general.
(See Table 2.4). Table 2.5 includes the results of an independent test, which point to significant differences in how the Americans perceived American behaviour, in general, compared to how the English viewed English behaviour, in general. The results comparing the American view of American behaviour to the English view of American behaviour were not significant.

Note: All statistics represent two-tailed tests. N may vary as not all participants answered all of the items included in the questionnaire.
Table 2.2

A comparison of American behaviour compared to Americans in general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Material Success and Power</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP-Popularity and Social Success</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF-Efficiency and Strong Management</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNF-A Powerful Authority</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Tough-Minded Assertiveness</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Rugged Individualism</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF-Restraint of Desires</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPF-Love, Faithfulness and Loyalty</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB- Admission of Failure, Withdrawal</td>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.3

*A comparison of English Behaviour with the behaviour of the English in general*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF-Efficiency Effective</td>
<td>English Own</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>English General</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPF -Love, Faithfulness and</td>
<td>English Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>English General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Hard work</td>
<td>English Own</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cooperation with Authority</td>
<td>English General</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.4
*A Comparison of American views of English behaviour compared to the English views of English behaviour*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-Material Success and Power</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF-Efficiency Effective Management</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Established Values</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB-Non-cooperation with Authority</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF-Restraint of Desires</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB-Social Noncomformity</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Unconventional Beliefs</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNF-Suffering</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.5
*A Comparison of American views of American behaviour, in general, to English views of English behaviour, in general*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF-Efficiency, Effective</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U- Material Success</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP-Popularity and Social</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Tough-Minded Assertiveness</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNB- Rugged Individualism</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF- Restraint of Desires</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N- Individual Dissent</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF- Hard Work</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB- Admission of Failure,</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3.3 Examining the Relationship Nationality, Age and Experience

The previous results have suggested that nationality had an impact on managers' views of American and English behaviour. To investigate whether or not the age of the participants or the level of cultural experience similarly had a main effect on these cross-cultural views, a two way between groups analysis of variance was undertaken for each of the Bales values described above. These values were included in each of the three scales, which made up the revised SYMLOG instrument. Also investigated was whether or not there were interaction effects between age and nationality, and nationality and level of experience. The results indicated that the main effect for age and experience did not reach statistical significance for any of the values listed previously. The results indicated that there was only one significant interaction effect between nationality and age, for the Bales individualism value (N), \( [F(3, 46) = 3.5, p = .02] \). There were no interaction effects for level of experience and nationality. See Table 2.6 for a summary of the analysis of variance results.

---

**Continued Table 2.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPB- American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Contentment English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN-Rejection American of Popularity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6
Examining the impact of age, experience and nationality on reported values in revised Bales and Cohen SYMLOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U-Materialism</th>
<th>Own Behaviour</th>
<th>English Behaviour</th>
<th>American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>$F(4, 46) = 1.3, p = .30$</td>
<td>$F(4, 46) = 1.4, p = .26$</td>
<td>$F(4, 46) = 1.1, p = .37$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>$F(4, 46) = .18, p = .95$</td>
<td>$F(4, 46) = .85, p = .50$</td>
<td>$F(4, 46) = .62, p = .65$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Age</td>
<td>$F(3, 46) = .47, p = .70$</td>
<td>$F(3, 46) = .32, p = .81$</td>
<td>$F(3, 46) = .95, p = .42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Experience</td>
<td>$F(3, 46) = 1.3, p = .30$</td>
<td>$F(3, 46) = .56, p = .65$</td>
<td>$F(3, 46) = .28, p = .84$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UF Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Assertiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Individualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4 Reliability

Bales and Cohen (1979) used a split half correlation method to assess whether the 26 items included in the original SYMLOG instrument were reliable. Bales' correlations indicated that the correlations ranged from .74 to .93, with a mean correlation for all 26 items of .88. In the current study, Cronbach alpha was used to measure the reliability of the 'own values' items, which were similar to the items included in the original Bales questionnaire. The coefficient in this instance was .73.

Two additional scales were added to the original SYMLOG instrument. One scale was designed to measure the participants' views of American behaviour, while the other was designed to measure the participants' views of English behaviour. A Cronbach analysis indicated that the scales used to measure views on English and American behaviour had an alpha coefficient of .62 and .68 respectively.
2.4 Discussion

2.4.1 CES Questionnaire Results

The results indicated that there were no significant differences between American and English managers in terms of the values included in the Comparative Emphasis Scale (CES) devised by Ravlin and Meglino (1987). The CES was chosen for this study because it measured values that were relevant to this setting. While the results of the modified Bales Questionnaire also suggested there were no significant differences in the reported own values of American and English managers, the results of the modified Bales Questionnaire did indicate that cultural stereotyping was occurring in this context. This suggested the CES was not the appropriate instrument to use in this context, because it was not designed to measure stereotyping.

2.4.2 Values

The results of Study 1 did not confirm the first hypothesis of this research, which predicted differences in US and UK managers' personal values. While the results of Study 1 were consistent with a number of studies suggesting the US and the UK score similarly on a number of value constructs (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; Trompenaars, 1993), they did not explain why stereotyping and misunderstandings were occurring in this bi-cultural setting, as suggested by Bennett (1994). As discussed in Chapter 1, it is logical to assume that if two groups have similar values, they would interpret the behaviour of the other using the same set of cultural guidelines. This should reduce the level of misunderstandings in this context. The results of this study did not support Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) who suggested the two groups have different attitudes toward uncertainty avoidance. They believed that these differences were associated with the stereotyping and misunderstandings in this context.
While the present study does not support the view that the US and the UK are characterised by different values, a number of recent studies have focussed on differences in value preferences in groups appearing to score similarly in large group, aggregate values studies. These underlying differences may explain the stereotyping and misunderstandings in this situation. For example, the GLOBE study (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) found that, consistent with Hofstede (1980), at a group or aggregate level, there were a number of value dimensions that Americans and the English shared. The GLOBE results also concluded that American and English managers' values differed on a number of value dimensions, and it was concluded these differences would inevitably affect each group's behaviour in the workplace. The GLOBE findings were also consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) and with the results of Study 1 in suggesting that Assertiveness, Efficiency, Achievement and Individualism were associated particularly with American behaviour: For example, the GLOBE research concluded that:

1. Americans scored high on Performance Orientation. The results of this values study indicated that American behaviour in general was associated with efficiency and strong management, while the English did not associate English behaviour with these values. In the earlier Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) study, the American managers believed that their orientation towards efficiency had translated into a task-related approach to decision-making, which emphasised quick and measurable results.

2. Americans scored higher on assertiveness than any country in the world; Ashkanasy et al. concluded that this value orientation had translated into America's direct style in terms of speech and leadership approach, which was consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson's earlier research. The results of the
values study also suggested that the American managers believed that Americans in general exhibited behaviour associated with assertiveness.

3. American behaviour was associated with individualism. The results of Study 1 also suggested that American behaviour, in general, was associated with individualism. Individualism vs. collectivism has been described as an important way of differentiating cultures (Smith & Bond, 1993), and the results of Hofstede's study (1980) also suggested that America is the most individualistic country in the world.

4. Americans valued material success and achievement more than the English, which was attributed to America's higher score on performance orientation. Ashkanasy et al. suggested that this orientation had translated into America's 'can-do' attitude with its emphasis on achievement, particularly in terms of material wealth. The results of Study 1 suggested that while the Americans and English did not disagree their own behaviour reflected material and financial success, the English said that, in general, English behaviour was not consistent with materialism.

Although Bales' (1979) SYMLOG values instrument did not directly measure a general tendency towards risk vs. risk avoidance, the results of the GLOBE research were also consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson's (2002) conclusion that the English are orientated toward risk-avoidance, while the Americans seemed more willing to risk conflict and/or embarrassment. In the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) it was concluded the Americans scored lower than England on risk avoidance, indicating that Americans placed less emphasis on formality and structure, which is designed to minimise the uncertainties of their daily lives. It could be hypothesised that consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson's findings, for the Americans, assertiveness has translated into a
‘can-do’ attitude, which has been associated with a task-orientated approach to decision-making. In a task approach the emphasis was on quick and efficient job or project completion rather than on a lengthy consideration of the pros and cons of the argument; thus, Americans may be prepared to make mistakes and risk failure by proceeding quickly to the implementation stage of the project, without careful consideration of the possible failure involved with implementing task completion too quickly.

It also could be conjectured that a direct style of speech, favoured by the Americans in Dunkerley and Robinson's (2002) earlier study, reflected a more risk-orientated approach to communication whereby individuals are willing to risk embarrassment and censure by being upfront with their views and opinions. This was consistent with Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) who suggested that a society’s orientation on the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension of cultural variability will influence style of speaking. They concluded that groups with higher levels of uncertainty avoidance will use understatement to a greater extent when managing unfamiliar situations than groups with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance. Thus, groups with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance, such as the US (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) will use more exact and explicit speech (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey). This was consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson's earlier study, in which English managers said that they preferred an indirect style of speech as it avoided emotional engagement and direct confrontation. Thus, it could be theorised that an indirect style of speech provided a framework whereby the uncertainties of life could be minimised. However, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the differences in mean cluster scores were not tested for statistical significance in the GLOBE study, so it is not really clear whether or not America and England have significant differences in their orientations on any of the GLOBE value dimensions.
2.4.2.1 Underlying Value Differences

The GLOBE project (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) concluded there were subtle differences in value preferences in groups previously thought to hold similar values. There have been other researchers who have also investigated differences in value preferences in countries that appear to score similarly on constructs used in Hofstede's (1980) study. For example, Schwartz and Bardi (2001) concluded that although the US and Western Europe share a number of values, individuals vary both within and across societies in terms of value priorities, and these differences may be related to heritage, social location and personal experience. Vandello and Cohen (1999) investigated various ecological, historical and social factors associated with regional US differences in Hofstede's (1980) Individualism vs. Collectivism dimension. They concluded there were regional differences in the US relating to a tendency towards individualistic vs. collectivistic behaviour, which they associated with economic and social factors. Kapoor et al. (2003) similarly concluded there are historical, social and demographic factors which limit the applicability of previous findings surrounding Individualism-Collectivism.

Thus, the current study did not indicate American and English managers vary in terms of their personal value systems. However, there is an increasing body of research to suggest there may be underlying differences in the value preferences of groups, which have been previously described as being similar by large aggregate values studies, e.g. Hofstede (1980). These differences may be due to differing social, historical, political and geographical variables. There is also evidence to suggest these differences may be associated with the view that American behaviour reflects concerns with assertiveness, individualism, efficiency, material success and achievement (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). This was also consistent with the results of Study 1. The methods used to measure these underlying differences in values (McClelland, 1987; Vandello, 1999) were innovative and
involved comparing historical and sociological data with measures of values and motivation. If this study had used a similar methodology, it may have been possible to measure the underlying variations in cultural value preferences. (See Section 2.4.4 for a discussion of methodological considerations).

2.4.2.2 Organisational Selection

While this study did not suggest differences in American and English managers' personal values, the participants reported that American and English values, at the group or aggregate level, differed in a number of value dimensions. As predicted, these differences centred on efficiency, assertiveness, individualism, and material success and power. There may be an explanation as to why the managers reported similar personal values, while believing at the group level, the two cultures differed. As indicated earlier in Section 2.2, all the participants in this study were working in American-owned organisations, either in England or in the US. It could be assumed that people and organisations 'select' each other on the basis of there being a high degree of 'fit' between the organisation's and the individual's skill base and value systems (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2001). The match is subsequently reinforced by organisational processes such as reviews, performance appraisals and assessments. Therefore, it is inevitable that if there is a lack of 'fit' between organisational and personal skill and values, the individuals will eventually leave the company and seek an organisation that is more in line with their own characteristics.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, both American and English managers reported that their own nationality, in general, displayed behaviours that were inconsistent with these managers' personal values. Therefore, even though the English and the American managers participating in this research share a similar set of attitudes, values, and a skill base that have made them successful in this organisational setting, this may or may not reflect similarities and differences in value systems that are inherent in English and American national cultures in general, or in organisations that are not Anglo-American in
nature. Therefore, it may be impossible to draw conclusions about the differences and similarities in values and beliefs between Americans and the English, in general, or between American and English managers who are not working in this particular bi-cultural context.

2.4.3 Cross-Cultural Interactions

It was predicted that Americans and the English would have stereotypical views of their own culture, and the other culture in this setting. The results indicated that stereotyping is occurring in this context. As hypothesised, these stereotypes are associated with material success and efficiency. For example, the Americans did not associate English behaviour with material success and power, nor did the Americans associate English behaviour with efficiency and strong management. As discussed in Chapter 1, stereotyping occurs when one group applies its own value systems when interpreting the messages of another group. Cultural misunderstandings are a special category of stereotyping, and similarly occur when one group interprets other cultural group's messages, using their own guidelines for appropriate behaviour.

As discussed, stereotyping and misunderstandings have been associated with people using their own set of cultural guidelines when interpreting the behaviour of another group (Triandis, 1994). Since these results indicated there were no differences in value systems, why was there evidence of stereotyping in this bi-cultural context? Some researchers, e.g. Miller (1995), have suggested that stereotyping is not always associated with differing value orientations at the global or the individual level. Miller suggested that conflict and misunderstandings can occur in the workplace even when people share a similar set of values. For example, misunderstandings could occur in situations where people share a common set of values, because each cultural group has different expectations or assumptions about a cross-cultural encounter or communication task; this,
in turn, influenced their expectations about culturally appropriate behaviour. Miller suggested that differences in communication style, i.e. the levels of directness vs. indirectness, may not be producing cross-cultural misunderstandings. It may be the pragmatic understanding each individual brings to a cross-cultural encounter that affects the expectations and assumptions about that encounter, i.e. how each individual assesses the purposes of an organisational activity or event. Therefore, even if an individual is aware of style differences in indirect vs. direct speech, for example, he or she may not be aware that different cultures have differing assumptions about cross-cultural encounters or communication tasks, these differing assumptions will, in turn, influence expectations about culturally appropriate behaviour. The results of Study 1 suggested that Americans assume that efficiency in language and decision-making are integral to personal and organisational success. In the context of this study, it appears the Americans expect the English to speak and make decisions in the same direct, task-related way (Bennett, 1994). When they discover the English are using a different approach to communication, which does not match their assumptions about effective communication, the Americans assume the English are behaving inappropriately and inefficiently.

2.4.3.1 Social Psychological Theory

Miller's (1995) views suggested that stereotyping and misunderstandings are complex phenomena, which take place when different cultural groups interact with one another, and can occur when groups have similar values. Miller's views also suggested that the results of Study 1 may be explained more successfully by theories relating to cultural stereotyping, Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978), and Cognitive Theory (Shaw, 1990), that focus on individual behaviour and the interaction of cultural groups. As Adler et al. (1986) pointed out, interaction is the essence of organisational behaviour, yet it is an area that has not been researched extensively in much group level, cross-cultural studies.
Stereotyping. The results of this study indicated that cultural stereotyping is occurring in this cross-cultural context in several situations. As hypothesised, these stereotypes are associated with material success and efficiency. Opinion is divided concerning the efficacy of stereotyping in cross-cultural contexts. Scollon and Scollon (2001) concluded that all types of stereotyping are detrimental to effective communication between cross-cultural groups because they tend to over-generalise and exaggerate similarities and differences between people, and they focus only on simple contrasts between people. While researchers such as Scollon and Scollon associate stereotyping with conflict and misunderstandings in cross-cultural work situations, Macrae et al. (1994) took a more positive view of stereotyping, and concluded that stereotyping is an effective and adaptive process that plays a central role in cognition. Through stereotyping, they concluded, people are able to better manage the demands made on their cognitive processing abilities.

The results of Study 1 did not indicate whether stereotyping was creating conflict, or increasing the effectiveness of communication in this bi-cultural context. The results suggested, however, that Americans continue to hold stereotypical views of the English, regardless of experience in interacting in cross-cultural groups. Macrae, Milne and Bodenhausen (1997) concluded that for some people, stereotyping can be an enduring phenomenon that is difficult to change, primarily because it is associated with a number of factors, which lessen the effect that any disconfirming information may have on future categorisations. For example, if an American had a prejudicial view the English are inefficient, there may be several reasons why Americans may continue to hold this stereotypical view, despite evidence to the contrary. Firstly, and consistent with Macrae et al., Americans may try to minimise the impact of disconfirming information, in order to maintain the integrity of the stereotype, i.e. the American may not consider information
associated with the view the English are efficient. Secondly, Americans may believe the target English person is an anomaly, and not really representative of English people in general. Also contributing to the maintenance of stereotypical thinking is the nature of the memory process itself. As most stereotypes are based on elements of truth, and stereotype congruent information is more likely to be remembered (Macrae et al.), these make it more likely that stereotypical beliefs will be more readily maintained.

The results of Study 1 suggested that the English do not have stereotypical views of Americans. As Castelli et al. (2004) stated, stereotyping is not always an inevitable process, and there are a number of moderating factors that reduce the likelihood that stereotypical thinking will occur. These include the motivation to change stereotypical thinking. This appeared to be consistent with the context of this study, as the English have chosen to work in an American working environment, and they are undoubtedly highly motivated to fit into this, for the most part, American environment (See Chapter 5 for a discussion of corporate culture). Further, stereotyping appears to be associated with reducing uncertainty in unfamiliar situations (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995). Since the English have placed themselves into this American environment, they may feel comfortable in this situation and may believe they already share a number of characteristics with the Americans, i.e. efficiency concerns. Thus, these factors may reduce the uncertainty inherent in the situation, and subsequently reduce the need for stereotypical thinking. Perhaps the situation is reversed for the Americans, as they may have the expectation of similarity when they enter their new cross-cultural environment (Bennett, 1994). Consequently, they may not see the need, or have the motivation, to change their stereotypical thinking (Castelli et al.).

Macrae et al. (1995) concluded that stereotyping, in reality, is a complex phenomenon, particularly as people belong to multiple categories, i.e. people may be
American, but they also vary in terms of age or sex, or level of experience. Any of these categories may indeed influence how people perceive others. The factors influencing which category will influence social perception include the salience of a particular categorisation, the processing objectives, and the level of prejudice inherent in the situation. An investigation of whether age or level of experience had an impact on values and levels of stereotyping indicated there was no main effects for either age or experience on any of Bale's variables, while there was only one interaction effect for age and nationality for the Bales' Individualism value. This suggested that in this situation, national culture was the primary variable affecting the categorisation of stereotypical information in this context. However, it was recognised there are other categorising variables that were not addressed in this study. By necessity, all participants were male, which precluded the effect that this categorisation would have on the perception of social events in this setting. Further, the questionnaire did not ask participants for their stereotypical views relating to other types of categorical cues, so it was impossible to determine the extent to which managers in this context were aware of more than one categorisation, and if this awareness was affecting the perception of social events. For example, do English managers have a different reaction to American females, than they do to American males? If so, which of these cues will be more salient, or will the conjunction of cues influence social perception? The effect of multiple categorical cues on stereotypical thinking in this area certainly warrants further investigation.

*Social Identity Theory.* As predicted, the results of this study were consistent with the view that Americans, in general, value efficiency (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). However, as previously noted, the Americans also believed the English in general did not share these concerns. Thus, the Americans appeared to believe the 'in-group', i.e. Americans, shared their efficiency concerns, while the 'out-group,' i.e. the English, did not. This was
consistent with Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978). Tajfel linked stereotyping with an individual's need to boost his or her own positive self-image; this positive self-identity or self-concept is related to membership in a social group or groups. People attach positive value to this group; this group membership is based on a shared set of values (Doise & Sinclair, 1973; Tajfel). Social Identity Theory predicts that individuals, by seeking to affirm their own positive view of themselves, will compare themselves to out-group members using their own set of group values and norms, in a way that places the out-group in a less favourable light. Social Identity Theory predicts that an individual's social identity can perform two functions: (a) it defines a person as belonging to a group; and (b) it provides a set of values and norms that will evoke appropriate behaviour in different situations, which can be essential in ambiguous or unfamiliar circumstances. Thus, consistent with Social Identity Theory, the Americans' efficiency-related values were defining their approaches to communication. Therefore, the Americans' cultural norms and values, e.g. efficiency, provided guidelines for interacting in unfamiliar situations. The Americans were also using their efficiency values as a basis for interpreting the behaviour of their English colleagues; they subsequently judged English behaviour as substandard. Thus, the Americans were placing themselves in a positive light, while denigrating the behaviour of the English, which is also consistent with Social Identity Theory.

The results of Study 1 pointing to stereotypes held by English and American managers concerning their own national culture were also consistent with the Tajfel's (1978) suggestion that if an individual believes that the in-group is not characterised by values and beliefs that will enhance his or her pride or self-esteem, individuals will reject or distance themselves from that group. Therefore, it is possible that Social Identity Theory may also explain why both American and English managers have stereotypical
views of their own culture. For example, the English managers said that as individuals they displayed behaviour associated with hard work more than the English in general. If it could be assumed that for the English the concept of working hard enhanced their positive self-image, it could be that the English managers were distancing themselves from the in-group, which they believed, did not similarly share their hard work values. Thus, by distancing themselves from the in-group, they believed they were enhancing their own positive self-concept. Of course this is only conjecture and further research would need to be carried out to determine whether or not Social Identify Theory applied in this instance. For instance, several studies have been carried out in the past (Bond & Hewstone, 1986; Brewer, Ho, Lee, & Miller, 1987) to determine how and if social identities operate in different situations.

'Positive Illusions'. As discussed, the results of the value portion of the research indicated that both the American and English managers held stereotypical views of their own culture, i.e. the Americans believed that they were not as materialistic as Americans in general; and the English said that the English in general valued material success more than they did as individuals. If it could be inferred that each culture was placing a negative connotation on the value of materialism, it would appear that individuals in both cultures held self-perceptions that were positively biased; both cultures, when describing their own characteristics, tended to emphasise those personal attributes that put themselves in a favourable light. As well as being consistent with Social Identity Theory, the evidence of own culture stereotyping was in line with Taylor and Brown's view (1994) that people's perceptions of themselves will inevitably be positively biased; this is necessary if individuals are to retain a state of psychological well-being. However, they concluded, that this approach led to biases in human thought and can create a situation whereby people consistently regard themselves in a more favourable light than they do other people.
Referring to these biases as 'positive illusions,' Taylor and Brown surmised that people (a) put themselves in a positive light, (b) believe they have more control over their lives than they do, and (c) hold a more optimistic view of the world than may be the case in reality.

The results of Study 1 suggested that both the American and English managers had 'positive illusions' about their self-perceptions. However, when analysing the results of the Bales questionnaire, particularly those items relating to hard work for instance, it was not clear whether English and American participants negatively or positively valued hard work. In his description of the value items, Bales described hard work as having a submissive quality: a person scoring high on this value works hard, and complies with authority. It was impossible to say whether the American and English managers similarly believed hard work had a submissive quality, or whether they regarded hard work in a more positive light. As 'positive illusions' are associated with placing people in a positive light, the results are inconclusive and it is impossible to determine whether positive illusions were occurring in this context; this would need to be clarified in future research.

As Taylor and Brown (1994) suggested, this positive self-perception can translate into a more negative view of other people. Bandura (1986) also suggested that these miscalculations of one's own and other people's behaviour can create adverse effects and may create interpersonal conflict. However, he believed that if the disparity between reality and the biased view of the individual was not too great, these 'positive illusions' could facilitate learning as well as psychological well-being. Whether or not this optimistic self-perception and a negative view of other people actually translated into discord or disagreement in Anglo-American workplaces, or whether it translated into the well-being of individuals and work groups, can only be conjectured; it is certainly an area which should be addressed in future research.
2.4.3.2 Cognitive Theory

Miller (1995) concluded that stereotyping and misunderstandings can occur when groups have similar values, as each group has different expectations or assumptions about a cross-cultural task or encounter. It was concluded these assumptions will affect how individuals interpret a cross-cultural event. As Study 1 has indicated that Americans and English appear to have similar values, it was previously suggested that stereotyping and misunderstandings in this setting may be explained more successfully by theories relating to cultural stereotyping, and Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978), than by large group values studies, such as Hofstede (1980). Thus, it is proposed that Cognitive Theory may provide insight into the behaviour of American and English managers working together in this setting.

Also proposing that Cognitive Theory may explain behaviour of cross-cultural work groups, Maznevski and Peterson (1997) suggested that cultural values are held by individuals and do in fact influence individual behaviour. However, they concluded there are a number of other variables that may influence the interpretation of organisational events. According to Maznevski and Peterson, these elements include a person's past experiences, knowledge, expectations, and other organisational factors, which are used by individuals when interpreting organisational events, and developing a behavioural response. The choice of elements, used in the interpretation of the organisational events, is dependent on a number of contextual and situational variables. For example, when the situation is unambiguous, i.e. there are a number of clear social and contextual cues which point to an appropriate behavioural response, people may not rely on their values and culturally based knowledge when perceiving and processing information. Instead, they may refer to past experiences or organisational guidelines in interpreting events. In
contrast, when interpreting less familiar situations, i.e. when interacting with other cultural
groups, people may refer to these cultural, values-based guidelines. For example, in this
research setting, Brown (1994) has suggested that when Americans begin working in
England, they seem ill-prepared for the differences in language style. Thus, consistent
with Maznevski and Peterson, in this unfamiliar situation, Americans may refer to their
own cultural values, i.e. assertiveness and individualism, when interpreting the language
style of the English. This may account for the misunderstandings found in Dunkerley and
Robinson (2002), which indicated that Americans were interpreting the indirect style of the
English as inefficient. Shaw (1990) similarly suggested there are a number of variables
that influence how people use language and approach various organisational events. These
factors include cultural values, as well as situational cues in the environmental context, the
person's motivation to change existing scripts, and the degree of exposure to other cultures.
This suggested that a study of the interaction between cultural groups is needed which
addresses societal cultural values of these groups, as well as a number of other factors,
including the context of the interaction, environmental cues which may limit the use of
values related guidelines when interpreting behaviour, and people's motivation to change
cognitive scripts. These issues will be addressed in Chapter 3.

2.4.4 Methodological Considerations

While this research did not find a difference in cultural values between Americans
and the English, previous research, such as the GLOBE project (Ashkanasy et al., 2002)
and Vandello and Cohen (1999), suggested there may be underlying differences in cultural
orientations in what may appear to be culturally similar, English speaking countries.
Certainly, there were a number of problems with the two instruments used in this study.
As previously mentioned, the CES instrument was not designed to measure cultural
stereotyping and therefore appeared to be inappropriate for use in this context. While the
Bales instrument was modified to measure stereotyping, there may have been difficulties in assessing small, underlying variations in the value orientations of American and English managers. As already mentioned, the Bales instrument was designed to be a workshop exercise where individuals described their own behaviour in terms of the 26 item questionnaire; this three-dimensional format was not used in this study.

It is concluded that the validity and the reliability of the Bales (1980) instrument may have been compromised in this research context. (See Section 2.2 for a discussion of reliability). The relatively low reliability scores on the three scales used in Study 1 could be associated with the wording of the behavioural descriptions included in the SYMLOG, which some participants indicated did not clearly denote the types of behaviours actually exhibited in a work situation; hence, any inference about how this behaviour was reflected in underlying value orientations may be open to question. The meanings of some of the value descriptions, such as noncomformity and noncooperation, appeared to be somewhat ambiguous, and the meaning only became clearer when put into the context of Bales' description of the letter code, i.e. the value noncomformity and noncooperation was defined by Bales as describing a person who appears to be unfriendly or evasive. Although the pilot study suggested the wording was clear and meaningful, in retrospect, it might have been better to include some of Bales' descriptions in the questionnaire itself to make the meaning of the items clearer to the participants. The items were not counterbalanced as the pilot study indicated that the participants thought the instrument was not overly long, and they felt they were not likely to make errors and mistakes. However, in hindsight, it might have been better to counterbalance the items so as to avoid fatigue effects that may have had an impact on the results.

It was also unclear whether or not some of the Bales' items held a positive or negative connotation for the participants, which would also affect the validity and
reliability of the Values Questionnaire. For example, hard work was described by Bales as having a submissive quality, in that the person displaying this value in their work behaviour tended to submit to authority; this appeared to have a negative connotation. However, it could be conjectured that some participants may have thought of hard work as a desirable aspect of organisational behaviour and, certainly in this context, many American and English managers may place a positive connotation on the value of hard work.

This possible discrepancy in the views of the participants and Bales in the desirability of values such as hard work made it difficult to determine whether or not the English and American managers were creating 'positive illusions' and were viewing themselves in positive light, or whether they were behaving in a manner predicted by Social Identity Theory, which suggested that people attach positive value to the in-group and will distance themselves from the out-group.

The Bales questionnaire was selected for this research because it included value orientations, particularly assertiveness, individualism and efficiency, which were mentioned by the English and American managers participating in Dunkerley and Robinson (2002). It was predicted that these values were reflected in the communication styles of the American and English managers (Smith & Bond, 1993; 1998). It was also predicted that differing communication styles were at the core of the conflict and misunderstandings occurring in this bi-cultural context. Dunkerley and Robinson suggested that Americans emphasised efficiency and assertiveness, which was reflected in their direct style of communication, while the English preferred a less direct approach to communication; these differing styles. It was suggested these differences were creating misunderstandings in the workplace. Thus, the Bales questionnaire offered an opportunity to test these results in a quantitative manner, i.e. were differing value systems at the core of
cultural misunderstandings? As suggested by Maznevski and Peterson (1997), this study of value orientations at the individual level of analysis was necessary and important as values are held by individuals and do influence individual and group behaviour.

Since the earlier Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) study also indicated that cultural stereotyping may be occurring in this bi-cultural context, the Bales questionnaire was adapted to test whether or not cultural stereotyping was taking place in this situation. Certainly a questionnaire could have been developed and validated that more accurately depicted behavioural statements reflecting different value orientations. However, this was beyond the scope of current research, which is primarily focussed on the interaction of individuals in bi-cultural work environments.

It is recognised that the sample size may appear to be small, but it was diverse. Further it was of sufficient size to yield significant differences between the two groups. This certainly attested to both the adequacy of the sample size and the face validity of the results. It therefore was deemed appropriate to draw more general conclusions from the data generated in this study and to use these conclusions in developing a theoretical framework for understanding and predicting cross-cultural differences in this context.

2.4.5 Conclusions

Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) indicated that the English and American managers participating in this research had differing communication styles and that these differing communication styles were contributing to cross-cultural misunderstandings and conflict in this bi-cultural context. The results of this values study indicated that there were no significant differences between the American and the English views of their own values. As previous research had indicated that conflict was occurring in Anglo-American organisations (Dunkerley and Robinson) and that values are reflected in behaviour (Bales & Cohen, 1979), these results appeared to be inconsistent with the results of previous
research, which suggested that differing value systems were at the heart of differing language and communication styles (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1998).

It was also found that cultural stereotyping was occurring in several situations: (a) the Americans held stereotypical views of the English; (b) and the English and the Americans also had stereotypical views of their own national culture. These were explained in the context of stereotyping literature and it was suggested that stereotyping could be generating some of this organisational conflict, described by Dunkerley and Robinson, as each group in this bi-cultural context was applying its own standards when assessing the behaviour and communications of the other group. It is concluded, however, that stereotyping can have a number of positive and negative effects, which were not investigated in this study.

2.4.5.1 Further Research

The results of Study 1 indicated that both American and English managers held stereotypical views of their own and the other culture. This seemed consistent with the idea that in-group members use their own set of values and social beliefs to both provide a basis for in- and out-group interactions (Doise & Sinclair, 1973; Tajfel, 1978). Each culture also appeared to be applying their own set of guidelines or values when interpreting the messages of the other cultural member. This may be resulting in a cultural misinterpretation or miscommunication (Smith & Bond, 1993, 1998; Triandis, 1994). As Smith and Bond (1998) have theorised, individuals will inevitably react with out-group members in a way that maintains a favourable perception of their own group, particularly in terms of their own group’s values and attitudes.

This study indicated there were no differences in the personal values of American and English managers. However, it has been suggested that in addition to a person’s cultural value orientations, there are many variables, which may influence a style of speaking or an approach to an organisational system or process. These include a person’s
attitudes toward work, the company culture, their experience in cross-cultural organisations, their expectations concerning a cross-cultural encounter, their profession or their personality. Therefore, the next phase of this research will be to address the similarities and differences in the American and English approaches to organisational systems, and to study the interaction between American and English managers in Anglo-American organisations.

The starting point for this research will be an investigation of the similarities and differences in the American and English approaches to specific organisational events: performance appraisals, leadership, and decision-making. Value systems undoubtedly influence behaviour, in terms of language style and approaches to organisational events. However, as the results of the values study did not indicate the Americans and English had differing value systems, subsequent studies will aim to identify other variables which may influence style of speaking or organisational behaviour in this context.
Chapter 3:
Communication Styles and Approaches to Performance Appraisals and Decision Making in Anglo-American Organisations

Summary

The results indicate there are differences in American and English approaches to decision-making, with Americans preferring a task approach with the emphasis on quick and efficient task completion, and the English preferring a process approach with a focus on consensus and relationship building. While there are no significant differences in their preferred performance appraisal technique, the American and the English have differing approaches to performance appraisals, which relate to communication style. The results also indicate that misunderstandings and cultural stereotyping are taking place in this organisational setting. It is concluded that while personal values inevitably influence language style and behaviour, there are number of factors contributing to style differences in this setting, including managers' expectations and corporate culture.
3.1 Introduction: Study 2

3.1.1 Cross-cultural Interaction

The results of the values research discussed in Chapter 2 indicated that, in this context, there were no significant differences in how the American managers described their own set of values compared to how the English described their own set of values. The results indicated cultural stereotyping was occurring in a number of areas within these bi-cultural organisations. Research has suggested that stereotyping can create conflict in cross-cultural companies when members of different national cultures interact within the workplace, thus jeopardising corporate effectiveness and employee morale (Campbell, 1967; Dunkerley and Robinson, 2002). These misunderstandings occur when people apply their own set of values when interpreting the messages of other cultural members (Smith & Bond, 1993). (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of cultural values, stereotyping and conflict).

It has been suggested that there are a number of variables which may influence style of speaking and approaches to organisational events. These elements include cultural values, as well as expectations, organisational structures, experience or personality. This chapter will therefore focus on the interaction between American and English managers in Anglo-American organisations. The starting point for this research will be an investigation of the similarities and differences in the American and English approaches to specific organisational events, i.e. performance appraisals and decision-making. This study will also aim to identify the elements that may influence approaches to communication in this setting.

3.1.2 Values and Culture

Social psychologists have concluded that most differences in styles of speaking could be explained in terms of the value dimension individualism-collectivism, suggesting that the level of direct speech is an important construct in understanding cross-cultural
differences in the style of speaking (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). However, most value research has concluded that the United States and Great Britain score similarly on most dimensions of cultural variability, which would suggest that Americans and the English should prefer similar styles of speaking (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hall, 1976).

A number of researchers (Ashkanasy et al. 2002; Vandello & Cohen, 1999) have concluded that even groups sharing similar sets of values, as defined by Hofstede (1990) and Schwartz (2002), may vary in terms of their value patterns, which could account for differences in communication or behaviour. (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of the relationship between values and style of speech). These variations in cultural values may be related to social, economic, or geographical considerations. For example, Trompenaars (1993) suggested the US is a large, culturally diverse society, and a direct style of speech has evolved that enabled individuals to break down social barriers and communicate with strangers. England, it could be theorised, is in comparison a rather homogeneous society and does not have the same need for direct speech.

3.1.3 Cultural Stereotyping

The results of Study I and Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) have suggested that despite the fact that both American and English participants had cross-cultural experience, stereotyping was continuing between English and American colleagues working together in Anglo-American organisations. Consistent with Triandis’ (1994) description of stereotyping, both groups were applying their own standards when evaluating the actions of the other culture and thus see each other as exhibiting inappropriate behaviour. (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of stereotyping).

3.1.3.1 Cultural Adaptation

There are several reactions that result from an unfamiliar cross-cultural situation. (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of cultural adaptation).
3.1.4 Cognitive Theory

Miller (1995) suggested that differences in communication style, i.e. the levels of direct vs. indirect speech, may not be producing cross-cultural misunderstandings in themselves. Miller suggested that misunderstandings may occur because each cultural group has different expectations or assumptions about a cross-cultural encounter or communication task, which in turn influences their expectations about culturally appropriate behaviour. (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of Cognitive Theory).

3.1.5 Cultural Differences in Decision-Making

Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) suggested that American and English managers may differ in their styles of decision-making. They concluded these differences may create cultural misunderstandings. However, few researchers have focussed on the impact of national culture on decision-making styles, particularly those employing a qualitative approach to that research (Schramm-Nielsen, 2001). According to Schramm-Nielsen, the emphasis with decision-making theory has previously centred on the idea that principles relating to decision-making are universal and thus should not show cultural variations.

Mann, Radford, Burnett, Ford, Leung, Nakamura, Vaughan, and Yang (1998) concluded that the core issues concerning decision-making are consistent throughout most cultures and focus primarily on issues surrounding the fulfilment of needs, the safety of individuals, and the maintenance of values and norms of societies. However, Mann et al. suggested there may be cross-cultural variations in decision-making styles that are related to who is involved in the decision process, and the values and norms that are relevant to that process.

Weber and Hsee (2000) have also concluded that many decision-making models have not addressed the relationship between culture and decision-making. They suggested that because many models were based on the study of American college students, it is impossible to determine whether the models described universal processes.
Consistent with the idea that decision-making is a universal process, Archer (1980) developed a nine-stage framework of decision-making, which included: (a) monitoring the situation to obtain feedback, (b) defining the problem, (c) specifying the objectives, (d) diagnosing the problem, (e) developing a strategy or solution, (f) developing alternative methods, (g) appraising alternative solutions, (h) choosing from alternatives, and (i) implementing a solution. Incorporating the idea that there are a number of core cultural values involved in decision-making, as well as a number of elements that are specific to different cultures, Mann et al. (1998) suggested that when people make decisions in a cross-cultural context, they must ask themselves the following questions: (a) who in the group has responsibility for decision-making; (b) whether decision-making takes place in a group or individually; (c) whether people have actual choice in selecting alternatives; or (d) if values emphasise risk vs. cautiousness, or long vs. short term goals? Mann et al. have concluded that these value differences related to the cultural orientations suggested by Hofstede (1976), particularly individualism vs. collectivism and uncertainty avoidance, suggesting a link between cultural values and decision-making style.

Schramm-Nielsen (2001) developed a model of decision-making that was based on the ‘economic Man’ models proposed by March and Simon (1958) and considered the impact of national culture. Schramm-Nielsen’s model suggested that decisions were made in a rational manner, i.e. people make decisions based on a careful assessment of the goals and the consequences of implementing a particular plan of action. Concluding that March and Simon's model oversimplified the decision-making process, Schramm-Nielsen adapted it to take into account the fact that decisions are not always based on rational thought and analysis. The new model depicted how national cultural characteristics will ultimately influence how people approach the decision-making process. It assumed that when people make decisions, they are involved in: (a) the perception of the problem, (b) the
identification of the problem, (c) problem formulation, (d) the search for alternatives, (e) evaluation of alternatives, (f) the choice of alternatives, (g) the start of operation, (h) implementation, and (i) control. The implication was that different cultures will emphasise different stages of the decision-making process.

3.1.5.1 Task Vs. Process

Maznevski and Peterson (1997) also proposed that norms and values will influence people’s cognitive structures, particularly when recognising the task or process-related implications of a potential decision; these values and norms provide guidelines as to how people can interpret an organisational event and implement a solution. The ‘task’ approach related to whether or not the emphasis was on quick and efficient task completion, while the ‘process’ approach centred on developing consensus and group harmony. Misunderstandings in this context may be related to the expectations that people bring to cross-cultural situations; these expectations affect how people assess a situation and develop an appropriate behavioural response (Miller, 1995).

3.1.6 Performance Appraisals

Most modern organisations in the developed world operate within a human resources (HR) framework (McKenna, 1994). The major themes for this HR framework are that employees are valuable assets and need to be rewarded, motivated and evaluated. It is also imperative that companies and individuals are committed to mutual goals and responsibilities. Performance appraisals or evaluations are a regular part of most corporate structures and are designed to: (a) be an evaluation of employees by their peers, their subordinates or others; (b) assist with a number of other corporate objectives; (c) create dialogue with employees; (d) assess employees with a view to both developing the individual, and the company; (e) increase the productivity of the organisation; and (f) assist with pay awards (McKenna).
However, while increasing numbers of organisations are using some kind of assessment procedure, previous research on performance appraisals has not addressed issues related specifically to the appraisal of expatriate managers, despite the fact that these managers are becoming strategically important in increasing numbers of US multi-national firms (Gregerson, Hite, & Black, 1996). Gregersen et al. have proposed that expatriate appraisals are particularly unique because of: (a) the exceptional nature of international assignments; and (b) raters' inexperience with issues related to the complexity of the expatriate assignments, particularly issues related to language barriers, and cultural issues related to performance appraisals. Gregersen et al. concluded that to increase the accuracy of expatriate performance appraisals, firms should pay more attention to multiple performance criteria, multiple appraisal forms, and more frequent performance appraisals.

A growing body of evidence has also suggested that there are cultural differences in managers' perceptions of performance appraisals. There is also evidence suggesting that managers' perceptions of employee motivations vary cross-culturally and these differences need to be taken into account during the performance appraisal process (DeVoe & Iyengar, 2004). The results of a survey of international organisations (Morris, Podolny, & Ariel, 2000), suggested that North American managers tended to value their work relationships for their utility rather than social, or emotional components. Miller (1999) proposed that the North Americans are individualistic and live in a culture of self-interest, where people are motivated by external factors. Miller concluded that the North Americans tended to believe that all employees are motivated by extrinsic factors, assuming that all employees adhere to norms emphasising pay and financial rewards. However, as DeVoe and Iyengar suggested, not all employees are motivated by financial rewards, particularly nationalities where the emphasis is on collectivism. DeVoe and Iyengar concluded that North American managers need to take into account individual
differences if they are to avoid de-motivating employees and decreasing job satisfaction. Arvey et al. (1991) concluded that more research needs to be undertaken to determine which performance appraisals are effective in different cross-cultural settings.

A number of performance appraisal methods are used in organisations to assess employee performance. One method is the Graphic Rating Scales, incorporating a ten-point scale, which the rater uses to measure individual performance. The Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scales/Behavioural Observation Scales are similar to graphic rating scales, although these measures are ‘anchored’ in descriptions of worker behaviour. A widely used, more sophisticated technique is Management by Objectives (MBO), which involves multiple forms and performance criteria and emphasises goal setting (McConkie, 1979). In MBO: (a) the goals are specific, (b) the goals are defined by measurable results, and (c) organisational and personal goals are linked. Another technique, which uses more than one rater, is the Multi-Rater Comparative Evaluation. The objective of this method is to create a performance profile of the employee, based on multiple criteria, and to provide valuable feedback information (Bozeman, 1997).

Gregerson et al. (1996) concluded, however, that previous research has not addressed issues relating to the effectiveness of these various appraisal methods in the context of expatriate managers. However, they have suggested expatriate performance appraisals should use techniques that are based on multiple appraisal criteria and multiple appraisal forms, such as MBO and Multi-Rater Comparative Evaluation described in this section. However, it appears that, consistent with Gregerson et al. and DeVoe and Iyengar (2004), more research is needed that focuses on managers’ perceptions of employee motivation, and on the effectiveness of different performance appraisal methods in different cultural settings.
3.1.6.1 A Cognitive Approach to Performance Appraisals

Shaw (1990) developed a cognitive categorisation model that described how managers collected, processed, stored, and used information about their organisational environments; the model emphasised there are cultural differences in how managers process this information about their environments (See Chapter 1). Fisher (as cited in Shaw, 1990) suggested there are cultural differences in the way that people process information, which may cause conflict and disagreement when managers appraise a member of another culture. In a study of supervisors and employees in a police department, Hauenstein and Foti (1989) found that the criteria by which supervisors and employers assessed employees' behaviour differed. Therefore, Hauenstein and Foti concluded that scripts used by each group to identify good and bad work performance also differed, concluding these differences might be more exaggerated in cross-cultural settings (see Chapter 1). Shaw proposed, for example, that the behavioural script used by a manager to evaluate an employee will depend on the manager's own schemas about what constitutes good employee behaviour; these ideas will have developed from the manager's own past experiences. Lord (1985) suggested that when a manager appraises an employee's performance, he or she will recall information about the actual behaviour of the employee; however, the manager will also recall prototypical characteristics about what constitutes good employee behaviour, which are associated with the category into which the employee has been placed by the manager.

3.1.7 Summary

The starting point for further research will be an investigation of the similarities and differences in the English and American approaches to specific organisational events, i.e. decision-making and performance appraisals. While value systems undoubtedly influence behaviour and communication style, the results in Study 1 indicated that
Americans and the English did not differ in terms of their personal value systems. While it is possible that the methodology may have precluded an investigation of underlying differences in values between the two groups, the discussion of Cognitive Theory suggested there may be other factors that explain the style differences and misunderstandings suggested by anecdotal evidence and described by Dunkerley and Robinson (2002). Therefore, this study will aim to identify other variables, which may influence style of speaking and approaches to organisational processes in this context.

Specifically, it is hypothesised that:

1. American and English managers have differing styles of communication, which will have led to misunderstandings, cultural stereotyping and inter-group conflict.

2. Consistent with Cognitive Theory, it is predicted there are a number of factors influencing the cognition of organisational events, in terms of language styles and approaches to a specific organisational event, i.e. decision-making and performance appraisals. These factors may include cultural values, as well as beliefs, emotions, the corporate environment, expectations, experience and learning.

3. American and English managers will differ in their approaches to decision-making, with Americans preferring a task approach with its emphasis on quick and efficient job completion. In contrast, the English will prefer a process approach to decision-making that emphasises gaining consensus and a careful review of the implications of task completion.

4. The English style of decision-making will be associated with the avoidance of risk and uncertainty.
5. The Americans will describe themselves as more efficient than the English, while the English will describe the Americans as aggressive and assertive. This is consistent with the results of Study 1.

6. English and American managers will differ in their approaches to performance appraisals, with Americans preferring systems that emphasise the extrinsic aspects of employee motivation.
3.2 Method

3.2.1 Participants

The participants in this study were 20 American and 20 English managers who were working in a number of companies in the South of England and in the United States. Both the American and English managers interviewed differed individually on a number of characteristics. These included the type of organisation in which they were working; their level of seniority within the organisation; the length of time they had worked in the organisation and age (see Table 3.1). Some of the participants were known to the researcher, others were introduced by the participants. Five of the American and six of the English participants had also taken part in the values research. The participants were selected from several types of organisations: (a) Information Technology, (b) Utilities, (c) Defence, (d) Manufacturing, (e) Consulting, and (f) Oil and Petroleum.

The manufacturing category included companies associated with defence, packaging, automotive and industrial products. The oil and petroleum category included managers who were lawyers and public affairs practitioners who were working within these organisations. All participants had experience of working in cross-cultural environments, and all bar three worked in American-owned organisations. However, this British organisation had previously merged with several American organisations and the three participants reported that the company had adopted an American organisational style.

All of the participants were male, because there were very few expatriate female managers in the Bristol area. Because the British are not a homogenous group and include the Scottish, the Welsh, the English and the Northern Irish, only English participants were included so any inter-British differences could be minimised.
Table 3.1. Age, Job and Company Type and Year of Cross-Cultural Experience of Americans and English Managers Participating in Interview Phase of this Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Company</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Consultancy</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Defence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The participants were all male because there are not many female expatriate managers in the Southwest of England.

To control for variability in the results that may have resulted from regional differences in value systems between the North and South of England, 18 participants lived...
and worked in the South of England; two English participants were from the South of England but were working in the US (see Section 2.2). All of the American participants worked in American-owned companies in the South of England, and throughout the US. As there may be regional differences between American managers in terms of values (Vandello & Cohen, 1999), the sample included managers from all over the US. For example, three participants lived and worked in the Eastern US; five were from the Midwest; eight were from the West; while four were from the Southern US. (See Section 3.4 for a discussion of methodological issues).

3.2.2 Design

The study was a structured interview design which included a series one-to-one interviews conducted with a total of 40 American and English participants (20 Americans and 20 English). The questions focussed on two areas of organisational life and were open-ended.

3.2.3 Materials

A three page, A4 document was printed for each of the 40 participants. Each document included questions on the two areas of organisational life (see Appendix B1). This question sheet included a number of option answers. However, the document was not designed to be shown to the participants. Instead, the option answers were used by researcher as aid to use when pursuing an open-ended line of questioning. A Sony tape recorder was used to record all of the conversations. For the telephone interviews, a Telephone Recording Plug, which plugged into a telephone socket, was used to tape record the conversations. The tapes were transcribed using the Sony tape recorder.

3.2.4 Pilot Study

The interview questions were initially developed from ideas generated from previous research (Dunkerley & Robinson, 2002), and from a thorough review of relevant
literature. The initial interview document was tested in a pilot study that included two American and three English managers in order to assess whether it included items that were relevant in this cross-cultural context. The managers made a number of suggestions, which were incorporated into the final draft.

3.2.5 Procedure

If possible, initial contact with the potential participant was made in person; if this was not possible, primarily due to geographical considerations, the contact was made by phone or by e-mail. The researcher also made one visit to the United States to interview three English managers, who were working in an American manufacturing company. Because face to face meetings were not always possible, eight interviews were conducted by telephone using a recording device designed specifically for this purpose.

To standardise the testing conditions and to make them situationally equivalent, participants were asked to select their preferred location for the interview; situationally equivalent conditions implied that participants should be interviewed in situations where they felt relaxed and comfortable. Thus, the participants were interviewed in a variety of locations, which included their offices, their own homes, public places, the researcher's own home, and by telephone.

Consistent with the concept of psychological equivalence, Cannell and Kahn (1968) suggested there are aspects of an interview situation that would encourage participants to be forthcoming about their attitudes and views. These attitudes included maintaining a friendly, conversational atmosphere and ensuring that each participant was not rushed for time. The researcher indeed tried to maintain this atmosphere rather than a more formal approach.

At the beginning of the interview, the researcher emphasised that the discussions were completely confidential and that no company or person would be mentioned by name.
Results would be presented in aggregate form and complete anonymity would be preserved. A brief background to the study was presented. The participants were then asked if they would object to the interview being taped. None of the participants expressed any concerns about confidentiality or had any problems with the conversations being taped.

The researcher then asked the questions concerning the two areas of organisational processes: performance appraisals and decision-making. The questioning focussed on their views concerning their cross-cultural interactions in these areas. The questions were deliberately left open-ended and the participant was left to pursue his own line of response. It was felt that the participant would then be free to offer his own views of the dynamics of cross-cultural interactions, thus providing invaluable insight into the results of this study. Further, if a participant introduced another topic, it was pursued, whether or not it was judged as relevant to the current study. The ultimate goal was to maintain an easy, conversational atmosphere.

Participants were asked to explain any specific remarks in greater detail; this was accomplished by repeating their comments and asking for confirmation to the accuracy of the reiteration. By adopting this approach, it was possible to obtain what were felt to be revealing and honest comments about attitudes towards the other culture. All the participants were very forthcoming and none were hesitant in responding to this type of questioning. The interviews were tape recorded and notes were made. The researcher has had considerable experience with interviewing people and has some knowledge of counselling skills. It was found that this experience seemed relevant in this context.

Each interview was planned to take about 30 minutes; however, each participant was cautioned that the questions were open-ended, as it was difficult to estimate the
duration. In fact, most of the interviews lasted for considerably longer because the participants became enthused with the subject and wanted to expand on their views.

At the end of the interview each participant was thanked and debriefed. They were also promised the results of the study in due course. Copies of the earlier Dunkerley (1997) study were also e-mailed as background information after the interview, so these results would not influence their responses.

3.2.6 Data Analyses

The data were in non-numeric form. There are advantages inherent in this methodology in that it provides a depth of quite detailed information. However, it was recognised that this method has its drawbacks in that it can provide results that do not militate against generalisations. However, every effort was made to minimise the weaknesses of the method, e.g., every attempt was made to probe and thereby clarify the true intent of the speaker. The tape recordings were processed within three to four days of the interview.

A software program known as QSR N6 (QSR International, 2002) was used, which is a database-like program that facilitates the handling of qualitative data. It creates categories for non-numeric data, enabling relevant text to be sorted into files that can be accessed readily and diverted into traditional word-packaging programmes. The first stage of the analysing process began with transcribing the 40 interviews and then inputting them into the QSR N6 database system. After reading and rereading the first eight transcripts, it was felt that the classification system seen below was an effective method of determining if differences and similarities existed in the styles of communicating and approaches to organisational systems and processes. The coding system also attempted to differentiate between American and English speakers in terms of whether they were speaking about their own culture or the other culture. Williams and Berry (1991) have pointed to the
difficulties inherent in cross-cultural research when a member of one culture attempts to study another, and indeed this American researcher tried very hard to gauge the true intent of each participant.

The initial coding scheme was created that categorised the views of each group under a number of headings that appeared to conceptualise the meaning and intent implied by the American and English participants. Although no formal reliability checks were run, these coding decisions were checked and ratified by a male, English colleague. After the coding sheets and the text references that related to each code were completed, they were given to an independent observer with appropriate research skills and English background to assess the accuracy of the coding systems. There were no areas of disagreement concerning the integrity of the coding scheme.

The initial coding system identified a number of areas that seemed to conceptualise the meaning and intent implied by the American and English participants. The codes are summarised as follows:

**Direct vs. Indirect Speech:**
- Is the speaker direct? Is the speaker indirect?
- Does he believe that Americans are direct/indirect?
- Does he believe that the English are direct/indirect?

**Task vs. Process:**
- Does the speaker favour a task-orientated approach to decision-making?
- Does the speaker believe that the Americans favour a task or a process related approach to decision-making?
- Does the speaker believe that the English favour a task or a process-related approach to decision-making?
**Efficiency:**
Does the speaker say he is efficient?
Does the speaker say that Americans are efficient? Are the English efficient?

**Corporate culture:**
Does the speaker say that corporate culture affects behaviour?
Does the speaker say that work experience affects behaviour?

**Adapting Behaviour:**
Does the speaker say that he has adapted his behaviour due to experience/corporate culture?

**Emotions:**
Has the speaker said he has been angered, annoyed, or frustrated by the behaviour of the other culture?

**Stereotypes:**
Does the speaker say that Americans are aggressive/forthright?
Does the speaker say that the English are uncomfortable with conflict?
Does the speaker say that Americans are task-orientated?
Does the speaker say that Americans are individualistic and not team-orientated?

A QSR N6 report of each interview transcript was printed, which included the line number in the text as a reference guide. Using a tabulation sheet, formatted as an Excel spreadsheet, each of the text references was noted in the appropriate category on the coding sheet, identifying both the speaker and the text reference number; these categories pertained to a particular area of coding described previously. When interpreting and coding the responses, a number of key words mentioned by the participants were used in order to clarify the meaning and intent. For example, it was concluded that a participant meant a style was efficient if he used certain key words such as: ‘quickly;’ ‘the bottom line;’ ‘it works;’ and ‘it’s easier.’
Consistent with results of this study, the meanings and intent of the English responses were not as obvious as it was with the American responses. While the Americans used phrases like ‘really annoyed’ or ‘it drives me crazy’ when describing their emotional reactions, the English used phrases like ‘it can cause bad feelings’ or ‘I was a bit put off.’ Williams and Berry (1991) have pointed to the difficulties inherent in cross-cultural research when a member of one culture attempts to study another and indeed this researcher sometimes found it hard to gauge the true intent of each participant. However, this was made easier by virtue of having over 22 years experience in living with the British. Williams and Berry also stated that members of one culture soon become ‘acculturated’ to another culture if they have lived within that culture for any length of time. Given this, the researcher’s background of being American but having lived in the UK for over two decades was an appropriate one.

The comments for each area of questioning were grouped into distinct categories that summarised the meaning and intent of the responses. In turn, it was possible to tally the frequency of the responses and quantify the data. Robson (1993) pointed out that coding data and then treating it in much the same way as quantitative data protects the results from the biases that may occur if the researcher relies on more intuitive methods of analysis.

The data was analysed using two different statistical techniques. Because the data fell into two distinct categories, i.e. ‘mentioned’ vs. ‘not mentioned’ or ‘commented’ vs. ‘did not comment’, the binomial distribution was used to determine whether the responses made within each group were significant or whether or not the same distribution of responses could be predicted by chance. The other statistical technique used was the Chi-Square exact probability test, which is a nonparametric technique for analysing data.
presented in the form of frequencies. It was used to compare responses between groups to test if the distribution of responses was likely to have resulted from chance.
3.3 Results

The interview questions referred to two areas of questioning: performance appraisals, and decision-making. However, when discussing their views on these topics, the participants made references to differences and similarities in styles of speech and communication. This was despite the fact that the interview questions did not specifically refer to particular styles of speech or ways of communicating, and similarly did not ask participants about their stereotypical views of the other culture. Nevertheless, both American and English participants made frequent comments during the course of the interviews concerning their preference or disregard for a particular style of speaking. They also volunteered comments concerning their emotional reactions to the style of the other culture, as well as comments concerning their stereotypical views of the other culture. The results are therefore presented to focus on the cross-cultural differences in styles of speaking and communicating between the two groups. The purpose of presenting the results in this way is to provide a theoretical basis for understanding the differences, which were creating difficulties in the workplace.

3.3.1 Categorisation of Differences and Similarities in Organisational Systems and Processes

As predicted:

1. American and English managers appear to have different styles of communication, and these have led to misunderstandings and stereotyping. However, the results were inconclusive as to the level of conflict occurring in this setting. (See Sections 3.3.1.1; 3.3.1.2; and 3.3.1.3).

2. The results indicated that corporate culture appears to be a factor influencing approaches to communication. (See Section 3.3.1.4).

3. Americans and the English have differing approaches to decision-making. (See Section 3.3.1.5).
4. The English style of decision-making appears to be associated with the reduction of uncertainty. (See Section 3.3.1.5).

5. The American behaviour is associated with efficiency and assertiveness (See Section 3.3.1.6).

Contrary to predictions, there were no reported differences in managers’ perceptions of performance appraisals.

3.3.1.1 Direct vs. Indirect Speech.

As hypothesised, a significant number of Americans: (a) preferred a direct of speech; and (c) believed the English preferred an indirect style. However, the English did not similarly view their speech style and English speech in general as being indirect.

Americans on the English. The Americans said the English preferred an indirect style of speech, and tended to wander around issues and use more words than necessary to make a point (Binomial distribution, $p < .01$, 19/20). Significantly more American than English managers said that the English preferred an indirect style of speech, where the emphasis was on implied meanings. The Americans believed that by using an indirect approach to speech, the English were able to avoid taking risks and reduce the probability of conflicts being made explicit ($X^2 (1, N = 40) = 8.5, p < .01$). (See Appendix B2 for a summary of the results, which are calculated using the binomial distribution and for a summary of Chi-Square results. See Appendix B3 for Chi-Square tables summarising raw data relating to interview questions).

If you make a point in the UK...you have to soften it up a little bit, or say it off-line (AB)....The English tend to construct gentle, roundabout ways of introducing their point; it's rude to be direct in British culture (BB)...There tends to be an emphasis on all the implied meanings (in Britain); it's quite baffling (CM)...Because when the Americans are being direct and the English were trying to be oblique, that is where the conflict comes from (DW).
Americans on Americans. Seventeen of the 20 American participants reported that, as individuals, they preferred a direct and explicit style of speech and believed they got to the point more quickly than the English and addressed issues more clearly (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 17/20 \)). Significantly more American than English managers said that they were direct in their style of speaking, and direct speech was said to increase their personal and organisational effectiveness (\( X^2(1, N = 40) = 12.5, p < .01 \)).

Americans are a lot more blunt (BM)... Americans are a lot more confrontational, more openly obstinate (DP)... Americans' direct approach is efficient (BB).

3.3.1.2 Emotions

As hypothesised, the differences in the American and the English approaches to language organisational events are associated with a degree of negative emotion, on the part of Americans and the English.

Americans on the English. Americans said that, at times, they had been frustrated, annoyed or angered by the style and/or approach of their English colleagues (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 19/20 \)). Fifteen of the 20 managers interviewed for this study commented that their frustrations centred on the English indirect style of speech, which Americans said was confusing and inefficient (Binomial distribution, \( p < .05, 15/20 \)).

Direct Speech: The English won't defy you to your face. I am not used to dealing with this and I find it frustrating (DP)... The English have a completely different way of speaking; it can really be frustrating (MS)... You don't get a clear answer back from the English. It's frustrating (RH).

Although not a statistically significant sample, nine Americans commented that they at some point had been annoyed or frustrated by the English style of decision-making.

Decision-making: We have these (English) processes in place, and we have to use them. That is an example of what frustrates me (WL)... The English keep discussing, rather than moving on. For me, I have to throttle back my impatience on it (HB)... Having a process approach can be frustrating. It makes everything
more drawn out than it needs to be (BP)... And the British are thinking that the Americans aren't detailed (in decision-making) and the Americans are thinking that the Brits are getting picky about things that don't matter. This has been a huge problem for us. It's frustrating for me (because) I like a quick fix (DW).

**English on Americans.** A significant number of English managers similarly said that, at times, they had feelings of frustration, annoyance or anger when interacting with their American colleagues (Binomial distribution, $p = .01, 16/20$). These emotions were associated with the Americans' task-focussed decision-making style (10 comments). Nine comments centred on English frustrations with the Americans' direct style of speech. The number of comments made in each category, however, did not reach statistical significance.

**Decision-making.** Quite frankly, there are issues that 'shooting from the hip' can't cover. That's where the English frustration comes in. Americans don't learn from their mistakes (RD)... I know there are a lot of English people who are frustrated with (American) speed of decision-making (RB)... When I suggest to Americans that they should work more collaboratively, the reaction is that it is really time consuming. The Americans say it frustrates the hell out of them and they don't want any part of it (AO).

**Direct Speech:** In my experience the Americans are really honest and direct, which has caused some fairly awkward moments with (the English) (PB)... The Americans have a knack for upsetting (English) people by the way that they talk (RB)... I had to give feedback to a senior (American) colleague on his (direct) interaction style. He was really grating on people (GP).
3.3.1.3 Beliefs and Stereotypes

As hypothesised, when commenting on issues relating to decision-making and performance appraisals, both American and English participants reported stereotypical views of each other.

Americans on the English. Americans managers said that the English could be described as reserved, and uncomfortable with direct speech and conflict (Binomial distribution, $p < .01, 17/20$). More American than English participants said that the English were uncomfortable with direct speech and conflict ($X^2 (1, N = 40) = 22.6, p < .01$).

The English person is generally more uncomfortable with getting feedback, bad, good or indifferent (JR)... The English open less of themselves, on average (DF)... With the English, there are lots of conversations behind the scenes, amongst themselves. They (the English) just aren't upfront (AB)... The English seem to construct gentle roundabout ways of introducing their point. I think that the British way is designed to protect feelings and avoid embarrassments where people have to save face in any explicit way (BB)... The English are just a little bit less confrontational. They are more concerned with keeping things calm and just moving on (DP).

The English on the Americans. The English said that Americans are less team orientated than their English counterparts, and were directive, and preferred to make individualistic decisions ($X^2 (1, N = 40) = 7.6, p < .01$).

Americans are directive. They may listen, but they still want to make the decision (AB)... The Americans are much less tolerant of differences between people and groups. They are much more authoritative when solving problems basically (AO)... Americans are like a puppet master, and don't take time to work in a cohesive group (GP)... I think that Americans are less team orientated. A lot of them default to working alone (ME).
3.3.1.4 Organisational Culture

It was predicted there may be a number of factors influencing behaviour in this bi-cultural setting. The results indicated that corporate culture appears to influence the behaviour of English managers in this setting, i.e. language and decision-making style.

*The English on the English.* Seventeen of the 20 English managers interviewed said that the corporate culture of an organisation can affect an individual’s behaviour, dictate the communication style and reprogramme values to a greater extent than national culture (Binomial distribution, $p < .01, 17/20$). The English also said their behaviour within the organisation has been adapted or changed as a result of working with the other culture (Binomial distribution, $p < .05, 15/20$).

I think it is a (corporate) cultural thing, that people will be upfront. If I wasn't dropped into this environment, I wouldn't do that (DS)... I think that once a person has bought into this (company) culture, (individual differences) are indistinguishable (AM)... I think there is definitely an influence of the corporate culture at work. I think it is inevitable, because if you are to be successful, you have to display certain behaviours (AO).

The results indicated that the Americans did not say that they had adapted their behaviour as a result of corporate culture (Binomial distribution, $p > .05, 11/20$), or as a result of experience with working with another culture (Binomial distribution, $p > .05, 13/20$).

3.3.1.5 Decision-making

As hypothesised, there are differences in American and English approaches to decision-making, related to a task vs. a process approach. As predicted, the English approach appears to centre on issues related to avoidance of risk and uncertainty.

*Americans on Americans.* The results suggest that American and English managers prefer different styles of decision-making. American participants said that, as individuals, they preferred a task orientation to problem-solving and decision-making, referring to a
preference for getting the job done quickly and efficiently (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 17/20 \)). Similarly, a significant number of American participants said that as a nationality, Americans preferred a task-orientated approach to decision-making (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 17/20 \)).

The difference is that in America, you get a few key people together and they will make a decision as quickly as possible. There is that pressure to get that result right now (PD)...The stereotype is that Americans are quicker to make decisions, and if they have to do this with less than perfect information, then they are willing to do that and take action (DF)...Americans will be quicker to push towards a conclusion, even if that means being a little bit more confrontational and demanding (DP).

**Americans on the English.** Americans said the English preferred a process approach to decision-making \( \chi^2 (1, N = 40) = 8.5, p < .01 \). The English, they said, liked to debate issues longer than the Americans and appeared to be more concerned with relationship issues, such as maintaining team effectiveness, than with implementing actionable conclusions (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 19/20 \)).

The English want to think through everything. Everything is evaluated. They don't want to make a mistake (BP)...In the UK, the decision-making structure is far more laid out than in the US. In the UK, people err on the side of not making the decision because they were analysing everything too much (AN)...The (English) group is excessively process driven....(The English) keep discussing and agreeing with it, rather than moving on (HB).

**English on the English.** The English agreed that they preferred to use a process approach to decision-making, which emphasises achieving consensus, building relationships, and addressing every aspect of the problem before proceeding with task completion (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 18/20 \)). As predicted, the process approach, which was characterised by thorough debate and consensus, was associated with avoiding risks, mistakes and failure.
With the English, it's all about relationships. That's the English way of doing things (DS)...Consensus is the ideal way to make decision. (The English way) is better because you get buy-in, which you need to go forward...The advantage of the English approach is that the entire case has been discussed beforehand and there are fewer surprises in the process. As everything is under control, you are less likely to trip over something (PS)...The stereotype is that British managers want to debate things a bit more, to make sure there are no wrinkles that have been left out, that there are no issues that haven't been addressed (AO).

**English on the Americans.** The Americans were seen as action-orientated, more concerned with task completion and appeared to have little regard for the consequences of proceeding to the action point too quickly (Binomial distribution, $p < .05, 15/20$).

In America, there is more of an urgency to frame the discussion of what we will be getting out of this and other action points (PS)...The Americans are much less tolerant of differences between people and groups. They are much more inclined to be authoritative when solving problems basically (AO)...Americans do not have a long term regard for the consequences of their actions. They do not pause to consider what the possible outcome of the decision might be (PF).

### 3.3.1.6 Efficiency

As predicted, Americans described themselves as having efficiency concerns, and believing they were more efficient than the English.

**Americans on Americans.** Proportionately more American than English participants said that as a nationality, Americans are concerned with efficiency in task and job completion, which they believed enhanced personal efficiency and contributed to the overall effectiveness of the organisation ($X^2 (1, N=40) = 5.6, p < .05$). More American than English managers said that a task approach to problem-solving was efficient ($X^2(1, N=40) = 8.1, p < .01$).

To be efficient and successful in getting the job done is the task that should be the number one priority. The task approach is more efficient (BP)...I think efficiency is (the American) bias. It is as clear as the nose on my face that speed and
timeliness are risks worth taking (WL)...The American results orientated approach is our goal. We will do anything to meet that goal, even if that means running full tilt from the word go (DO).

*Americans on the English.* American participants said that the English are inefficient and are not concerned with completing tasks and jobs in the most expedient way possible (Binomial distribution, \( p < .01, 17/20 \)). Proportionately more American than English participants said that the English were inefficient (\( \chi^2 (1, N=40) = 18.2, p < .01 \)).

The British leaders would be willing to sacrifice speed of action to make sure everything is carefully considered. You know, you just move much more slowly (DF)...I find that the English do a lot checking to make sure. I find it the case that they keep discussing things, rather than getting on with it. I think that for me I had to throttle back my impatience on it...it takes too much time (HB)...If (the Americans) could have fixed the problem in ten minutes, it will take (the English) a month, because that's how long the process takes (DW).

3.3.1.7 *Performance Appraisals*

Contrary to predictions, there were no reported differences in the American and English approaches to performance appraisals.

Note: Tables summarising these results are included in Appendix B3. Full details concerning the comments made by the participants regarding style of speech, decision-making, efficiency, personality, corporate culture, work experience, adapting behaviour, emotional reaction, and beliefs and stereotypes are included in Appendix B4.
3.4 Discussion

3.4.1 Direct vs. Indirect Speech

The results of this study suggested that Americans prefer a direct style of speech where the true meaning and intent of the speaker is explicit, revealing the speaker's true intentions. An American manager, for example, remarked that directness and honesty were important: “You need to give constructive criticism. I think you have to.” Proportionately more American than English managers reported the English style of speaking was indirect where the true meaning of the communication was left implicit, and the true intent of the message is concealed. An American manager's comment was consistent with the view that Americans believed the English style of indirect speech was associated with avoiding embarrassment and conflict: “I think that the British way is designed to protect feelings, and to avoid situations where people have to save face in any explicit way. Avoiding embarrassment is really part of the English style in the first place.” However, the English did not report they preferred an indirect style of speech. They similarly did not report the English, in general used an indirect style of speech.

Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) described directness as a powerful construct for understanding differences in interaction styles, and certainly this view was reflected in this research context in that many of the different indicators of communication styles could be explained along the dimension of direct vs. indirect speech. Children learn the rules and norms of appropriate interactional behaviours and thus learn to apply these rules when choosing a communication style that effectively expresses their objectives and intentions. Therefore, it was suggested that the style of communication reflects the norms, values and attitudes of a culture.

As discussed in Chapter 1, social psychologists have classified the variability of value systems along a number of dimensions, which as discussed in Chapter 1, tend to
group the US and Great Britain along similar dimensions. Hofstede (1980), Parsons and Shils (1951), and Triandis (1986) have isolated individualism-collectivism as the major dimension of cross-cultural variability: individualistic cultures tend to emphasise the goals of the individual, while collectivist cultures emphasise the predominance of group goals over those of the individual. Cultures have also been differentiated according to the predominant type of communication in the culture (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988, 1996; Hall, 1976), which has been associated with individualism vs. collectivism (See Chapter 1). Hence, these results would appear to support the view that Americans and the English prefer similar styles of speaking.

Why do Americans prefer to use direct rather than indirect speech? According to Johnson and Johnson (1975), the preferred style of communication is dependent on the childhood language socialisation process, which emphasises the accepted values and assumptions of a particular culture. Johnson and Johnson concluded that the communication style of American children apparently reflected the values of self-worth, assertiveness, achievement and honesty. Hofstede (1980) concluded that the US was the most individualistic country in the world, which would reinforce the importance of using direct speech, i.e. a style that reflected the true meaning and intent of the message. The GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) also concluded the US is the most assertive country in the world, which they suggested was also associated with a direct style of speech. This view was consistent with the results of Study 1 (see Chapter 2) where American managers agreed that American behaviour was associated with assertiveness which, as the research suggested, should result in a propensity for direct speech. While a person's orientation on the individualism vs. collectivism dimension may determine a person's style of speech, others (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988) have suggested that speech style is also influenced by a person's propensity to avoid risks, e.g. uncertainty.
avoidance (See Chapter 1). Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey proposed that if people exhibit higher levels of uncertainty avoidance, they will tend to use elaborate language and understatement to manage their uncertainty in ambiguous situations. Conversely, if people have lower levels of uncertainty avoidance, they tend to have lower levels of anxiety when interacting in unfamiliar or uncomfortable situations, and can afford to be exacting and direct in their speech. The idea that Americans have lower levels of uncertainty avoidance, which is reflected in their speech style, was proposed by Dunkerley and Robinson (2002).

Research has pointed to other factors which may be related to the Americans' use of a direct style of speech. Trompenaars (1993) noted the American preference for direct speech, and believed it has evolved because culturally diverse immigrants were able to use direct speech as a mechanism for breaking down communication barriers, making it easier to converse with one another. McClelland (1987) suggested that economic conditions would affect child-rearing techniques, which would subsequently affect language styles. For instance, he concluded there have been high levels of economic prosperity in the US, which has resulted in higher levels in need for achievement (nAchievement). This has translated into cultural values that reflect honesty, individualism and efficiency. These values, he proposed, have manifested themselves into a direct style of speech. Conversely, McClelland (1987) proposed the English prefer an indirect style of speech. This style reflects lower levels of nAchievement, caused by economic deprivation associated with two world wars fought close to its shores, and a history of autocratic leadership. Thus, low nAchievement is associated with a more pessimistic society that has developed a cultural value system reflecting a tendency for risk-avoidance. Uncertainty avoidance, he concluded, is associated with the English preference for indirect speech. Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) similarly found the English stated a preference for indirect speech, which, it was proposed, was associated with higher levels of uncertainty avoidance.
Thus, the results of this study suggested the American style of speech reflects values associated with individualism, assertiveness, and low levels of uncertainty avoidance. However, contrary to McClelland's view that the English use an indirect style of language, the results of this study are inconclusive as to the preferred language style of the English, and the societal values associated with this language style. However, it must be emphasised that the interview questions did not refer directly to differences in styles of speech, and not all of the participants volunteered their opinions on these issues. It may be that Americans volunteered these comments to a greater extent than their English colleagues because, for the Americans, these issues are important and relate to success or failure of their international assignments. As discussed in Chapter 1, Bennett (1994) had suggested that language differences were associated with the high failure rate of US assignments to Britain. Indeed, these results suggested a significant number of Americans appeared to be misunderstanding their English colleagues, and were negatively interpreting the English style. (See Section 2.3.2 for a discussion of cultural misunderstandings). In contrast, perhaps the English did not mention their preference for indirect speech because speech styles were not an issue for them. The English may believe they have already adapted their indirect style of speech to be consistent with the American corporate culture (See Section 3.4.9, and Section 3.4.10 for a discussion of cultural adaptation and corporate culture, respectively). The results of Study 2 similarly indicated the English had adapted their speech styles to conform to the Americanised culture (see Section 3.4.10). The view that the use of language styles varies according to situational factors was consistent with Norton (1978), who concluded the use of communication styles may vary according to time, context and situation. This suggested that the use of languages style is not necessarily prescribed by national cultural orientation, but can be influenced by a number of contextual factors (Hall, 1976). Alternatively, the English may have joined a US firm
particularly because they preferred a direct, American style of communication. This suggested that they may not find the Americans' direct style of speech problematical. This may be why they failed to mention these issues during the interviews. Thus, the results do not appear to offer insight into which style of speech is preferred by the English, or the cultural values that underpin this style.

3.4.2 Misunderstandings and Stereotyping

The results were inconclusive as to the preferred speech style of the English. However, the results indicated that: (a) Americans believed there were cross-cultural differences in styles of speaking and communicating between the two groups; and (b) cultural stereotyping is occurring in this context.

Misunderstandings. The results of Study 2 suggested that Americans preferred a direct style of speech, believed the English preferred indirect speech, and were interpreting the English style in a negative manner. This is consistent with Smith and Bond's (1998) definition of misunderstandings, as the Americans were applying their own standards when evaluating the actions of the English. Consequently, the Americans believed the English were exhibiting inappropriate behaviour. For instance, while the Americans prefer a direct form of communication where the meaning and intent of the message is explicit, a significant number said the English use a more indirect form of communication where the messages are left implicit, leaving room for confusion and misunderstandings. Consequently, they believed the English are inefficient and inscrutable. An American manager described how differing approaches to communication had contributed to misunderstandings in this setting: "Because when Americans are being direct, and the English are being oblique, that's where the conflict comes from." The view that Americans believed the English style of speaking left room for misunderstandings was
consistent with another American manager's comment: "In England, there tends be an emphasis on all the implied meanings. It's quite baffling."

Consistent with Smith and Bond's definition (1993) and as hypothesised, these style differences and cultural stereotyping were associated with misunderstandings in the context of language style. There was also evidence suggesting that each group misunderstood each other's approach to decision-making, as (a) each group believed their style of decision-making was effective; (b) they used their own standards when describing the behaviour of their cross-cultural colleague; and (c) they gave a negative interpretation to the other culture's style. However, it must be noted that while each group mentioned they had felt frustrated and annoyed with the other culture's decision-making style, the number of American and English comments concerning these reactions did not reach statistical significance.

**Stereotyping.** As well as suggesting that misunderstandings were occurring in this setting, the results also indicated that both groups had stereotypical views of each other. The Americans believed the English were uncomfortable with direct speech and conflict. The English believed the Americans to be directive and authoritative. Stereotypes have been defined as over-generalised beliefs that one group has about another (Scollon & Scollon, 2001). Some researchers have suggested that stereotypes can create misunderstandings and conflict (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995), while others concluded that stereotypes can play a positive role in cross-cultural interaction. For instance they facilitate the cognitive processing of cultural events, enabling individuals to categorise and simplify what can only be viewed as a confusing and complicated social world (Macrae et al., 1994). They similarly concluded that stereotypes play an essential role in social cognition, as they enable people to redirect their mental capacities into more conscious, complex reasoning strategies (See Chapter 1). However, this study did not measure
directly levels of conflict and anxiety in this context, so it is difficult to determine whether the stereotyping was playing a role in social cognition, or creating conflict and misunderstandings.

Macrae et al. (1997) pointed to the enduring nature of social stereotyping, which was related to the fact that stereotypical information is more easily retained and is harder to forget. Although later research has pointed to moderating factors, which may limit the pervasiveness of social stereotyping (Castelli et al., 2004), Macrae et al.'s conclusion that stereotypes are not necessarily phenomena that are eliminated through cross-cultural experience appears to have some relevance in this research context. Consistent with this view of stereotyping, the results indicated that despite the length of time that Americans and the English had worked together in a cross-cultural setting, a significant number of both American and English managers reported having, at some point, a degree of negative emotion when interacting with the other group. Again, it should be emphasised that this study did not address and measure directly organisational conflict in this setting. However, it should be noted the comments pertaining to emotional reactions were consistently made in the present tense, suggesting the Americans and the English continued to experience a degree of negative emotions when interacting with their cross-cultural colleagues.

Although stereotypes often play a positive role in sustaining harmonious intercultural relations, Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) suggested that stereotypes create expectancies that the other cultural member then attempts to confirm or deny, perhaps creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. In this way, the stereotypes can in fact be guiding and even sustaining certain behaviours within the organisation. For example, the Americans, who have described themselves as action-orientated, may believe that the English prefer not to take risks. Thus, the Americans may be depending on their English colleagues to restrain some of their more impulsive reactions by providing a more balanced
view of the positive and negative aspects of an issue. The idea of self-fulfilling prophecies was consistent with Bargh et al. (1996) who found there may be an automatic, i.e. unconscious, basis for self-fulfilling prophecies. They proposed that when the perceiver activates stereotypical thinking, he or she may behave in a certain way. For instance, in this setting, the Americans may believe the English will not self-disclose; consequently the Americans may not ask the English person for any personal information. However, because the Americans have not asked for personal information, it is all the more likely the English will not disclose. This will ultimately confirm the stereotype for the American perceiver, and will increase the likelihood this stereotypical thinking will be repeated in the future. This may be an unconscious process, with both groups unaware of the part they have played in this scenario.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that cultural stereotyping has its negative aspects, primarily because both the Americans and the English participants admitted they were at some point annoyed, uncomfortable or frustrated with the other culture’s approach. This is a situation that cannot be conducive to either inter-group harmony or organisational effectiveness, with Campbell (1967) concluding that there is a strong relationship between conflict and negative stereotyping. While levels of conflict and disagreement were not measured in this research context, anecdotal evidence has suggested that cultural differences are indeed having a negative effect on the success of Anglo-American relations in the workplace. This was suggested by Bennett (1994), and discussed in Chapter 1.

3.4.3 Emotions

As hypothesised, a significant number of both American and English participants said they had experienced some feelings of frustration, annoyance and degrees of anger when interacting with the other cultural member in this organisational context. Again, it should be noted that levels of conflict and anxiety were not measured in this research
context. Nevertheless, both groups described their negative emotional reactions. For example, an English manager remarked that the English were annoyed when American colleagues used a task approach to decision-making: “Americans just want to get on with it...but there are issues that ‘hip-shooting’ can’t cover. That’s where the frustration comes in.” The Americans believed the English were often reserved, which they found to be inherently inefficient and made them difficult to understand. An American manager’s comment represented the view that English reserve led to inefficiencies: “When I worked in Bristol, if there was a problem, nobody would talk about. It was really frustrating, because even if it was a really big problem, (it wasn’t resolved).” The English also said they were reserved by nature. For example, an English manager believed the English were less candid than the Americans, while another English participant suggested the English were reserved, and less ‘upfront,’ than Americans, “because (the English) don’t want to hurt or criticise people.” Similarly, the Americans believed the English managers were indirect and ‘uncomfortable’ with conflict.

Cushner and Brislin (1996), however, suggested that not all miscommunications elicit a negative reaction. For example, the findings from this research indicated that Americans and the English often appreciate the style of the cultural member. An English manager, participating in this study, stated that although the English were typically more reserved and less open, he believed that openness was “critical” in the development of the business. An American manager pointed out that that “the English were often elegant in terms of how they were trying to make their points and arguments - more parables, metaphors, history!”

There may in fact be several reactions that result from any cross-cultural interaction (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). These include varying degrees of negative reactions. If one person uses his or her own set of guidelines for interpreting behaviour, he
or she may incorrectly assess the intentions of the other speaker, i.e. because Americans are direct, the English may apply their own set of norms and values and incorrectly accuse the Americans of being loud and pushy. Cushner and Brislin suggested that by increasing their knowledge of other cultures, individuals should be able to understand what is taking place in cross-cultural interactions. They should then be able to acknowledge their emotions and their consequences, and adapt their behaviour in order to avoid and overcome any negative emotional response. (See Section 3.4.9 for a discussion of cultural adaptation).

3.4.4 Social Identity Theory

The previous remarks suggested that both Americans and the English were placing a positive spin on their own culture's behaviour, while having a negative view of the other. Thus, both the Americans and the English appeared to have social biases that were associated with denigrating the 'out-group' and normalising the 'in-group.' This appeared to be consistent with Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978). Social Identity Theory predicts that people create a sense of identity by defining themselves in relation to groups. By describing themselves as American or English, for example, people create a self-identity, which is related to their national culture. Alternatively, as people belong to a number of groups, they may also define themselves by association with other groups to which they belong, i.e. managers, Company X employees etc. Social Identity Theory predicts that people will have a preference for viewing their 'in-group' positively, as this will contribute to their self-esteem. Thus, it appears the Americans and the English, in this instance, were defining themselves in terms of their national culture, and were subsequently comparing themselves favourably with the other group. This was consistent with the remarks made by each group. As discussed in Chapter 2, that Social Identity Theory also predicts that
people will distance themselves from the ‘in-group’ if they feel this group is not characterised by qualities that enhance a positive self-image.

3.4.5 Decision-making

As hypothesised, the results of this study have pointed to significant differences in the American and English approaches to organisational systems and processes in one of the two areas discussed, i.e. decision-making. Americans appear to have a greater concern for task completion than in the processes involved in task completion. As hypothesised, the American style of decision-making reflects efficiency concerns, i.e. those associated with completing tasks in a direct, expedient way. Conversely, the English show a greater concern for the processes involved in task completion, i.e. concerns associated with a thorough analysis of the problem and maintaining harmonious relationships. As predicted, the English style of decision-making appears to be associated with a propensity for avoiding uncertainties. For example, by using a process approach, the English may hope to reduce the possibility of risk that is associated with completing the task too quickly, without considering thoroughly the pros and cons of implementing a decision.

3.4.5.1 Task vs. Process

The results of this study indicated the Americans and the English differed in their approaches to problem-solving and decision-making, with Americans agreeing that efficiency in decision-making depends on adopting a task orientation. Consistent with these results, Smith and Bond (1998) indicated that cultures have distinctive approaches to problem-solving and decision-making, which vary on preferences for a task vs. a relationship-orientated approach (referred to as process in this study) to leadership and decision-making. They have defined task as a style emphasising structure. In contrast, process focuses on building successful relationships between leaders and subordinates. Maznevski and Peterson (1997) similarly suggested that national culture has a strong impact on behaviour within cross-cultural organisations, because it affects how individuals
interpret and process work events, enabling them to develop situationally appropriate behaviours. Maznevski and Peterson concluded that culture influenced behaviour in cross-cultural organisations by providing the basis by which managers can interpret the event and subsequently develop a course of action. Thus, people were able to form ideas about evaluating possible response outcomes and developing appropriate behaviours. Smith and Bond (1998) also concluded that the cultural orientation of the individual determines whether or not the person recognised the task or the process-related implications of an organisational event, i.e. when confronted with a decision-making event, will the individual decide to focus on completing the task efficiently and quickly, or will the emphasis be on developing consensus and maintaining the harmony of the group? Maznevski and Peterson suggested that individuals who assess information using process-related schemas are adhering to the principles of a harmony-based culture; i.e. they are particularly concerned with ensuring that the balance and the processes of the group are being maintained. They will make sure that everyone in the group has had input into the decision-making process, i.e. they will try to achieve consensus. Individuals who focus on the task-related implications of a decision are adhering to the principles of a mastery-orientation culture in that they are interested in controlling the situations and processes in decision-making. They will try to intervene and solve the problem directly and immediately, seeking the aid of the group members.

Do American and English managers differ in their preferences for either a mastery or a harmony orientation? The evidence seemed to support this idea. The results indicated that Americans do prefer a task orientation and ultimately believe they can solve any problem or situation. The results also indicated that the English do aim for harmony within the group, and they do try to gain consensus before proceeding to the action point, providing support for Maznevski and Peterson's theories.
The mastery vs. harmony conceptualisation appeared to be similar to Hofstede's (1980) and Schwartz' (1994) individualism-collectivism dimension. As discussed in Chapter 1, this described whether a culture defined itself according to its own personal characteristics and achievements (individualistic), or whether they defined themselves as members of a group and emphasised the harmony of that group (collectivistic). Relevant to this discussion is Uncertainty Avoidance proposed by Hofstede and the GLOBE project (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). This referred to a society's tendency to put in place values and structures that limit uncertainty associated with daily life. However, while differences in collectivist and uncertainty avoidance related values would explain why the US and England differed in their approach to decision-making, most of these studies have indicated that America and England scored similarly on most value dimensions. However, Smith and Bond concluded that America was undoubtedly the most individualistic country in the world. Although the results of Study 1 similarly did not indicate differences in the value systems of American and English managers, a number of recent studies (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Vandello & Cohen, 1999) have concluded there may be slight underlying differences in the value systems of countries, like the US and the UK, which have previously been described by Hofstede and Schwartz as having similar value patterns. As discussed in Chapter 1, the GLOBE research pointed to underlying differences in England's and America's orientation on the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension, i.e. the extent to which values emphasise behaviours associated with avoiding the uncertainties of daily life. The GLOBE researchers pointed to different historical, political and social conditions that had contributed to the variations in cultural values between the seven English speaking countries, which were once part of the British Empire. The GLOBE project described the US as one of the highest performance-orientated countries in the world, concluding that this performance orientation had translated into a preference for a
decision-making style that emphasised quick, deliverable results. This view was consistent with results of Study 2: the American participants said they were efficient and preferred a task-orientated approach to decision-making. As discussed, the GLOBE researchers also concluded that in terms of the value dimension of assertiveness, the Americans appeared to score among the highest of any country in the world; the researchers concluded that this value orientation has translated into America's 'can-do' attitude with its emphasis on achievement, particularly in terms of material wealth. They also concluded that assertiveness is associated with the Americans' direct style of speech, and optimistic approach to decision-making, which was consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson (2002). However, it should be noted that the mean country scores for the nine cultural dimensions within the Anglo Cluster were not tested for statistical significance, so it is not really certain whether or not these differences can actually predict variations in cross-cultural behaviour in this context.

The idea that deep-rooted historical and political factors can surround the use of a culture's predominant communication style may explain why the US and English managers prefer to use differing approaches to decision-making. The idea that America and England had experienced differing social and political factors, that subsequently influenced communication styles, has had additional support in the social psychology literature (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; McClelland, 1987). For example, McClelland proposed that child-rearing practices would be influenced by social and political factors, which would affect language and personalities. As discussed in Section 3.4.1, he proposed that Great Britain had lower levels of nAchievement than the Americans, because of differing political, economic and social conditions. This, he theorised, had translated into attitudes and beliefs associated with the avoidance of risk in terms of language and communication. This was consistent with the view of social
psychologists and linguists who have agreed that styles of communication and language within cultures are adopted as the result of specific socialisation processes, which take place within the family (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Okabe, 1983; Tannen, 1992).

The results of this study indicated the English preferred a process approach to decision-making. As discussed previously in this section, uncertainty avoidance, as discussed by Ashkanasy et al. (2002), may be at the core of the English preference for a process-orientated approach, i.e. perhaps a process orientation to decision-making may form part of a societal or value structure that is in place to eliminate some of the risks and uncertainties inherent in both society as a whole and in organisational life in particular. By adopting a process approach to decision making, whereby the potential pitfalls of task implementation are thoroughly discussed in advance, the English may be trying to avoid uncertainties associated with too quickly implementing a course of action that may end in disappointment and failure of the task. For example, an American participant commented: “I think that the English want to think everything through...everything is evaluated so that they're not going to make a mistake.” An English participant similarly remarked: “The advantage of the English approach is that the entire case has been discussed beforehand and so there are fewer surprises in the process. Everything is under control and people are less likely to trip over something.”

In this research, all of the participants in the study could be classified as successful by virtue of holding important and pivotal positions in the workplace; undoubtedly all of the managers interviewed have reached a number of personal and organisational goals and aspirations. However, it is suggested the process orientation, preferred by the English managers in this study and described by both the English and American participants, appeared to emphasise norms and values such as group cohesiveness, teamwork and balance, over goals such as task-completion. This was consistent with McClelland (1987)
who proposed that America was characterised by high nAchievement, suggesting Americans would be comfortable with taking risks. This was also consistent with the results of Study 2, which indicated that Americans preferred a task approach to decision-making where task completion was given precedence, over strategies concerned with minimising the risks involved in completing a task too quickly. In contrast, McClelland concluded England was characterised by low nAchievement, which was associated with a tendency to avoid risks. This was consistent with the results of this study suggesting the English preferred to minimise the risk of potential failure of the task by emphasising process concerns.

3.4.6 International Differences in Decision-making

Although the results of this research indicated there were significant differences in the styles of decision-making between American and English managers, few researchers, at least in this context, have focussed on the effect of national culture on decision-making styles, particularly those employing a qualitative approach to that research. With decision-making theory, the emphasis has previously centred on the idea that principles are universal and thus should not show cultural variations (Schramm-Nielsen, 2001). According to Mann et al. (1998), the core issues concerning decision-making are consistent throughout most cultures and focus primarily on issues surrounding the fulfilment of needs, the safety of individuals and the maintenance of values and norms of societies. However, Mann et al. suggested there may be cross-cultural variations in the processes of decision-making, particularly differences related to who is involved in the decision process and the values and norms that are relevant to that process. They have stressed that cultural values do play a very significant role in the decision-making process as they provide the basis for determining whether or not to emphasise the short or long term goals; values also determine whether to employ a high or a low risk strategy, and particularly relevant to this
research, values may determine whether a task or a consensus approach to decision-making is employed.

A number of decision making models have been proposed that assume the decision-making process is universal (Archer, 1980). However the results of Study 2 indicated that there appeared to be cross-cultural differences in the American and English approaches to decision-making. This suggested that the differences may be related to the different emphasis each culture places on different stages of the decision-making process. A model describing how different cultures emphasise various phases of the decision-making cycle could be developed, which incorporates the idea that each cultural group will focus on those facets that will be instrumental to the success of the decision. A review of the literature suggested that decision-making may not follow a completely rational structure whereby individuals are able to analyse and assess every potential outcome (Mann et al., 1998). Instead individuals may employ a heuristic model whereby they use rules to guide their problem-solving behaviours, i.e. they may use past experience as a guide to selecting the correct solution or to assessing the event in terms of how readily the memory of similar events springs to mind. Decision-making is a complex area and will be discussed only briefly here. However, the model proposed in Figure 3.1 assumes that not all individuals will employ every stage of the process when making a decision, emphasising that cross-cultural differences may be inherent in the decision-making process.

3.4.7 Proposed Model of International Decision-Making

The proposed model of international decision-making (see Figure 3.1) was largely based around the nine-stage format proposed by Archer (1980). The proposed model incorporates Archer's representation of the various stages involved in the decision-making process. Archer assumed that decision-making was a universal process, and people were
American Model of Decision-Making

1. Monitor Marketplace
2. Define Problem
3. Specify Risk (High? Low?)
4. Diagnose and Consult (Priority? Yes? No?)
5. Develop Alternatives
6. Develop Criteria and Methods
7. Appraise Alternative Solutions
8. Choose Alternative
9. Implement

English Model of Decision-Making

1. Monitor Marketplace
2. Behavioural Scripts
3. Specify Risk (High? Low?)
4. Diagnose and Consult (Priority? Yes? No?)
5. Develop Alternatives
6. Develop Criteria and Methods
7. Appraise Alternative Solutions
8. Choose Alternative
9. Implement

Highlights denote less emphasis on this phase of decision-making

Figure 3.1.
involved in all stages of his model when making decisions. However, the proposed model assumes that decision-making models are not universally applicable, and people will approach decision-making in different ways. Indeed, this model illustrates that the actual form of the decision-making process will depend on a number of factors. These factors, it is proposed, included the past experiences of the individual making the decision, i.e. has this strategy worked for this person in the past? The strategy employed may also be based on assumptions held by the decision-maker, i.e. is the decision to be made similar to ones the person has dealt with in the past, and will he or she be able to categorise the event within existing cognitive structures?

Particularly relevant to this research, it was proposed that an individual’s value systems may influence how they make decisions. In this instance, the English and Americans may vary in terms of their propensity to reduce the uncertainty in their lives. For example, both the American and English comments in Section 3.2, suggested the English tended to show a greater preference for avoiding uncertainties than their American counterparts, in terms of both their propensity for direct vs. indirect speech and for selecting either a task or a process approach to decision-making. Therefore, as indicated in Figure 3.1, it is proposed that Americans may specify that the risk inherent in a proposed decision outcome to be low and may proceed more quickly to the implementation stage of the process, preferring a task-orientated approach to decision-making. The English, on the other hand, may perceive the risk to be much greater, and thus may involve themselves in more stages of the model, i.e. they may spend more time diagnosing the problem and developing alternative solutions, before actually implementing the decision. This is shown in Figure 3.1.

However, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, there are a number of variables that may influence the interpretation of organisational events and the development of a
behavioural response. These elements include cultural values, as well as experiences, assumptions, and organisational factors. As the shading suggests in Figure 3.1, due to various differences in values, experiences and assumptions, individuals may place a different emphasis on each stage of the decision-making model, indicating that decision-making is not a universal process. Indeed, as the results of Study 2 have indicated, Americans have said they rely more on a task-orientated approach to decision-making, whereby they more quickly diagnosed the problem, assessed a lower risk factor and proceeded directly to the implementation stage of the decision-making process.

The English said they preferred a process approach: they similarly diagnosed the problem, but subsequently assessed a higher risk factor than their American counterparts. As a result, they developed alternative solutions, and assessed these solutions, employing various experiential and value-related factors, before selecting an appropriate decisional outcome. For example, an American participant commented that the Americans typically diagnosed problems as having a low risk factor and quickly proceeded to the implementation stage: “The stereotype is that Americans are quicker to make decisions. If they have to make decisions with less than perfect information, then they are willing to do that and take action.” As suggested by an English participant, the English tended to assess a higher risk associated with task implementation, and subsequently involved themselves to a greater extent in process issues such as careful assessment of possible problems associated with task completion and the development of alternative strategies: “The English want to consider issues more carefully. Generally the English want to debate things a bit more, to make sure there aren’t any wrinkles left to iron out and there aren’t any issues that haven’t been addressed.”
3.4.8 Efficiency

As hypothesised, the results of this study indicated that the Americans have an orientation towards efficiency, i.e. completing the tasks in the most direct and expedient way possible. An American manager’s comment was consistent with the American view that a task approach to management was efficient: “To be efficient and successful in getting the job done, the task should be the number one priority.” As hypothesised, this orientation is reflected in their communication style. While English participants may share this concern for completing work tasks as quickly and expediently as possible, the results indicated that they were far less likely to express these concerns to others. For example, an English manager stated that: “I don’t feel that I focus on efficiency, but that just happens when I focus on the (process).” Americans, however, stated that the English were inherently inefficient and did not share their concern for completing the task in the most expedient way possible. As an American manager explained, “the British leaders sacrifice speed of action to make sure everything is carefully considered. It just makes things move much more slowly.” These results were consistent with previous research (Ashkanasy, 2002) suggesting that American behaviour is associated with efficiency, in terms of language style and approaches to organisational events (See Chapter 1).

3.4.9 Cross-Cultural Adaptation

The results indicated that consistent with predictions, the English reported they have adapted their behaviour as a result of working in the bi-cultural setting. Specifically, they believed this behaviour change was a result of corporate culture, which they believed dictated appropriate styles of communicating (See Section 3.4.10). However, the Americans did not similarly report their own behaviour had changed as a result of working in this bi-cultural context.
Earlier models of cultural adaptation focussed on how people deal with 'culture shock' (Oberg, 1960), while others emphasised the necessity of acquiring a knowledge and skill base that enabled people to manage effectively diverse cross-cultural situations (Guthrie, 1975; Taylor, 1994). Newer models focussed on the cognitive elements of cultural adaptation, whereby the inherent anxiety present in the unfamiliar situation prompted an individual to modify their cognitive schema in which they process information and subsequently develop an effective behavioural response (Anderson, 1994).

Anderson (1994) has pointed to a number of outcomes of the adaptation process. Individuals can end the overseas assignment; they can try and minimise any undue contact with the other culture; they can attempt to do their work, although they may experience degrees of negative emotion and perhaps depression; and they can apply themselves to the task-related elements of the work, while trying to avoid any interactions with cross-cultural colleagues.

According to Bennett (1994), whose comments were discussed earlier in Chapter 1, Americans do not adapt particularly successfully to living in Great Britain. How well did the American and English managers in this study adapt to this bi-cultural situation? The participants did not include those individuals who left their international postings because of their inability to adapt successfully to their cross-cultural surroundings, so it was not possible to actually assess why international management assignments may fail in this context. Indeed, those managers taking part in this study seemed to be working successfully in this bi-cultural setting. The results of this research also indicated that American and English managers appeared to be sensitive to the values and behaviour of other cultural members. Although this study did not measure anxiety and levels of conflict, nevertheless, the results indicated managers still retained some feelings of frustration and anxiety in cross-cultural interactions. Thus, the results indicated that these
managers had not fully mastered the intricacies of the other culture, and were not completely at home living and working within another cultural environment (Anderson, 1994). As discussed, these feelings of stress and anxiety described by the participants may eventually lead to the failure of expatriate assignments, and certainly can lead to cultural disharmony and the ineffectiveness of the organisation (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1998).

As discussed, while the English reported they had adapted their behaviour to conform to corporate culture, the Americans did not report they had adapted their behaviour. Berry (1997) developed a framework for describing and interpreting cultural adaptation. It is suggested that this framework may provide insight into the acculturation strategies adopted by Americans and the English in this study.

In his cultural adaptation framework, Berry (1997) suggested that when people entered a new culture, they used one or a combination of four strategies when acculturating into the new environment: (a) assimilation, i.e. people do not wish to maintain their values; (b) separation, i.e. people hold their values and avoid contact with other groups; (c) integration, i.e. people maintain their own identity, but retain contact with other groups; (d) marginalisation, i.e. there is no interest in having cultural relations with other groups. Berry proposed that the strategy selected will be influenced by the two psychological outcomes that occur early in the acculturation process. These outcomes will subsequently influence the acculturation strategy selected. The remarks made by the Americans and the English managers indicated that each group's psychological outcomes differed, and suggested that Americans and the English subsequently used different acculturation strategies:

1. The remarks made by English managers indicated that they adapted their behaviour to conform to the Americanised corporate culture. This suggested that for the
English, the psychological outcome was a behavioural shift. This occurs when acculturation attempts are seen as non-problematical, and conflict is minimal. This person is then able to shed old behaviours, learn new behaviours and avoid conflict. The general outcome to this scenario is an assimilation strategy, whereby the groups do not retain their own culture.

2. The results of Study 2 suggested cultural misunderstandings are occurring in this context. This was consistent with Bennett (1994) who described how Americans were misunderstanding their English colleagues, which was contributing to the high failure rate of American expatriate assignments to Britain. This evidence suggested that the psychological outcome for the Americans may involve a degree of acculturative stress. With this situation, people may not feel their problems are insurmountable, but they may feel some acculturative stress, i.e. 'culture shock.' After acknowledging their situation, most people are able to assess their options. Subsequently, they may consider an integration strategy, which involves retaining one's own characteristics, while maintaining relationships with the group.

Thus, it is theorised that the Americans and the English may use different acculturation strategies, as defined by Berry (1997). If Americans and the English do use different strategies, this would be consistent with the context of this research setting. Both American and English managers taking part in this study were working in American organisations, with American corporate cultures. It is inevitable the corporate culture will dictate appropriate communication styles (See Chapter 5 for a discussion of corporate culture). Therefore, once the American managers have experienced culture shock, as Berry (1997) suggested, they are likely to assess the situation and discover that there is no need to adapt their behaviour, as it is already consistent with the corporate culture. In contrast, the English assess the situation and may decide to adapt their behaviour to align
with American corporate values. These behaviour changes are undoubtedly reinforced by company review and assessment procedures. For the English, this process is undoubtedly made easier by the fact they have selected themselves into this American style organisation. Thus, it is possible their own values and behaviour are already fairly consistent with the American culture in which they now find themselves working. In a remark that illustrates the need to adapt behaviour to the dominant culture, an English participant, with considerable experience in working with American colleagues, explained that although he preferred an indirect style of speech, he had recognised that to survive and perform effectively within the organisation, he would have to adapt his behaviour to align with the norms and expectations of the organisation:

"... It is like being in a nudist camp – which I haven’t done either. But in a sense when you get to the point that they’re all nude, but you’re not, you are actually more uncomfortable, right? So you are in an environment and told that this is what is expected and ...people complain and you actually get to the evaluation process and they mark you down. And it is easier to give in to it than not, almost. You may have to overcome feelings of uncomfortableness."

Referring to the quote above, it could be theorised that the English managers may believe they will be rejected by the host group if they do not adapt their behaviour, i.e. they may fear a poor performance appraisal. They are therefore motivated to think about their behaviour and develop different, more appropriate behavioural strategies. Hence, as Berry (1997) theorised, they may decide to change behaviour and avoid conflict. As discussed, the negative emotions felt by the Americans may be related to their initial expectation concerning the forthcoming cross-cultural encounter, expectations which did not, in fact, meet the reality of situation (Cushner & Brislin, 1996; Rogers & Ward, 1993). The American expectations of similarity in culture were described by Brown (1994). This suggests that when a person is aware of the codes, values and behaviour of another culture,
they should be less likely to apply their own guidelines when interpreting the behaviour of other cultural members.

According to Mullavey-O’Byrne (1994), the inevitable result of expectations not matching reality will be a strong emotional reaction; frustration was indeed frequently cited as the inevitable result of cross-cultural encounters described in this study. (See Section 3.4.3). What are the implications of these findings? An appropriate level of anxiety can be conducive to effective performance (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). As explained in the English participant’s quote cited earlier, feelings of ‘uncomfortableness’ or anxiety can encourage people to look at their behaviour in the context of an unfamiliar cultural setting and subsequently enable them to adapt their behaviour to conform to the current situation. However, frustration can be an extremely uncomfortable emotion; it can be debilitating and can lead to ineffective behaviour, inhibit successful organisational performance, and lead to aggressive behaviour and conflict. Negative emotions may eventually have devastating effects on the effectiveness of the organisation and the morale and well-being of the employees (Cushner & Brislin, 1996).

Was the frustration felt by both American and English employees debilitating and was it creating friction and conflict in the organisation? The results of this research were inconclusive as to the extent of the adverse emotional reactions within Anglo-American workplaces. As stated previously, the design of this study did not include questions that asked the participants whether or not they had suffered with undue stress. Nor did the structure of the study include interviews with those individuals who had failed at their expatriate assignments. It can be hypothesised that these individuals who leave their overseas workplaces had experienced high levels of anxiety that precluded effective performance within the organisation and eventually led to the failure of the assignment. An area of future research may be to interview those people who have been unsuccessful in
cross-cultural assignments in order to assess as to why and how this was so. Also it may be useful to measure the anxiety levels in organisations. If these are higher than expected, it may be possible to attempt an intervention. Perhaps, it would be feasible to ease the problem of inappropriate expectations by putting forward realistic expectations about the cross-cultural assignment during cross-cultural training sessions. This topic will be addressed in Chapter 6.

3.4.10 Corporate Culture
In Study 1, it was concluded there were no differences in the personal values of American and English managers in this context. However, it has been suggested that in addition to a person's cultural value orientations, there are other variables that may influence styles of speaking or approaches to organisational systems or processes. An aim of this research was to identify these variables, as they may influence style of speaking or approaches to organisational behaviour in this context.

The results of Study 2 indicated that a significant number of English managers believed an individual's behaviour within an organisation is more influenced by the corporate culture of the organisation than by the national orientation of the employee. The American managers did not share this view. This suggested that corporate values, like societal values and expectations, are elements of previous knowledge that are used by people to simplify cognition and process information efficiently. Thus, the corporate culture of an organisation appears to influence people's speech styles and their approaches to organisational events. This was consistent with Cognitive Theory, which predicted that behaviour is influenced by values, as well as a number of other situational variables, which include expectations, experience, learning and cultural adaptation.

Societal culture is associated with ideas, beliefs, values and knowledge that define a particular society, and influence the behaviour of cultural groups (Bales & Cohen, 1979).
Corporate culture is linked to customs, values, knowledge and traditions of work organisations, which influence the behaviour of work groups (Hatch, 1993). According to the classic text on corporate culture, Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life by Deal and Kennedy (1982), developing and realising a strong corporate culture is a powerful method of guiding behaviour within organisations and consists of values, beliefs, myths, heroes and symbols, which are understood by everyone in the organisation, and helped people in organisations to develop appropriate behavioural strategies (See Chapter 5 for definitions of corporate beliefs, heroes, myths and symbols). Schein (1988) further conceptualised the concept of corporate culture and put forward the idea that it is a pattern of assumptions, which helps individuals to cope with their corporate environment. If culture has been successful in shaping behaviour, it is passed down to new members of the organisation. On a more cynical note, some researchers have pointed out that corporate culture can be used as a means of controlling the behaviour of employees, enabling employers to take over the hearts and minds of their employees (Casey, 1995). Ray (1986) suggested that corporate culture was indeed a powerful bureaucratic tool and has taken over from earlier experiences of organisational control that focussed on the direct supervision of subordinates through the development of line systems in manufacturing, for example. According to Ray, the newer type of control, corporate culture, is even more potent than direct supervision because it has not only tried to influence behaviour, but it has also tried to internalise the commitment of employees.

The effectiveness of having a single corporate culture that attempts to influence all individuals in an organisation has been questioned by researchers, because it has been suggested, that by imposing a strong corporate culture, individuals inevitably try to reinterpret the corporate messages in line with their own values and thoughts about their role in the organisation. Thus, the effects of a strong culture, it was theorised, could be just
the opposite of what has been intended (McGovern, Hope-Hailey, & Stiles, 1995).

However, the results of this research have indicated that at least in this instance, English managers have reported that corporate culture has had a significant impact on behaviour in cross-cultural organisations. As an example, the following are representative of the views of English managers concerning the impact of corporate culture on behaviour in the organisation: “Yes, I think that it is...a cultural thing that people here will just be upfront. If I wasn’t dropped into this environment, I just wouldn’t do that (direct speech). But being reprogrammed in the (company name) way, that’s just the way it is. It is a strong culture; if you don’t like it, you leave.” Another English manager commented: “Yes, there is certainly an influence of corporate culture at work and I think it is inevitable...because if you are going to be successful you have to display certain types of behaviours. If these behaviours are unnatural to you, you will find it difficult.”

While a significant number of English managers suggested that corporate culture influences behaviour within the organisation, Americans did not share this view. This discrepancy of views appears to be associated with the fact that these companies, and their senior management are American, except for one organisation that was essentially British in origin (although it has subsequently merged with several high-profile American companies). The norms, values, rituals, symbols and artefacts were American in origin. Consequently, there was no need for Americans to adapt their behaviour, as the corporate culture had already embraced American values. Indeed, most of the English participants reported that the norms and values centred on direct speech and a task-orientated approach to decision-making, which as discussed in this chapter, are related to an American style of communication. They also believed that the reward systems, i.e. performance appraisals, emphasised American values; in other words, “if you don’t like it, you leave.”
Fung (1995) suggested there were three types of strategies that can be employed when managing diverse cross-cultural organisations. One of these strategies is the ethnocentric approach whereby senior managers emphasised the values of the home country, in this case the US. In this situation, the values appeared to centre on efficiency, direct speech and a task-orientation to problem-solving. In the ethnocentric approach, it is assumed that the American way is the best way forward, the most logical, and would therefore be the most effective method to be employed world-wide. According to Koot (1987), until recently, efficiency was one of the core values of the American corporate philosophy; he now believed that Americans had adopted a ‘softer’ approach to management, replacing efficiency with openness, flexibility and decentralisation. However, according to the results of this research, American managers do have an orientation towards efficiency, i.e. completing the tasks in the most direct and expedient way possible; this orientation is reflected in their communication styles, which also emphasised direct speech and openness.

The second management strategy defined by Fung (1995) was the polycentric approach, which centred on the idea that a universal management approach was not possible. Fung’s third management strategy was the geocentric approach, which pointed to the need to have general rules that contribute to corporate efficiency; these rules are then negotiated at the local level and thus reflect local views and values. This topic will be discussed in further detail later in Chapter 5, particularly as related to the ethicality and practicality of adopting an ethnocentric approach to management.

3.4.11 Models of Organisational Behaviour

The results of this research have suggested the model of organisational behaviour depicted in Figure 3.2 may provide insight into behaviour within cross-cultural organisations. The proposed model is based around the various models of organisational
behaviour that emphasised the relationship between cultural orientation and cognition. For example, the model includes elements of Redding's (1986) cognitive model (see Chapter 1), which suggested that because people are inundated with a great deal of information at any given time, they are likely to develop a cognitive structure that helps them to process and organise information efficiently. Noting the importance of analysing organisational behaviour at the individual level, Redding suggested that culturally patterned experiences, which he defined as values, are arguably the most important influences on an individual's cognitive processes. He concluded that the rewards or valued outcomes from behaviour will influence an individual's cognitive and affective processes. Rewards or valued outcomes will inevitably influence how people develop ideas about what is important to them, and these ideas subsequently serve as guidelines for future behaviours. This was consistent with the remarks of English managers in Study 2, which suggested that the organisational reward and appraisal systems reinforced behaviours that were consistent with those prescribed by the corporate culture. This made it more likely these behaviours were repeated in the future. The proposed model also includes elements of Maznevski and Peterson's (1997) proposals that culture can affect whether or not individuals recognise the task implications within an organisational activity, or the process implications of organisational activities.

As discussed in Chapter 1, Miller (1995) suggested that the differences in communication style, i.e. the levels of directness or indirect speech, may not be producing cross-cultural misunderstandings in themselves. It may be that the pragmatic understanding each individual brings to the cross-cultural encounter may affect the expectations and the assumptions about that encounter, i.e. how each individual assesses the purposes of an organisational activity or event. Therefore, even if an individual is aware of style differences in indirect vs. direct speech, for example, he may not be aware
that members of different cultural groups have entirely different expectations or assumptions about cross-cultural encounters or exchanges. These may in turn influence their expectations about culturally appropriate behaviour. Miller concluded that researchers need to look at specific organisational situations to identify the meanings and inferences to which participants are orientating themselves. Shaw (1990) similarly suggested that behaviour in organisations can be explained by a cognitive model that describes how employees process and analyse information about specific interactions with the organisations, i.e. meetings or performance appraisals. Shaw also suggested that there are a number of variables that influence these cognitive processes. These include situational cues in the out-group's behaviour, and the current demands being made on the individual, which determine whether the individual's response is automatic, i.e. unconsciously activated, or controlled, i.e. managed by conscious thought. Also affecting cognition of a specific situation is how motivated employees are to change the existing structure of their scripts and schemas. He has concluded that aspects of national culture as outlined by cross-cultural researchers (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn & Strodbeck, 1961) will inevitably influence cognition, the use of behavioural scripts, and ultimately employee behaviour. Shaw proposed that these effects will be moderated by variables such as the degree of exposure to the other culture, familiarity with the other culture and educational similarity. The proposed model includes elements of Shaw's and Miller's theories.

3.4.12 Proposed Model of Organisational Behaviour

The proposed model (see Figure 3.2) is based on the assumptions that individuals in cross-cultural organisations use cognitive processes to enable them to process and organise the huge amount of information they receive at any given time. The stages of the model, i.e. perception, information processing, outcome, and adaptation, are consistent
with Shaw (1990) and Redding (1986) in suggesting that the cognition of organisational events involves a number of stages. Firstly, the individual has to perceive the stimulus event. Secondly, he or she then processes the information relying on prior knowledge, experiences, beliefs, stereotypes, values and personality; this information is stored in memory and is used to analyse future behavioural stimuli. Although the results of this research did not indicate that the American and English participants differed in their 'own' value systems, other researchers have suggested that a person's cultural orientation will ultimately influence communication style and approaches to corporate systems and processes (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Maznevski & Peterson, 1997). For example, it appeared the propensity for direct vs. indirect speech, a task vs. a process orientation to problem-solving, and a focus on efficiency in problem-solving found in this research may be culturally determined, although the results of this study were inconclusive. However, the results of this research have indicated that cultural values per se are not the only influences on behaviour within Anglo-American organisations. The results suggested that cultural stereotypes also affect a behavioural response, i.e. while processing an organisational event a person may assess the situation by drawing on his stereotypical views of the other cultural member. For example, if an English manager has the stereotypical view that American people are direct, he or she may either adapt his or her behaviour by choosing to speak in a more direct manner. In contrast, the person may proceed in an indirect manner, which may be misinterpreted by American colleagues, who
Figure 3.2
Cognitive Adaptation in Cross-Cultural Organisations. Based on Redding's (1986) and Shaw's (1990) conceptualisation of cognitive adaptation and adapted to reflect the results of this study.
using their own set of guidelines, may be annoyed or frustrated by the lack of perceived efficiency in the indirect approach. Future behavioural responses can be affected in different ways. As a result of the frosty response of the American colleague, the English manager may decide to adapt his behaviour and use a direct approach to speech. Alternatively, an English manager may become frustrated or angry and this can affect the success of future relationships with American colleagues. This can also affect cultural harmony and the effectiveness of the organisation. As discussed in Section 3.4.9, people can experience strong emotional reactions when a cross-interaction does not conform to the expectations of the participants; these emotions can have an impact on the behavioural responses of individuals in cross-cultural organisations.

A review of models of organisational behaviour described in the organisational psychology literature suggested that cognitive models have not addressed directly corporate culture and its impact on organisational behaviour, and this is reflected in the proposed model shown in Figure 3.2. As discussed in Section 3.4.10, the results of Study 2 have indicated that a significant number of English managers believed that an individual's behaviour within an organisation is more influenced by the corporate culture of the organisation than by the national orientation of the employee. However, the American managers did not share this view. It was theorised that this was related to the fact that corporate cultures were grounded in American values. Therefore, there was no reason for Americans to adapt their behaviour.

The results of this research have suggested that for English managers, corporate culture, like values, stereotypes and emotions, can affect the processing of new information, i.e. corporate culture is one of the elements of prior knowledge that are stored in an individual's memory and affect the interpretation and processing of organisational events. Although the English manager cited earlier preferred an indirect style of speech, he
recognised that corporate culture dictated a more direct style. Therefore, he was
“programmed in the (company name) way,” and had adapted a more direct style of speech
that was reinforced by the organisation, perhaps through positive performance appraisals.
This positive reinforcement makes it more likely that this behaviour would be repeated in
future interactions. This is illustrated by the arrows in Figure 3.2, which suggest the
cognitive process is cyclical in nature, with past experiences influencing the processing of
future events.

The results concerning the effect that personality has on organisational behaviour
were inconclusive, and did not indicate whether or not personality will influence
behavioural choices. According to Huczynski and Buchanan (2001, p. 143), personality
refers to “psychological qualities that influence an individual’s characteristic behaviour
pattern, in a distinctive and consistent manner, across different situations and over time.”
Personality traits determine how individuals look at the world, i.e. how people perceive
events and interpret cues in their environments in response to behavioural stimuli before
determining an appropriate response. This is depicted in Figure 3.2, which highlights how
individuals perceive stimuli, process the information using stored knowledge, and develop
an appropriate behavioural strategy. Researchers, e.g. Eysenck & Eysenck (1982), have
suggested that pattern personality traits are universal and have a biological base. While
Kelley (1986) questioned whether there are cultural specific personality traits, Smith and
Bond (1988) suggested that it is more important to learn whether or not the pattern of traits
or components of personality are universal and relate to one another in the same way
across cultures.

The most salient feature of the proposed cognitive model of cultural adaptation,
which was also reflected in Shaw (1990) and Redding (1986), is its cyclical nature. This
implies that after each behavioural response, people will re-evaluate their response
according to its impact within the organisation, and the success or failure of the
behavioural response. The cyclical nature of the model also suggested that each stage of
the model has an impact on the other stages; values and beliefs will affect perception,
processing, cultural adaptation, and the behavioural outcome, for example. A behavioural
response can also be reinforced by other organisational mechanisms such as performance
appraisals. For example, in the quote cited earlier in this document, the manager believed
that if he did not adapt to the particular style of doing things, he "would be out."

3.4.13 Performance Appraisals

There were no significant differences in the type of performance appraisal
preferred by the American and English managers participating in this research project; e.g.
type of performance appraisal referred to a 360 degree performance appraisal whereby
input to a person's performance is obtained from superiors, subordinates and
clients/customers (McKenna, 1994). Management by Objectives (MBO) is a type of
performance appraisal whereby individuals are assessed against objectives, which are
agreed at the beginning of the performance cycle by an employee and his or her manager
(McConkie, 1979). However, during the course of discussing performance appraisals and
decision-making, American and English managers said they preferred to use different
communication styles and approaches in performance appraisals, when making decisions
and performing leadership tasks. These styles appeared to centre on a preference for a
direct style of speech, preferred by the Americans; and an indirect style of speech preferred
by the English managers. The results, which indicated the English appeared to avoid
conflict in their work relationships, also pertained to all areas of organisational life
discussed during the interviews; i.e. the English managers appeared to approach
organisational interactions in a manner that reduced the possibility of conflict and
arguments.
3.4.14 Methodological Considerations

The results indicated that the communication styles of American and English managers working together in cross-cultural organisations: (a) differed; (b) were leading to misunderstandings in the workplace; and (c) thus were reflecting differing norms and value systems inherent in the American and English cultures. However, when discussing, interpreting or explaining the results within a theoretical context, it is important to assess the appropriateness of drawing general conclusions about differences in American and English communication styles using data that was generated using this interview method, or whether there are more plausible alternatives.

There are a number of potential weaknesses in the interview techniques. They relied on a relatively small number of interviews, which were collected by a female, American researcher; no checks were made to assess whether or not factors such as the nationality or gender of the researcher and/or the participants affected the results. The method did not involve any direct observation of work-related talk or action and relied exclusively on self-report measures. The study design, by necessity, involved an accidental or opportunity sampling and there are a number of drawbacks to this design in that it is not known whether or not the managers working together in cross-cultural organisations were typical of the population of American and English employees working together in cross-cultural groups. Further, there was no follow-up survey to: (a) investigate further and in greater depth any issues raised during the first set of interviews; and (b) assess whether or not similar results would be obtained at different times using different groups of participants.

A method which took into account all of these areas of potential weakness was unfeasible as participants had made it clear that they would not consent to direct observation, and would be unavailable for further interview. However, it was felt that the
method selected offered a number of advantages and certainly seemed consistent with the aims of the project.

The method relied on the analysis of qualitative data, for the most part. Asking open-ended, semi-structured questions gave participants the opportunity to volunteer their observations, opinions, attitudes and private interpretations, which it was hoped, would provide insight into these cross-cultural issues. The method relied on a semi-structured interview design focusing on two areas of interaction: performance appraisals, and decision-making. The format of the interviews was quite informal and enabled the researcher to explore various opinions and attitudes. However, in terms of attitudes such as direct and indirect speech, and the values of efficiency, the interviewees volunteered their opinions and were not influenced by the opinions of the researcher.

As is the case with all research, it was acknowledged there will be interviewer effects. In this instance, it was recognised that the gender and nationality of the researcher would affect the results. However, it is suggested these effects may be limited. Both the English and American participants were direct in their remarks and open in their criticisms. Several participants commented that the interviews had offered them the opportunity to organise their thoughts and feelings concerning these issues. In summary, all the participants seemed sincere, and neither the English nor American participants appeared to be evasive, uncomfortable or embarrassed. In fact most of the interviews extended well beyond the proposed 30 minute timeframe, primarily due to the enthusiasm of the participants; this appeared to attest to the success of the interviewing process.

While the method did not involve random sampling, every attempt was made to enhance the probability that any differences or similarities in ways of communicating and the approaches to various organisational systems and processes resulted from national cultural variations and not random variables that may have confounded the results. The
participants were a diverse group having been selected from a mixture of traditional and high-technology organisations. The sample included both middle and senior management; the length of cross-cultural experience varied from less than one year to more than 20 years in an attempt to control for variability in the results that may have resulted from learning and cultural adaptation. The variability also enabled the researcher to assess whether or not cross-cultural experience, age or job level had any effect on behavioural outcomes within the organisations.

It was also recognised that there may be regional differences in the communication styles of both American and English managers. To eliminate inter-British differences, i.e. differences between the English, Welsh, the Scots and the Northern Irish, only English participants were selected. To eliminate regional differences that may exist in the English context, only English participants from the South of England were selected. As Vandello and Cohen (1999) have concluded, there may be regional differences in the values and communication styles of Americans. Therefore, every effort was made to include managers from all over the US, and indeed this was the case. As mentioned, all the participants were by necessity male, which may limit the generalisation of the results outside this research context. Participants varied within groups on a number of characteristics, which were not controlled for in this experimental design, such as personality and factors related to the corporate and professional cultures, although results of this research indicated that these factors do indeed affect behaviour within the organisation.

The sample size may appear to be small, but it was diverse. Further it was of sufficient size to yield significant differences between the two groups. This certainly attested to both the adequacy of the sample size and the validity of the results.
3.4.15 Summary

The results of Study 1 indicated there were no differences in the personal values of American and English managers (See Chapter 2). Therefore, an objective of Study 2 was to identify other variables, which may influence style of speaking or approaches to organisational behaviour in this context. The results of Study 2 suggested that corporate values, like societal values and expectations, are elements of previous knowledge that are used by people to sift, filter, and organise information pertaining to organisational life.

The results suggested that Americans prefer a direct style of speech, which appeared to be associated with values of individualism, assertiveness, and low uncertainty avoidance. The results were inconclusive as the preferred speech style of the English, and the societal values associated with English speech.

Although Study 1 indicated that Americans and the English were characterised by similar values, both the American and English comments suggested the English show a greater preference for avoiding uncertainty than their American counterparts. Suggestions have been made to explain why England and the US, similarly clustered along Hofstede's (1980) and the GLOBE research project's (House et al., 2002) dimensions of cultural variability, should develop quite different styles of decision-making. It was suggested that speech and approaches to organisational events are linked to sociological, political and economic factors involved in the evolution of communication patterns. This implied that even English speaking countries, like the US and the UK, who share similar values and cultural orientations, may develop dissimilar styles of language and approaches to company events. The idea that deep-rooted historical and political factors can surround the use of a culture's predominant style of communication in preference to another has had support in the social psychology literature (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; McClelland, 1987). McClelland reasoned that differences in personalities have evolved because different economic, political or sociological conditions motivate adults to adopt certain
child-rearing techniques. This was consistent with the view of social psychologists and linguists who have agreed that styles of communication and language within cultures are adopted as the result of specific socialisation processes that take place within the family (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Okabe, 1983; Tannen, 1992). There is also evidence suggesting that style of communication is based more on context, time and situation (Norton, 1978), than a person's national cultural orientation. This suggested that even if groups are similar in terms of value dimensions described by Hofstede (1980), Schwartz (1994) and Trompenaars (1993), they can have different approaches to communication based on differences in these three variables.

The results of Study 2 have indicated that, at least in this specific context, Americans working in bi-cultural organisations are misunderstanding the indirect communication style of the English, and are experiencing some feelings of frustration, annoyance or irritation with English speech. The English and Americans also appeared to prefer different styles of decision-making. The Americans preferred a task-orientated approach, which focused on efficient task completion. In contrast, the English preferred a process-related approach where consensus and fair play were important. Although the results suggested that Americans and the English prefer different styles of decision-making, the results were inconclusive as to whether this involved cultural misunderstandings. However, each group made comments denigrating the other culture's style, while 'normalising' their own style. This was consistent with Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978). Closely aligned to the concept of misunderstandings is cultural stereotyping. The results have supported the idea that cultural stereotyping is taking place in this context, with the view that Americans see the English as indirect and inscrutable upheld in this instance. The Americans also believed the English were indirect and
uncomfortable with conflict, while the English said the Americans were not team-orientated.

Models addressing the mechanism by which people perceive and process environmental stimuli, and develop behavioural strategies were also proposed. These models incorporated the ideas that corporate culture and work experience appeared to have an impact on the behaviour of English managers in particular.

The results of Study 2 indicated that misunderstandings and stereotyping have been occurring in this bi-cultural context. Hence, if companies are to avoid unsuccessful international assignments, it is suggested that they should look at all of their systems and processes to ensure that they are compatible with the norms, values, and communication styles of all groups in culturally diverse organisations. Therefore, Chapter 4 will focus on leadership, another area of organisational life where stereotyping and cultural misunderstandings may be occurring. Do the English and the Americans have differing views of leadership styles? Do these styles reflect differences in task vs. a process approach to leadership? Are these differences resulting in miscommunications and organisational conflict?
Chapter 4

Differences and Similarities in American and English Managers' Preferred Styles of Leadership

Summary

This chapter will focus on the differences and similarities in the style of leadership practices between American and English managers working in Anglo-American organisational environments. A questionnaire is used in this research, which asks 18 American and 19 English managers for their views concerning their own style of leadership, their stereotypical views of the other culture's style of leadership, and their ideal style of leadership. As predicted, the results indicate the English have stereotypical views of American behaviour that centre on the American preference for a task and an authoritative approach, while the English style centres on loyalty and employee welfare. The results of this study are discussed in relation to management, cognitive and social psychological theories of leadership.
4.1 Introduction: Study 3

4.1.1 Leadership Theory

The results of Chapter 3 suggested that American and English managers, when interacting in the bi-cultural context, were experiencing negative emotions that were associated with cultural stereotyping and misunderstandings. Cultural misunderstandings and stereotyping can lead to conflict and organisational inefficiency, affecting employee morale and leading to the breakdown of cross-cultural relationships (Smith & Bond, 1993; Triandis, 1994). It has been suggested that companies should look at all their systems and processes to ensure that they are compatible with the norms, values, and communication styles of all groups in culturally diverse organisations (Pfilzer, 1998). Therefore, it was logical to investigate the relationship between an individual’s cultural membership and approach to specific organisational events, focussing on the interaction of American and English managers in the workplace. While Study 2 examined the interaction of American and English managers in two organisational systems, performance appraisals and decision-making, this chapter will focus on leadership practices and attitudes in the bi-cultural context.

Stodghill (1950, p. 3) defined leadership as “the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its effort toward goal setting and goal achievement.” According to Stodghill, any definition of leadership should include three components: (a) leadership is a process designed to shape people's behaviour; (b) leadership is contextual; and (c) and leadership is evaluative, and sets standards for effective goal-setting in leadership. Yuki (1994) described leadership as a process that involved one individual influencing another regarding the attainment of group goals. Another definition, focussing on aspects of organisational leadership, stressed that leaders of companies should be able to influence, motivate, and enable employees to contribute toward organisational
effectiveness and success (House et al., 1994). These influences can centre on motivation, facilitating teamwork and relationships, and organising work activities. Bass (1985) suggested that management and leadership are not the same: management involves functions such as planning, staffing and directing aspects of the role, while leadership is a characteristic that may be displayed in any one of these managerial functions.

Smith, Peterson, Bond, and Misumi (1992) suggested that theorists in the United States were the first to describe and define the dimensions of leadership. These earlier theories centred on a task vs. process dimension, with task defined as an approach centring on getting the job done quickly and efficiently, and process defined as an approach associated with consensus and developing relationships within the group. The second dimension described by the early American theorists was the autocratic vs. the democratic style; and the third dimension centred on differences associated with leaders who initiate structure compared to those leaders who consider foremost the welfare of their employees. Similarly, Mimusi (1985) suggested that effective leaders tended to focus on the attributes of performance and maintenance, which he defined as concepts that appeared to be similar to the dimensions described by Smith et al. and discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

Early research on leadership also focussed on the traits that were associated with effective leadership. Bavelas (1968) suggested that successful leaders were quick to make decisions, were courageous in risk-taking, were intuitive, and were calm under pressure. Stodghill (1974) emphasised that personality traits in themselves did not make a good leader, as by implication, if leaders are to be followed, their personalities and leadership styles need to be compatible with the personalities and goals of their followers. Later leadership research focussed on managerial qualities that were reflected in a combination of personality traits, motives, and cognitive, affective and administrative skills (Bray & Campbell, 1974). Bray and Campbell concluded that effective managers scored high on
oral communications, human relation skills, need for advancement, resistance to stress, and tolerance for uncertainty.

Leadership theory also focused on the effectiveness of different leadership styles in various settings. For example, Lippit and White (1968) tested the effectiveness of Lewin's (1951) styles of leadership in an experiment that took place in a classroom setting; Lewin's styles of leadership included: (a) autocratic, (b) democratic, and (c) laissez-faire. The results indicated that the children responded more favourably to the democratic leader and were more cooperative, and less aggressive. As this type of research has been criticised because it did not take place in organisational settings, later studies focused on autocratic and democratic styles of leadership in organisational settings. These studies concluded that a democratic style of leadership is ideal as it fosters open communication, self direction and consensus (Lowin, 1968). An autocratic style of leadership, focusing on obedience, close supervision and control, may be appropriate in situations where this style appeals to the personalities of some subordinates, and to subordinates who are not highly motivated (Argyris, 1973). Fromm (1942) suggested that the autocratic style may appeal to leaders who need an outlet for frustration and aggression.

Lewin's (1951) ideas, in particular, had considerable influence on leadership theory in the US. Likert (1967), for example, expanded Lewin's leadership framework to include styles such as exploitive authoritative; benevolent authoritative; consultative and participative. These were defined as follows:

1. Exploitive authoritative. Leaders make the decisions and use threats to influence their subordinates.

2. Benevolent authoritative. Leaders use rewards to influence employees, but upward communication is limited and employees are encouraged to be subservient.
3. Consultative. Leaders communicate with employees and reward their behaviour. However, while employees make some decisions, broad policy decisions are made from the top.

4. Participative. Leaders discuss performance issues with the subordinates, with the emphasis on communication and group decision-making.

The participative style of leadership, which focuses on empowering employees and delegating responsibility, has been identified as a particularly important element of effective leadership (McKenna, 1994). However, there have been critics of this style of leadership who suggested that it can ignore organisational structure in favour of group harmony, and overlook the important role that power and bargaining can play (Crozier, 1964; Strauss, 1968). Blake and Mouton (1985) developed a managerial grid where leadership style was considered in terms of two factors that were presented on a two dimensional graph. Productivity, the first factor, indicated the level of concern that a leader had for production and was measured on the 'X axis.' The second factor was the level of concern that a leader had for people and was measured on the 'Y axis.' These two dimensions were similar in concept to the styles of decision-making that were referred to in Chapter 3. Results indicated that American managers preferred a task orientation to decision-making, which was similar to Blake and Mouton's production dimension, while the English managers preferred a process orientation, which was similar to Blake and Mouton's people dimension. However, Blake and Mouton proposed that the '(9, 9)' style, which represented high people and production concerns, was ideal as it equally emphasised both people and task concerns of management and leadership.

4.1.2 Leadership and Culture

While Blake and Mouton (1985) and a number of earlier North American theorists (Bavelas, 1960; Lewin, 1951) suggested that ideal leaders would exhibit the same style of
leadership regardless of specific environmental or cultural circumstances, a review of the
literature suggested there was a difference of opinion concerning the universality of
leadership characteristics in terms of variables such as values, norms, traditions, views of
relationships, hierarchies, and attitudes toward risk (Morrison, 2000). Misumi (1985), for
example, suggested that leadership behaviours were specific to each organisational
environment and that subordinates assessed and subsequently reacted to leadership
behaviours in line with the meanings that individuals placed on that behaviour. These
meanings were shaped in part by societal norms and values.

As suggested by ‘values’ researchers (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994), cultures
are characterised by their own unique set of values, beliefs and attitudes that influence the
behaviour of people within different societies. According to Implicit Leadership Theory
(House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002), these beliefs and assumptions (implicit theories) helped to define the attributes that characterised an effective leader. House et al.
suggested that individuals in different societies varied in terms of leadership beliefs and
attitudes, which would influence how people perceived their leaders, and granted status
and privileges to these leaders. They concluded that ultimately societal cultural values will
affect leadership behaviour patterns and organisational practices in a particular culture.

Research evidence has suggested that there are differences in global vs. domestic
leadership. In this instance, what works in America may not necessarily work in the UK.
However, Smith (1997) concluded that previous values research (Hofstede, 1976;
Trompenaars, 1993), focussing on broad, national cultural values, did not relate
specifically to leadership behaviours. In order to assess global leadership in particular,
Smith surveyed over 3500 middle managers in 35 nations. The survey instrument included
eight work events. For each work event, eight suggestions were provided, outlining
different ways in which the event could be handled. Participants were asked to indicate the
extent to which they would rely on each of the eight methods when solving the eight hypothetical work situations. While Smith found that most managers rely to a great extent on their experience and training, there were differences in the relative emphasis that managers from different cultures placed on the eight suggested methods of handling organisational events. These methods included formal rules, unwritten rules, specialists, colleagues, boss, own experience and wide-spread beliefs. Smith concluded that there are differences in global vs. domestic leadership.

To study whether or not European managers were effectively handling cross-cultural differences, Suutari (1996) asked managers in Germany, Sweden, France and England to describe their working relationships with other cultural groups. The results indicated that English managers were viewed by other cultures as low on task and the interpersonal aspects of leadership behaviour, which was consistent with the results presented in Chapter 3. While the results of GLOBE (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) research (see Chapter 1) centred on values, this research also addressed a number of cross-cultural issues relating to leadership: (a) are leadership characteristics universally accepted and effective across cultures; (b) what are the attributes that characterise effective cross-cultural leadership; and (c) is there a theory that can explain how either culture-specific, or universal leadership characteristics affect differences between leadership behaviours in organisations?

The research hypotheses of the GLOBE project (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) predicted that leadership attributes such as an orientation to achievement and hard work, for instance, would be universally applicable. It was hypothesised that other leader attributes such as leader subtlety and focus on group harmony, may vary cross-culturally. The first objective of the GLOBE project was to measure the participants' values systems in terms of the proposed nine cultural dimensions, and was based on earlier studies such as Hofstede
(1976) and Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961). These nine dimensions were discussed in Chapter 1.

The second objective of the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) was to develop a list of leader behaviours and attributes and to determine which leadership characteristics were universally endorsed and practiced, and which leadership characteristics were culturally determined. This research empirically tested six styles of leadership: (a) charismatic; (b) team orientation; (c) self-protective; (d) participative; (e) humane; and (f) autonomous. The GLOBE study also included questions asking participants to describe organisational practices in terms of 'As Is' (or how practices were at the time) and 'Should Be' (or how practices should be). Countries were subsequently grouped into clusters on the basis of similar scores on the cultural value dimensions. America and England were included in the Anglo Cluster that comprised the seven developed, English speaking countries that were once part of the British Empire. The results indicated that in terms of the 'As Is' and 'Should Be' analyses, the predominately individualistic managers in the Anglo Cluster wished to balance their structures, which facilitated achievement, with structures that were more collectively focussed and allowed for greater teamwork and shared rewards. The results of the GLOBE project suggested there were a number of universal attributes of leadership behaviour that were characteristic of all the clusters. These reflected integrity, i.e. honesty and trustworthiness, and related to encouragement and motivation. House et al. (2002) concluded that societal values have an impact on leadership behaviour. Leadership behaviour also affects organisational practices and culture, while societal culture affects the shared ideas that cultural members have concerning leadership styles and practices.

There were a number of differences in how individuals in the Anglo Cluster viewed leadership. Americans in particular tended to glorify the concept of leadership and
wanted leaders to delegate responsibility and empower their subordinates. As discussed in Chapter 1, Ashkanasy et al. (2002) also found that Americans scored higher on ‘assertiveness’ than the other countries in the Anglo Cluster. The conclusion was reached that these value orientations have translated into America's direct style in terms of speech and leadership approach. The GLOBE research results also indicated that Americans valued material success and achievement more than the English, which they attributed to America's higher score on Performance Orientation. This orientation, they suggested, has translated into America's ‘can-do’ attitude with its emphasis on immediate results (House et al., 2001).

The results also indicated that there were a number of similarities in leadership practices and behaviour in the Anglo-Cluster. Specifically, Ashkanasy et al. (2002) concluded that the Anglo Cluster was characterised by the following:

1. Charismatic Style. This was identified as the most effective style in the Anglo Cluster. The style is associated with vision and future orientation, and a tendency to risk taking. This was associated with low Uncertainty Avoidance which referred to the extent to which societies placed values on norms that reduced uncertainties in their lives.

2. Team-Orientated Style. This was consistent with low Power Distance and low Uncertainty Avoidance, and the approach to leadership is related to shared visions and team structures. Note that power distance referred to the extent to which people shared power.

3. Participative Style. The Globe results (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) suggested that the Anglo Cluster was not associated with a participative style of leadership, which was defined as a non-autocratic style with an emphasis on group cooperation and harmony. The Anglo Cluster was linked with an
individualistic set of values with an emphasis on freedom and independence. Ashkanasy et al. concluded that the leaders in the Anglo Cluster must recognise the need to delegate responsibility and to avoid autocratic approaches.

4. Humane Leadership. The results (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) indicated that the Anglo Cluster scored relatively highly on this dimension, which is associated with team-orientated and humane-orientated values.

4.1.3 Cognitive Models

The GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002), found a number of differences in US and English value orientations, which were related to various sociological, economic and political factors. However, the results of Study 1 indicated that American and English managers share a similar set of values. As discussed in Chapter 2, this similarity in values, suggested by previous research (Hofstede, 1976; Schwartz, 1994), should lead to similar styles of speech and approaches to organisational systems and processes, such as styles of leadership (Maznevski and Peterson, 1997). Shaw (1990) proposed a cognitive categorisation model suggesting that differing concepts of leadership were associated with variations in cross-cultural societal values found in aggregate values studies. This took into account his view that there are cultural variations in the way that people perceive and process organisational information and subsequently develop a behavioural response. His model was discussed in Chapter 1. However, as discussed in Chapter 3, Shaw also proposed a number of other variables that influenced the cognition of leadership events. For example, Shaw concluded that the 'prototype' of a good leader developed from past experiences as well as cultural values and norms. This was consistent with the results of Study 2, which indicated that corporate culture is one of the elements of knowledge that people use to sift, filter, and organise information pertaining to organisational life. The
view that cultural values are only one element of knowledge people use when interpreting leadership events, was consistent with Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars (1996). They similarly suggested that while values as described by Hofstede (1980) and Schwartz (1994) were associated with people's views of good leadership prototypes, how a manager or leader was perceived by his subordinates depended on the subordinate's own past experiences about what constitutes good leadership. In practice, the idea of being labelled a good leader was particularly important because good leaders were regarded as powerful figures and were more likely to be viewed as responsible for positive outcomes in the organisation. If a leader was labelled a 'non-leader,' anything that he or she accomplished may not be recognised or rewarded within the group (Lord, 1985). Leadership theory (Shaw, 1990) suggested that effective leadership required that if leaders and subordinates hold similar concepts of what defines a good prototypical leader, the leader was more likely to influence his or her subordinates.

In cross-cultural contexts, Shaw (1990) concluded that effective leadership required that people hold similar concepts of what defines a good prototypical leader. He also suggested a number of other variables that may influence how a person in cross-cultural settings views an out-group member, which may affect his or her willingness to change their leadership schemas. These variables include how recently and how frequently the schema has been accessed, and how important the schema was to the individual. As suggested by Lord (1985), the cognition of a specific situation may also be influenced by how motivated the employee is to change the existing structure of their schemas. These effects may be moderated by variables such as the degree of exposure to the other culture, familiarity with the other culture and educational similarity.
4.1.4 Cultural Stereotyping

Stereotyping and misunderstandings were discussed in Chapters 1, 2 and 3, where it was concluded that these phenomena can be associated with conflict. Smith and Bond (1998) concluded that while emotions and anxieties are an inevitable consequence of cross-cultural encounters, most people are unprepared for the impact that these emotions have on organisational effectiveness and emotional well-being. Cushner and Brislin (1996) suggested that experience in interacting in cross-cultural situations will enable managers to adapt their behaviour, suggesting that people would then be less likely to experience negative emotions associated with stereotyping and cultural misunderstandings in an organisational setting. Ratiu (1983) concluded, however, that although cultural stereotyping did affect how cultures behaved towards one another, effective managers were able to adapt their behaviour using past experience as a guide. Less effective managers only looked at behaviour that conformed to their stereotypical expectations of other cultures, enabling them to confirm these stereotypes. As Smith (1997) concluded, some managers may deny there are any cultural differences. When confronted with unfamiliar behaviour exhibited by their cross-cultural colleagues, they may judge their cross-cultural colleagues on the basis of stereotypical prejudice, attributing any differences to personal shortcomings and to poor and ineffectual performance. Hanges, Lord, Day, Sipe, Smith, and Brown (1997) concluded that stereotypes affected how people viewed a new leader. If the leader behaved in a way that is inconsistent with stereotypical expectations, people may refuse to follow this leader.

4.1.5 This Leadership Study

As discussed in Chapter 3, American and English managers were experiencing a level of negative emotions that was associated with cultural stereotyping and misunderstandings. Although conflict and anxiety were not measured in this context, cultural misunderstandings and stereotyping can lead to conflict and organisational
inefficiency when different cultural groups interact in the workplace. Misunderstandings and stereotyping can subsequently affect employee morale and lead to the breakdown of cross-cultural relationships (Smith & Bond, 1993; Triandis, 1994). As this research focuses on the interaction of American and English managers in Anglo-American organisations, this leadership study will similarly focus on the similarities and differences in the American and English approaches to leadership.

It is proposed that this study will examine the similarities and differences in the English and American approaches to leadership. Specifically, it is hypothesised that:

1. Cultural stereotyping is taking place in the context of leadership behaviours. English and American managers will describe American leaders as assertive, authoritative, and individualistic. This was consistent with the results of the values study (see Chapter 2), studies such as the GLOBE project (Ashkanasy et al. 2002), and Hofstede's (1976) research, which predicted that Americans were assertive and individualistic.

2. As investigated in the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002), it is predicted that American and English managers will have different views of 'As Is' (or current) leadership behaviours and 'Should Be' (or ideal) leadership behaviours. These idealistic views of behaviours will be related to teamwork, group harmony, and concern for employees.

3. The English and Americans will associate English leadership behaviour with process issues such as group harmony, employee welfare and teamwork. It is also proposed that American and English managers will associate American leadership behaviours with task issues, i.e. efficient and quick job implementation. This was consistent with the results discussed in Chapter 3.
4.2 Method

4.2.1 Participants

The participants in this leadership study were 18 American and 19 English managers, who were working in a number of companies in the South of England and in the United States. These participants also took part in the interview phase of this thesis, as the questions pertaining to leadership were addressed after the participants discussed performance appraisals and decision-making. However, two American and one English participant said they did not have time to complete the leadership questionnaire. (See section 3.3 and Table 4.1).

4.2.2 Design

The study was divided into two parts. The first part was a questionnaire to test for differences and similarities between American and English managers in their own views of leadership; their stereotypical views of the other culture's style of leadership; and their ideal leadership style. The second part was a self-analysis, paper and pencil task in which participants were asked to plot their leadership preferences on a two dimensional grid developed by Blake and Mouton (1985). The grid considered leadership in terms of two separate dimensions: the level of concern that an individual leader had for production and people.

4.2.3 Materials

The leadership questionnaire and the Blake and Mouton (1985) management style grid were printed on two pages of A4 paper (see Appendix C1). Thirty-seven copies of this two-page document were printed on a HP 750c printer, one for each participant. A Sony tape recorder was used to record all of the conversations. For the telephone interviews, a Telephone Recording Plug, which plugged into a
Table 4.1
Age, Job and Company Type and Year of Cross-Cultural Experience of Americans and English Managers Participating in Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Company</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>Consultancy</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th></th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

telephone socket, was used to tape record the conversations. The list of characteristics that were used in the leadership questionnaire was initially compiled from a review of the organisational literature, piloted, and subsequently revised (see Section 3.2.4). The Blake and Mouton (1985) grid was selected because the two dimensions measured on this
instrument were consistent with the conclusions of Dunkerley and Robinson's earlier study (2002), which suggested that the Americans and English managers varied in their preference for a task vs. a process style of leadership and management.

4.2.4 Pilot Study

The leadership questionnaire was tested in a pilot study that included two American and three English managers in order to assess whether the list was comprehensive and if it included items that were relevant in this cross-cultural context. The first two managers in the pilot study made a number of suggestions, which were then implemented in the latter three pilot sessions. A final draft, which was used in the main study, incorporated the changes made by the participants in the pilot study.

4.2.5 Procedure

The procedure for this study is described in more detail in Section 2.2.3. In the case of the eight interviews conducted by telephone, the two leadership instruments were e-mailed to the participants in advance of the interview; and they were told that instructions on completing the instruments would be provided during the course of the interview.

The items were not counterbalanced, as the intention was to include these instruments at the end of the interview session. However, it is recognised this may have contributed to fatigue effects. Before completing the leadership instruments, the researcher discussed with the participants the 15 characteristics included in the leadership questionnaire, and the leadership preferences included in the Blake and Mouton grid (1985). After completing the leadership instruments, the participants were asked to explain why they had selected the five characteristics in each column and why they had selected their particular style of leadership on the Blake and Mouton grid. As was the case with the remarks pertaining to decision-making and performance appraisals, these comments were
tape recorded and notes were made. The remarks were included in the analysis of comments made in the interviews, particularly those remarks that related to task vs. process, direct vs. indirect speech and efficiency.

4.2.6 Data Analyses

The data collected from the leadership questionnaire and the Blake and Mouton (1985) grid were entered into two separate SPSS worksheets. The Chi-Square exact probability test was used to compare American-American, English-American, and English-English responses in the leadership questionnaire.

As the results were measured at the interval level in the Blake and Mouton (1985) grid, t-tests were used to analyse data. The first analysis involved the independent t-test, which was used to compare the responses of the American and English managers, to test whether there were significant differences in the American and English preferences for a task vs. a process orientation to leadership. The paired t-test was used to compare the within group task and process scores of American and English participants to test whether there were significant differences in each group’s preference for either of the two dimensions of leadership preferences.
4.3 Results

4.3.1 Leadership Questionnaire Results

The results indicated that consistent with predictions:

1. Cultural stereotyping was taking place in this Anglo-American context. As predicted, English managers have the stereotypical view that Americans are task-related in their approach to leadership, and prefer a style of leadership that is authoritative (See Table 4.2). (Note: All tests are reported at the two-tailed level of significance).

2. The Americans have different views of their 'As Is' behaviour, compared to their 'Should Be' behaviours. While American managers said that concern for the welfare of employees was an ideal leader characteristic, this ideal did not reflect their own personal style (see Table 4.3). However, contrary to predictions, the English did not have differing views of their 'As Is' vs. ‘Should Be' behaviours, i.e. they said their own and ideal styles of leadership were similarly associated with employee welfare concerns. (See Tables 4.4 and 4.5).

3. The English associate American leadership behaviour with a task-orientated and authoritative approach to leadership (See Table 4.2). The English associate English behaviours with concern for the welfare of employees (See Table 4.5).
Table 4.2
Chi-Square Results. The English Managers’ Stereotypical Views of American Leadership Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers Say:</th>
<th>Chi-Square Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportionately more English than American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans prefer a task-related approach to</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=37) = 7.9, p = .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans have an authoritative style of leadership</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=37) = 8.3, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3
Chi-Square Results. The American View of Their Own Behaviour Compared to ‘Ideal’ Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Americans Say That:</th>
<th>Chi-Square Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While concern for the welfare of employees is an</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=36) = 8.0, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal leadership characteristic, they do not say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this style reflects their own leadership style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4
Chi-Square Results. English and American Views of their "Ideal" Leadership Behaviour

Proportionately more English than American Managers Say:

Concern for the welfare of employees is an ideal leadership characteristic

\[ X^2 (1, N = 37) = 7.3, p < .01 \]

Table 4.5
Chi-Square Results. English Views of their 'Own' Behaviour

Proportionately more English than American Managers Say:

Their own style of leadership centres on loyalty to the group.

\[ X^2 (1, N = 37) = 6.6, p = .01 \]

4.3.2 Leadership Grid Results

As predicted, the results of a paired test indicated that a significant number of Americans (M = 7.85, SD = 1.39) said that they preferred a task rather than a process approach to leadership (t = 2.0, df = 19, p = .05). (All tests are two-tailed). A significant number of English managers (M = 8.0, SD = 1.5) also said that they preferred a task rather than a process approach to leadership (t = 2.4, df = 19, p < .05). The results indicated that Americans and English managers both scored higher on task orientation, indicating that
there were no differences between the two groups in terms of task orientation to leadership 
(t=.4, df = 39, p > .05). The results also indicated that were no differences between the 
groups in terms of a preference for a process approach to leadership (t=.1, df = 39, p > .05).
4.4 Discussion

4.4.1 Cultural Stereotyping

The results of Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 indicated that cultural stereotyping was taking place in Anglo-American organisations. The results of the leadership questionnaire discussed in Study 3 also indicated the English had stereotypical views of Americans, which were associated with a task approach to leadership, and an authoritarian style of leadership. Cultural stereotyping, as discussed in Chapter 1, is associated with generalised beliefs that people have about one another (Smith & Bond, 1998), and involves a number of positive and negative outcomes (Cushner & Brislin, 1996; Macrae et al, 1994). For example, stereotypes can enhance cognition, or they can create conflict between groups.

Was the stereotyping in this situation associated with positive or negative outcomes? Although participants said they had experienced a degree of negative emotion as a result of working in this setting, none of the comments relating to leadership behaviours suggested that leadership stereotypes were creating conflict in this instance. Nevertheless, the results suggested the English associated their leadership style with relationship concerns, while the American style was associated with efficiency and task-completion. These differing approaches may have implications for the efficacy of leaders in this bi-cultural setting. As Shaw (1990) has suggested, effective leadership requires that both groups hold similar concepts about what constitutes good and bad leadership. He emphasised that matching leader and subordinate leadership concepts has implications for the effectiveness of the leader-subordinate relationship. Shaw concluded that if leaders and subordinates shared similar leadership concepts, the leader was in a better position to influence his or her subordinates. Shaw suggested the match between leadership concepts is particularly important in unfamiliar cross-cultural situations, where the cues for appropriate behaviour are more ambiguous.
Shaw (1990) suggested that effective leadership requires that leaders and subordinates share similar concepts of prototypical leadership. The results of Study 3 suggested, however, that American and English managers had differing views concerning effective leadership. As Shaw suggested a match in groups’ leadership views is particularly important in cross-cultural settings, this has implications for the efficacy of American and English leadership behaviours in this bi-cultural context. However, Ratiu (1983) concluded that effective managers were able to change their stereotypical views as a result of experience, and were subsequently able to adapt their behaviour accordingly. Less effective managers only looked at behaviours that conformed to their stereotypical views, thus confirming the stereotype. This was consistent with Smith (1997) who suggested that while some managers may deny that there are any cultural differences at all, others will judge their colleagues on the basis of these stereotypes, which will adversely affect cross-cultural relationships. However, as this study did not measure directly conflict or the effectiveness of leadership practices in this context, it is impossible to say whether American and English managers had adapted their stereotypical views as a result of experience, or whether their behaviour is conforming to stereotypical expectations.

While the results of Study 3 did not indicate whether stereotyping was having adverse effects in this setting, Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) suggested that stereotyping could negatively affect cross-cultural relationships because stereotypes created expectancies that the other cultural member either tries to confirm or deny. As discussed, expectancies are one of the variables that people use when interpreting organisational events. For example, if English managers believed that Americans were authoritative and task-orientated, attributes which were not valued by the team and process-orientated English managers, the English manager may act on this stereotype by judging the performance of the Americans to be poor and substandard. However,
Gudykunst and Toomey concluded that good managers may recognise they have stereotypical knowledge about the Americans and then they may actively try to confirm or deny the accuracy of this stereotypical prejudice. This was consistent with Castelli et al. (2004) who concluded that stereotypical thinking can be moderated by processing goals, prejudicial beliefs, or the complexity of the task. However, the results were inconclusive as to whether the Americans or the English had moderated their stereotypical thinking.

4.4.1.1 Cognitive Theory

A review of the organisational literature pertaining to cognitive models of leadership suggested these models have not addressed the impact of cultural stereotyping on the cognition of leadership behaviours, particularly on the perception of organisational leadership cues and the subsequent development of appropriate behavioural responses.

This research has pointed to a number of ways that cultural stereotypes can influence the cognition of leadership events, including the perception of leadership cues, and the development of cognitive schemas and leadership prototypes. For example, as the English believed the Americans were task-orientated, this stereotype may influence the cognition of the leadership event in several ways. For example, as the results suggested, if an English manager perceives that an American prefers a task approach to leadership, he or she may choose to adopt a more task related approach with the Americans. Alternatively, the English manager may choose to use a more comfortable, process-driven approach to leadership, which may be misinterpreted by American colleagues. The American colleagues may subsequently use their own set of guidelines for appropriate style of leadership, and thus misinterpret the leadership event. This can lead to frustration and anger on both sides. Emotions can create a situation whereby an English manager decides to adopt a more task-orientated approach to leadership. Further, these emotions can lead to disharmony in the organisation and perhaps the failure of the international assignment (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). The results of this study indicated that, while emotions do play
an important role in the cognition of organisational events, there was no evidence of emotional conflict in the context of leadership behaviours.

Shaw (1990) proposed a cognitive model of leadership, which was similar to the decision-making model described Figure 3.2, and illustrates how individuals perceive an organisational event, and process the event using a mixture of prior knowledge and values. He suggested that values associated with societal culture, have a particular influence on the cognition of leadership behaviours. These values are associated with aspects of national culture as defined by Hofstede (1980), Schwartz (1994) and the GLOBE study (Ashkanasy et al., 2002), and can affect how individuals interpret information (see Chapter 1). For example, Shaw's model suggested that values associated with efficiency, which was linked with American behaviour (see Chapters 2 and 3), will inevitably affect leadership behaviour by influencing the development of ‘prototypes’ of good leaders that were associated with efficiency and strong management.

Although some research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) has pointed to differences in values between the US and England, other researchers (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994) have concluded that the US and Great Britain share similar values and should have similar styles of communication (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). The results of the values study (see Chapter 2) suggested that American and English managers have similar values. See Chapters 1 and 2 for a discussion of this topic. The Cognitive Categorisation Model (See Figure 3.2) explains why English and American managers have different approaches to speech and organisational systems and processes, despite their apparent similarity in value systems. As discussed in Chapter 3, the cognitive model indicates that societal values are not the only factors influencing the perception of organisational events and the development of a behavioural response. It is suggested that a person's ‘prototype' of a good leader will also develop from past experiences and a number of other factors. These
include the motivation of the employee to assess the schemas or leader prototypes. The motivation of the individual can also be moderated by variables such as familiarity with the leader, organisational practices, or educational similarity. It is therefore suggested that although the Americans and the English may share a similar set of societal values (see Study 1), they may nevertheless have very different views of good and bad leadership. These views may have developed from their previous experiences. As suggested by Shaw (1990), these stereotypical views can be moderated if the person is motivated to change. This stereotypical thinking may alter as a result of experience or the effect of corporate culture. The impact of corporate culture on behaviour was discussed in Chapter 3, where it was concluded the English were motivated to change communication styles to be consistent with corporate culture. This suggests that although societal values will inevitably influence people's approaches to leadership, experience, motivation and corporate culture may also affect stereotypical thinking about these issues. (See section 4.4.2 for a discussion of the impact of corporate culture on leadership behaviours).

4.4.2 Task vs. Process Approaches to Leadership

Smith, Peterson, Bond, and Misumi (1992) suggested that theorists in the United States were the first to focus on a number of elements of effective leadership, which included the task vs. relationship dimension. This was similar to the task vs. dimension described in Chapter 3. Similarly, Mimusi (1985) suggested that effective leaders tended to focus on the attributes of performance and maintenance. These are concepts that were also similar to the task vs. process dimensions of management styles described in this research. The results of the leadership questionnaire indicated that English managers hold the stereotypical view that Americans prefer a task-related approach to leadership. This was consistent with results discussed in Chapter 3 that similarly suggested that both the Americans and the English believed that the Americans preferred a task approach to
decision making. The Americans believed that efficiency in decision-making depended on adopting a task orientation. The results of the Blake and Mouton (1985) grid indicated, however, that Americans and English managers similarly prefer to use a task, rather than a process approach to leadership. This was inconsistent with the results of Study 2, which suggested the English preferred to use a decision-making style, emphasising process concerns. While it was possible that English managers use a process approach to decision-making and a task approach to leadership, the evidence from Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) and the results of Studies 1 and 2 suggested that English managers' communication styles and approaches to most organisational systems centre on process issues, such as maintaining relationships and gaining consensus. This implied that the task vs. process dimension would be relevant in both decision-making and leadership behaviours. It is true that American and English managers participating in this research shared a number of characteristics: they were successful and held pivotal roles in their organisations. They also share organisational goals associated with completing work tasks quickly and efficiently, although the English seemed less likely to express these efficiency concerns to others. Therefore, it was expected that English managers would say they valued a style of leadership that emphasising task-related goals.

However, while English and American managers share organisational goals associated with efficiency and task completion, the results of this research have suggested that the English and American approaches to task completion varied in terms of style: while both the Americans and the English had the same efficiency goals, the English tended to emphasise people concerns in goal achievement more than their American colleagues. This was consistent with Smith and Peterson's (1995) suggestion that there are differences in the relative emphasis that managers from different cultures placed on methods of handling organisational events. The apparent discrepancy between the English
managers' preferred use of the process style, i.e. their 'Should Be,' style, and their reported use of the task style, i.e. their 'As Is' style, may also be related to the effect that corporate culture has on organisational behaviour. This was discussed in Chapter 3 and Section 4.4.1.1. English managers reported that corporate culture had a greater influence on organisational behaviour than national cultural values. It is suggested that although English managers may believe that people concerns are vital elements in successful and efficient task completion, they may recognise that they are working in American companies with American corporate cultures. If American corporate cultures dictate that a task leadership style is the most appropriate, inevitably the use of the style will be reinforced by organisational systems such as performance appraisals and reviews. As suggested by the following quote from a participant, to be successful in this bi-cultural environment, English managers working in American companies may have to adapt their behaviour to be consistent with the American style of working, even if this means that behaviour may be inconsistent with an individual's own values orientation and preferred behavioural style: "Since I have come to work in (American company), I've had to learn to work outside my comfort zone. I've had a lot of adapting to do."

4.4.3 Cross-Cultural Differences in Leadership Behaviours

Morrison (2000) suggested that there is a difference of opinion concerning the universality of leadership characteristics, i.e. are leadership traits universally accepted or are there cultural variations determined by variables such as values, norms, traditions, views of relationships, hierarchies, and attitudes toward risk. While many studies have addressed these issues, House, Javidan, and Dorfman (1994) concluded that many of studies focussing on the universality of leadership styles have been flawed by methodological problems and inconsistencies. To resolve these methodological concerns and to investigate the relationship between leadership and national cultural values, the
GLOBE project (Hanges et al., 2002; House, et al.) examined the interrelationships between company culture, national culture and organisational leadership. The aims and results of the GLOBE research, particularly in relation to differences and similarities in global value orientations, were discussed in further detail in Chapter 1. The results of the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2001) pertaining to cross-cultural differences in leadership styles suggested that American emphasis on individualism and assertiveness had translated into an American leadership style that focuses on individual achievement. This was also consistent with results of the leadership questionnaires, which indicated the English believed Americans were authoritative and were not team-orientated, preferring a more individualistic management style.

The leadership questionnaire asked participants for their views on their own leadership style compared to their ideal view of leadership behaviours. The GLOBE study, using a similar methodology, asked participants to describe organisational practices in terms of their own style, 'As Is,' compared to how practices 'Should Be' (their ideal style). The GLOBE study found that the 'As Is' leadership styles of the Anglo Cluster reflected the individualistic nature of people in this group. The 'Should Be' styles reflected more collectivistic ideals such as employee empowerment, teamwork and shared rewards. The results of the leadership questionnaire were consistent with the results of the GLOBE study, and indicated that Americans had differing views of ideal vs. 'As Is' behaviours. The results indicated that while Americans believed leaders ideally should show concern for the welfare of employees, they said that their own or 'As Is' style of leadership did not similarly reflect these group concerns. The results here suggested that the English managers did not differ in their reported own and ideal leadership characteristics, which was inconsistent with results of the GLOBE study. This suggests that all of the countries in the Anglo cluster had differing views of their own style of leadership, centring on...
individualistic values, vs. their ideal style of leadership, which centred on collectivistic values. As English managers said their own behavioural style reflected norms and values associated with group concerns, i.e. loyalty to the group, perhaps English managers believed that their own and ideal styles already reflected values associated with maintaining group harmony. The Americans may have recognised that while collectivistic goals were ideal, their individualistic and performance-related values necessitate that task-related goals take precedence over process-related ideals.

4.4.4 Cognitive Leadership Model

Although the concept was not addressed directly in Study 3, corporate culture may also have an impact on the cognition of leadership stimuli in Anglo-American companies. It is suggested that corporate culture, like emotions, cultural stereotyping and cultural values, is one of the important elements of knowledge and experience that affects the processing of company events and the selection of an appropriate behavioural response. The model depicted in Figure 4.1 conceptualises the impact that corporate culture, emotions, and cultural stereotyping have on the processing of leadership events. These are areas that, it appeared, have been ignored in the organisational psychology literature.

Based loosely on Shaw's (1990) original model of Leadership Cognition, it reflects Shaw's view that cognition of an organisational event involves perception of situational cues, matching these cues within existing cognitive structures, and developing a behavioural response, and these factors are incorporated into Figure 4.1. The proposed model, however, differs from Shaw's version as it describes how emotional responses affect the organisation and perception of leadership cues. Figure 4.1 also describes how cultural stereotyping and corporate culture affect the perception and categorisation of stimuli, which shape the schemas, leadership prototypes, behavioural scripts and the eventual behavioural responses.
Figure 4.1
Cognitive Processing of Leadership Events in Cross-Cultural Organisations. Adapted version of Shaw (1990) model to reflect the impact of emotions, cultural stereotyping and corporate culture on cognition.

Note: Those items highlighted in bold indicate stages of cognitive process, which were suggested by the current research study.

4.4.5 Methodological Considerations
There were a few weaknesses in the study design. These were related to the sampling, which was opportunistic and relatively small, which may have affected the generalisability of the results (See Sections 2.4 and 3.4).

The leadership questionnaire developed for use in the leadership research was based on a review of the leadership literature. However, validity and reliability of the
instrument were not tested. Developing a valid and reliable close-ended questionnaire requires that the researcher understands the full range of attitudes and beliefs in the population being investigated (Coolican, 1996). This was not the case in this instance, as the research objective was to identify leadership attitudes and beliefs in this context. Therefore, in order to establish which leadership attitudes and beliefs were relevant in this situation, the questionnaire was tested in a pilot study that included two American and three English managers, and their comments were incorporated in the final version of the questionnaire. Participants were also given the opportunity to volunteer their own views and opinions of leadership qualities and behaviour. While Coolican suggested that closed-ended questioning requires in-depth knowledge of the subject being investigated, the use of a pilot study and an open-ended approach, used in conjunction with the closed-ended questioning format, enabled the researcher to obtain greater access to the full range of leadership attitudes held by the participants in this research.

The Blake and Mouton (1985) management grid was used to assess leadership attitudes in Chapter 4. Its validity and reliability have not been formally tested. However, it was selected for use in this research because it: (a) measures management approaches that were consistent with Dunkerley and Robinson (2002); (b) is used extensively in training situations; and (c) is highly regarded by organisational practitioners as an effective tool for measuring leadership behaviours.

The intention was to include these instruments at the end of the interview, as this followed the logical progression of discussion topics. While there may have been priming or fatigue effects associated with this, the participants in the pilot studies did not report these in the debriefing. The items in the leadership characteristic survey were not counterbalanced. Therefore, this may have affected the results, as people may have selected items on the basis of their order in the list. However, the interviewer discussed the
characteristics with the participants before they completed the task, during the conversation about leadership behaviours. Therefore, each participant had the opportunity to think about each characteristic and its relevance to behaviour, which may have minimised ordering effects.

4.4.6 Summary

Consistent with the results of Study 2, the results of the leadership questionnaire and the Blake and Mouton (1985) leadership grid indicated that cultural stereotyping was occurring in this bi-cultural context. English managers said Americans were task-orientated, and authoritative. Evidence was inconclusive as to whether these stereotypes led to positive outcomes, i.e. enhanced cognition, or negative emotions, i.e. created disharmony and conflict. Although the English believed their leadership style differed from the Americans', the results were inconclusive as to whether the effectiveness of the leader-subordinate relationship was compromised in this situation, as suggested by Shaw (1990). American managers had differing views of their own and ideal styles of leadership, which was consistent with the GLOBE study results (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). However, the English similarly described their own style of leadership and their ideal view of leadership as being associated with group and people concerns. The Americans said that while concern for the welfare of employees was ideal, they did not say that their own style reflected these concerns, i.e. they were not necessarily putting theory into practice.

It is suggested that while English and American approaches to leadership may similarly reflect concerns about goal completion and efficiency, these leadership styles may differ in the emphasis that each group places on people concerns. For example, while English and American managers' leadership behaviours may similarly reflect a concern for efficiency and task completion, the English managers place a greater emphasis on people or group concerns than their American colleagues.
The English managers believed the Americans had an authoritative approach to leadership. As the results of this study suggested, although the English managers’ preferred leadership style was associated with people and group concerns, American and English managers similarly used a task-orientated approach to leadership. Hence, it is suggested that English managers may adapt their behaviour to be consistent with the American culture in which they are working, and the expectations of their American co-workers.

Study 1 indicated that Americans and English have similar cultural values. This was consistent with the results of large, aggregate values studies, e.g. Hofstede (1980). A cognitive model of leadership (see Figure 4.1) illustrates that while cultural values inevitably influence behaviour in cross-cultural work groups, corporate culture, cultural stereotypes, and emotions also have an impact on cognition of leadership events. These are factors, which have not been discussed in the organisational literature. Therefore, it is suggested this cognitive model may explain why American and English approaches to leadership behaviour appeared to differ in this cross-cultural context, despite previous evidence suggesting American and English have similar cultural values.

Consistent with the stated aims of this research (see Chapter 1), there were a number of areas to be considered for additional research. For example, it may have been feasible to test the model of decision-making depicted in Figure 4.2. However, as discussed, the model appeared to confirm Dunkerley and Robinson’s (2002) suggestion that the English and Americans differed in their approaches to decision-making. The results of Study 2 indicated that corporate culture has an impact on organisational behaviour. Thus, corporate culture appeared to be an excellent avenue for following up the results of Study 2, as it was an area that hasn’t been addressed extensively in the context of influencing behaviour in cross-cultural groups. As indicated, corporate culture, like
national culture, values, stereotypes and emotions, appears to be one of the elements of prior knowledge that are stored in a person's memory and affects the processing of organisational events. This suggested that corporate culture influences people's speaking styles and approaches to organisational events. As corporate culture may have an impact on organisational behaviour in this context, it is suggested that a case study is needed that focuses on organisational behaviour in a large, multi-national organisation. This is reported in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5
Corporate Culture: A Case Study of Company X

Summary

The results of Studies 1, 2 and 3 indicated that corporate culture, like national culture and national cultural values, may influence behaviour in organisational settings. Accordingly, a case study, focussing on a large multi-national organisation, should provide insight into the impact of corporate culture on behaviour. The comments made by employees of Company X suggest that Company X has a strong corporate culture. It is also concluded that the corporate culture, with its associated values and beliefs, is consistent throughout Company X's international offices. It is suggested that while people's societal value systems remain static, their work practices align with specific working practices. It is concluded that corporate culture has an impact on individual behaviour within this organisation. The key elements, which are thought to be integral to implementing and maintaining a strong corporate culture, are discussed.
5.1 Background: Study 4

The results of Studies 1, 2 and 3 indicated that when a manager is faced with a range of possible behaviours, the choice of behaviour may be influenced by an individual’s national cultural background. However, the results also indicated that a significant number of English managers believed that an individual’s behaviour within an organisation is more influenced by the corporate culture of the organisation than by the national cultural orientation of the employee. Although it was suggested that corporate culture, like national cultural values, personality, and emotions, may be an element of prior knowledge affecting the perception and processing of organisational events, the influence of corporate culture on the cognitive processing of organisational events appears to have been overlooked in the organisational literature. Hofstede et al. (1990) suggested that much of theory relating to corporate culture has been neglected by empirical research, and that much evidence concerning corporate culture, i.e. corporate cultural values, and corporate practices, has been anecdotal, and was associated with descriptions of corporate jargon, such as ‘heroes’, ‘pep talks,’ and the like. They emphasised there is a lack of knowledge surrounding the relationship between corporate values, national cultural values, and individual behaviour within the organisation. It was also suggested that more research should focus on the relationship between corporate values and organisational processes such as selection, training and appraisal systems.

The objectives of this case study are consistent with Hofstede et al.'s suggestions that more research should focus on corporate culture, particularly on the relationship between corporate culture, national culture and behaviour. Specifically, this case study will investigate the relationship between national cultural values, corporate cultural values and the impact of both on people's behaviour. It will also examine the relationship between corporate culture and various organisational systems, i.e. training, recruitment and
acculturation. This case study will focus on a large international management firm well known for its strong corporate culture.

5.2 Corporate Culture Defined

Culture is associated with ideas, beliefs, values and knowledge that define a particular society and relate to the idea that people are diverse and will therefore develop different understandings of their social and natural environments. Corporate culture is linked to the anthropological concept of culture. However, unlike culture, which refers to the beliefs and values of societies in general, corporate culture is related to customs, values, knowledge and traditions of work organisations (Hatch, 1993). Unlike culture, which has been studied by anthropologists for over a century, corporate culture has been the focus of research for only the last 60 or so years.

According to Pettigrew (1979) and Scholz (1987), corporate culture consists of values and beliefs that are used by group members to help them understand their work environments and develop appropriate patterns of behaviour. Morehead and Griffin (1992) described organisational culture as a set of values that helped people to understand and develop patterns of acceptable behaviour. This suggests that these values are often communicated through stories and other more indirect means. The concept of corporate culture was popularised by management writers, Peters and Waterman (1982), who emphasised the relationship between corporate culture and performance, and identified cultural factors that contributed to cultural excellence. These factors included elements related to managers' involvement in company operations and the decision-making processes, a customer orientated approach to marketing, the development of small work units with less hierarchy in the company structure, and adherence to company values and beliefs.
The ‘7-S Framework,’ proposed by Peters and Waterman (1982), described the elements of organisational success. As depicted in Figure 5.1, all of the seven variables are interdependent with shared values placed in the centre of the framework, which are in effect holding all of the other elements together. According to Peters and Waterman (p. 76), shared values provided employees with behavioural guidelines so, “people way down the line know what they are supposed to do in most situations, because the handful of guiding values is crystal clear.” Peters and Waterman emphasised that organisational success has as much to do with effectively managing people as it does with managing the more formal aspects of strategy and structure.

Peters and Waterman (1982) were later criticised for the lack of scientific rigour used in developing their principles (McKenna, 1994). It was suggested that the sample of companies included in the book were not randomly selected and evidence included in the results was obtained from companies that were not included in the sample described in the book. Other detractors have suggested that many of the companies mentioned in the book were far from excellent performers and a number of them subsequently encountered difficulties (Thompson & McHugh, 1990). Despite the criticism, a review of the organisational literature suggests that, more than 20 years later, Peters and Waterman’s ideas are still being discussed. This suggests that their thoughts about corporate culture, discussed in their book, *In Search of Excellence* (1982), are still relevant in 21st Century workplaces.
Deal and Kennedy (1982) described a strong corporate culture as one where the values are clearly defined, the majority of people share these values and people's behaviour is consistent with, and guided by the company values, suggesting that a strong corporate culture can increase the effectiveness of the organisation. According to Deal and Kennedy, corporate culture consisted of beliefs, myths, heroes and symbols, jargon which employees understood and believed in, and referred to in their everyday working lives. Specifically, they identified a number of elements that were crucial to the make-up of a strong corporate culture: these are summarised in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1

Elements which Define a Strong Corporate Culture (from Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Culture</th>
<th>Elements Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>This is the single most important element influencing a corporate culture, as the business environment determines what a company must do to be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>As the basic concepts and beliefs of a company, values are at the centre of a company culture and define success in organisational terms. According to Deal and Kennedy, all companies with strong corporate cultures had a complex set of values, which employees were expected to embrace and use as a set of guidelines for appropriate and effective behaviour. They suggested that successful companies (a) have a clear and consistent view of how they aim to conduct their business, (b) continually reshape their values, and (c) share and communicate the values with everyone in the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td>In corporate jargon, these are people who personify the culture's values and provide a role model for acceptable and desirable behaviour, thus showing employees 'what you have to do to succeed around here' (Deal &amp; Kennedy, p. 14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rites and Rituals</td>
<td>The day to day work routines, these show employees what is expected of them and provide examples of what the companies stand for. Deal and Kennedy concluded that companies with strong corporate cultures lay out in great detail the routine the company expects its employees to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cultural Network</td>
<td>This is the method by which the values and heroes are communicated throughout the organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Deal and Kennedy (1982), a number of other researchers have identified elements that defined a strong corporate culture, e.g. Eglin and Barber (1981), Ouchi (1981), Tighe (1981), and Trice and Beyer (1984). These elements are summarised in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Practices</td>
<td>These consist of rites and ceremonies, which help employees to identify with the organisation. These include ceremonies such as employee sales awards and rituals which are more informal social occasions (Trice &amp; Beyer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Communications</td>
<td>These consist primarily of stories which emphasise how people in the organisation have adhered to values and subsequently achieved success. Myths, which include accounts of past successes, may be padded by fictional facts and legends, and may be related by older employees (Trice &amp; Beyer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Cultural Forms</td>
<td>These are physical factors that portray the organisation in a distinctive light (Trice &amp; Beyer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Language</td>
<td>For instance, companies like McDonalds refer to their members as crew members (McKenna).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Recruitment and Training</td>
<td>These include special induction courses, which emphasise values and company philosophy (Eglin &amp; Barber; Tighe).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Most companies reinforce and reward appropriate and approved behaviour. The type of reinforcement varies between companies and can include a number of qualitative and quantitative measures (Ouchi).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982) were effective in promoting the concept of corporate culture among companies and researchers, Schein (1985) was influential because he was able to set out a conceptual framework to analyse
and implement corporate cultural strategies within organisations (Hatch, 1993). According to Schein (1985), culture was not defined by the overt behaviour of cultural members, but was instead a pattern of shared, implied basic assumptions, which lie beneath the cultural values and beliefs and have been developed and taught to new members as the correct way to think, act and feel. In Schein's model (1985), corporate culture was described as existing on three levels, which were defined by their accessibility to cultural groups (See Figure 5.2):

1. Surface Manifestation of Culture. These are the most visible aspects of culture and included rituals, language, architecture, ceremonials, courses, heroes, mottoes, myths, slogans, and physical layout and symbols.

2. Values and Beliefs. Located beneath the surface, these support the surface manifestations of culture. According to Schein, values and beliefs are what (a) define and differentiate one firm from another, (b) represent successful solutions to past problems, (c) often represent the view of the founders, and (d) are operationalised into company procedures. Although management may desire all employees to adopt this set of corporate values, Schein believed that it is only necessary for employees to follow the practices suggested by the value systems and display the expected behavioural responses.

3. Schein's third level of culture was described as the key to understanding a culture, and was defined as the basic, but invisible and unconsciously held assumptions that were the actual culture of the organisation. This level included views that employees had about various aspects of the function of organisational life. Schein concluded that a founder's values and beliefs were taught to new members, and if these values and beliefs translated into
successful behaviour and organisational performance, the values were transformed, cognitively, into basic assumptions.
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**Figure 5.2.**

*Three Levels of Culture (Schein, 1985)*

Although Schein's (1985) model is still widely discussed among researchers and practitioners, some have disputed aspects of his proposals. For example, researchers have questioned whether (a) Schein has empirical evidence to support a link between the three levels of his model of organisational culture; (b) if organisational cultures within the same organisation are unitary; or (c) whether there are various levels of subculture within the culture itself (Borum & Pedersen, 1990; Young, 1989). Yet according to Hatch (1993),
Schein's theory continues to have relevance and remains one of the few conceptual models of corporate culture ever offered.

5.3 Socialisation Process

Like many researchers examining issues surrounding corporate culture, Peters and Waterman (1982), Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Schein (1985) have all focussed on the concept of organisational values and beliefs, which were invisible (Schein), provided common direction for all aspects of organisational life (Peters & Waterman), and offered guidelines for the day-to-day behaviour of group members (Deal & Kennedy). Thus, it is inferred that like societal values, as defined by Hofstede (1980) etc., corporate values provide behavioural guidelines for people working in organisations characterised by a strong corporate culture.

In Schein's (1985) view, values originated from the founder of the company or represented successful organisational solutions from the past, while Huczynski and Buchanan (2001) argued that values reflected the values of the current company management, which are then operationalised into company practice and procedure. As suggested by Schein, and Huczynski and Buchanan, employees are only required to follow value-specified practices and are not required to adopt these values as part of their own personal value structure.

As discussed, the strength of a corporate culture depends on the employees' willingness to follow specified work practices. However, the strength of a culture also depends on a number of variables that include (a) the homogeneity of the group, (b) the length of time that people remain in a group, and (c) the intensity of the socialisation process. According to Huczynski and Buchanan (2001), the socialisation process included the following:
1. The selection process that informs new people about the organisation and ensures that employee and organisational values are consistent, thus ensuring homogeneity of the culture and reinforcing the company image with both successful and unsuccessful candidates.

2. The encounter stage whereby new employees interact within the workplace and are able to match their initial expectations and assumptions with the reality of organisational life, and its associated set of values, attitudes and procedures.

3. The metamorphosis stage whereby new employees adjust to new values and attitudes, norms and required behaviours. This stage is supported by a number of organisational initiatives that include performance appraisals and reviews, which reward and reinforce new behaviours, as well as coaching and mentoring systems whereby new employees are matched with an existing member of staff who are able to counsel and guide new recruits as they adjust to new ways of thinking and behaving. If the new employee is unable to adjust, the candidate may leave the organisation.

Performance appraisals and reviews are important elements of the socialisation process of new employees just joining a new company, particularly those companies that have a strong corporate culture (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2001). It is a method of reinforcing the new ways of thinking and behaving that have been adopted by its members, and rewarding those members who have been successful in their adaptation efforts. According to Pascale (1985), the strength of a corporate culture is also associated with the intensity of the organisational socialisation process, which referred to the method by which new employees learn about appropriate ways of thinking and behaving. Trice and Beyer (1984) concluded that the successful socialisation of new employees into the corporate culture required that the company adopt a number of communication and educational
practices designed to teach people how to think and behave in a manner that is consistent with corporate values.

5.4 Organisational Culture and Performance

Deal and Kennedy (1982) suggested that the strength of a corporate culture is associated with the effectiveness of the socialisation process, which influenced the extent to which employees shared values, beliefs and assumptions. A strong corporate culture is a prerequisite to building and maintaining organisational excellence and improved economic performance. The strength of a corporate culture is associated with the degree to which employees share values, beliefs, and assumptions, and the extent to which employees are motivated and committed to these values and assumptions. In effect, Deal and Kennedy argued, a strong culture gives employees a sense of purpose, suggests guidelines for acceptable behaviour, and provides employees with a sense of identity that makes the job ultimately more rewarding and fulfilling.

However, other researchers argued that there is no empirical evidence to suggest a relationship between corporate culture and economic performance (Saffold, 1988), while others have proposed that a strong culture can actually inhibit economic performance by preventing employees from adopting new and innovative ways of working (Hope, 1990). McGovern, Hope-Hailey, and Stiles (1995) have also questioned the effectiveness of a strong culture by suggesting that people will inevitably reinterpret the corporate message in line with their own personal set of values and norms, concluding that the effects of a strong corporate culture may be the opposite of what was intended.

As discussed in Chapter 3, some researchers have suggested that corporate culture has been conceived as a method of controlling the minds of employees. Casey (1995) concluded that corporate culture has taken over from older types of organisational control, such as the development of line systems that allowed direct supervision of employees.
Like its older counterpart, Casey suggested that corporate culture similarly tries to take over the 'hearts and minds' of employees, and argued that the new form of employee control is even more potent than direct supervision because it tries to maintain the commitment and control the behaviour of employees.

5.5 National Culture

A number of researchers have suggested that national culture and societal values can influence the way that organisations operate in international markets and can affect whether or not the organisation's corporate culture is accepted by the host country employees (McKenna, 1994; Ouchi, 1981). As discussed in Chapter 1, the research of Hofstede (1980) and others have found a number of differences in the national value orientations of people worldwide. Grey and Thone (1990) concluded there were a number of differences in the American and European approaches to management that needed to be addressed when organisations decided to operate in an international arena. Commenting on the results of a large international research project that aimed to identify differences in value orientations between American and European businessmen, Grey and Thone concluded the following:

"(Our results) reveal a European corporate culture, which embodies greater vision, responsiveness, innovation, and employee involvement than the North American culture, which stresses individual performance and extrinsic rewards" (p. 27).

Other researchers have pointed out that national societal values may affect whether multi-national companies can successfully establish their company cultures in foreign subsidiaries. Pfilzer (1998) suggested that Americans have been too quick to implement their strong corporate cultures into foreign, host nations, without considering the differences in societal values between the US and other countries, as described by Hofstede.
(1980), Schwartz (1994) and others. Fombrun (1984) found that societal value factors affected the successful implementation of strong corporate cultures, while Laurent (1989) concluded that national cultures were more stable than organisational cultures. Tyson and Jackson (1992) concluded, however, that cross-cultural value studies such as Hofstede (1980) are flawed and the results were simplistic in assuming that values are consistent within national boundaries, suggesting that this type of analysis perpetuated cultural stereotyping.

Norburn, Birley, Dunn, and Payne (1990) studied companies in the US, England, Australia, and New Zealand to determine whether the corporate cultures, and national and corporate values were consistent cross-culturally, and whether the corporate cultures within companies operating in different countries were similarly characterised by elements that constituted marketing effectiveness. These elements of marketing effectiveness included having a definable set of corporate values, being externally focussed and maintaining closeness to customers. The results indicated that there were variations in managerial attitudes, beliefs and values that related to the inevitable effect that national culture has on the patterning of people's behaviour. However, Norburn et al. found that the overall pattern of corporate value and beliefs were consistent throughout the companies in the four nations, and were aligned with similar organisational aspirations including employee development and maintaining closeness with customers.

To study whether or not corporate cultures reflected the nationality of the group members, the industry in which the organisation was categorised, or the type of task undertaken by the work group, Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders (1990) studied a number of organisational work units in 10 organisations in Denmark and the Netherlands. Based on Hofstede's (1980) earlier study of differences in national cultural values, the first phase of the study used the original databank of 116,000 survey questionnaires, which
included questions written after an initial in-depth interviewing process involving employees of a large American multi-national organisation. The results of Hofstede's earlier study on cultural value orientations are discussed in Chapter 1. However, as a re-evaluation of the original data did not reveal any relevant data concerning the company's corporate culture, Hofstede et al. used the original study as a model for the later study, which studied corporate culture in private companies, private service companies and public institutions. The results indicated that employee values tended to vary more on the basis of nationality, age and education than they did according to the corporate culture itself. As values are acquired in early childhood and remain consistent throughout adulthood, it was concluded that people's work behaviour will be a reflection of enduring societal cultural values that are associated with risk, security, success and family life. After assessing the extent to which values are promoted by an organisation's founders and managers, Hofstede et al. found that while leaders may shape corporate cultures, these cultures ultimately affect people through the implementation of specific work practices. Work practices were defined as conventions, habits, and usages and included preferences for problem-solving style, communication climate, and type of organisational structure. Hofstede et al. found considerable differences in work practices for people who held similar societal values systems. The differences in work practices centred on a number of elements, including results vs. process goals and people vs. getting the job done orientations, which were similar in concept to the task vs. process styles of decision-making and leadership discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively. Hofstede et al. concluded that successful companies focused on their employees and were customer driven, which was similar to the ideas proposed by Peters and Waterman (1982) and Deal and Kennedy (1982), and discussed earlier in this chapter. The researchers concluded that corporate culture could be
defined as a perceived set of common organisational practices and included symbols, heroes and rituals that have a specific meaning for the people in that organisation.

5.6 An Introduction to Company X

This case study will focus on Company X, a large, international management consultancy firm, which was founded over 75 years ago in the US. Although the participants in this case study all worked in the London office, Company X has 82 offices in 44 countries and serves a large, prestigious client base. The founders of Company X believed that the new firm would have two objectives: (a) to enable clients to make significant improvements in their performance; and (b) to build a firm that attracted, and developed its workforce. Today, the strong corporate culture, with its associated values, and socialisation practices, is still at the centre of the company's dual mission to both serve clients and create an attractive working environment where talented people would wish to work.

Today, Company X's dual mission to support clients and develop employees is supported by four aspirations or values:

1. Serve clients as primary counsellors on overall performance.
2. Deliver the best of the firm to every client.
3. Create an unrivalled environment for superior talent.
4. Govern through a values-driven partnership.

The managing director described the firm as being driven by a professional approach, which they hope will have an impact on the businesses they advise, while maintaining a commitment to developing a meritocracy or a 'collegial' community, which is dedicated to developing its own staff. The managing director described the firm as a group of leaders, not of followers, emphasising that people are expected to be self-governing and share equally in incentives and evaluation practices. The firm is led by a
partnership group and the managing director stressed that it is not tied by earning pressures, which enabled a longer perspective on expansion and client services. There are seven job levels within Company X, which include: associate, engagement manager, associate principal, partner/principal, director, and senior director. In this case study, people working in Company X are referred to as ‘employees’, although it is corporate policy to refer to employees as ‘Company X-ites.’

Company X has a rigorous assessment procedure that begins with the leader of each project team assessing the performance of members after the completion of a project. More formally, each junior member has a performance review where a partner, called a development leader, talks to all the people who have worked with the associate member for the past six months. The development manager will subsequently summarise the associate's development status, i.e. the things in which the associate will need to improve and aspects in which he or she is working really well. The development manager then provides a synthesis of the information to a group of senior people in the organisation known as ‘cohorts.’ There are four of these ‘cohorts’ in the London office, each with approximately 13 partners with responsibility for six people. The overall recommendations for each associate evolve from this meeting, and although the person being appraised is not present during the proceedings, the development manager summarises the outcome of the discussion to the associate, which has consequences for promotion opportunities and compensation. The recommendation could be that the person is not right for the firm. A variation of this review format is used to evaluate senior people in the firm.

According to company literature, Company X's benchmark is its problem-solving style. The Company X model is broken down into six stages, which include analysing the
problem, gathering and interpreting the data, managing the team, getting the buy in, developing the appropriate leadership capabilities and implementing the solution. (See Chapter 3 for further discussion of problem solving styles).

Company X’s organisational literature describes leadership as being at the core of who they are, portraying the organisation as a partnership guided by values centring on client service, and helping clients and company members to grow professionally. It is not a corporation concerned with commercial and earning pressures. The firm uses a five part leadership model that rates its internal leaders, or consultants, on a scale of five to one, with five being the highest in terms of leadership skills and capabilities. Five indicates a distinctive leader who has the ability to combine judgment creativity and insight into complex problems, while one describes a leader who is marginal and focuses too much on the right answer and not on changing client performance.
5.7 Method

5.7.1 Participants

Interviews were conducted with 13 employees of Company X, using a volunteer sample. The participants included three associates, three managers, one associate principal, one principal, one partner, one director, and three senior directors. Nine of the participants were men, while four were women. Eight of the participants were English, four were American, and one was Mexican. Although the Mexican could be grouped in neither the American or English categories, she was selected to participate in this study because she had worked for many years in the American company and was in a position to provide insight into issues relating to national and corporate culture. Secondly, it should be emphasised that this case study was not a comparison of English vs. American behaviour. Rather the case study was an investigation of the impact of corporate culture on behaviour and organisational systems. Therefore, she appeared to be well placed to offer her opinions in these areas. Four of the participants taking part in the research volunteered a number of comments relating to corporate culture during the interviews that centred on performance appraisals and decision-making, which were discussed in Chapter 3.

5.7.2 Design

The case study used a semi-structured questionnaire, which included a series of one-to-one interviews focusing on corporate culture. The questions were open-ended. A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix D1.

5.7.3 Materials

The list of questions was initially compiled from a review of the organisational literature and appeared relevant to the stated aims of this study, which were to examine the relationship between corporate and national values, and to examine how corporate culture influenced individual behaviour and organisational systems and processes. A Company X
senior director reviewed the draft document, and a number of minor revisions were subsequently incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire.

Nine copies of this document were printed on a HP 750c printer, one for each participant. However, the questioning remained open-ended as the questions were used only by the interviewer as guidelines for discussion. A Sony tape recorder was used to tape record the one-to-one interviews. For telephone interviews, a Telephone Recording Plug, which required a telephone socket, was used to tape record the conversations.

5.7.4 Procedure

Initially, a senior director of Company X was asked whether a case study of Company X would be feasible. After agreeing to take part in the case study, the senior director, with the help of his personal assistant, approached a number of Company X employees, and asked if they would participate in this research. Subsequently, five interviews were arranged to take place in Company X's London offices. Because face-to-face meetings were not always possible, four interviews were conducted by telephone. At the beginning of the interviews, all participants were assured confidentiality, and were told that no company or individual would be mentioned by name. None of the participants expressed any concerns about the conversations being taped. All of the participants appeared to be forthcoming about their views and opinions concerning Company X's corporate culture. The company's corporate values, practices, appraisal systems and socialisation and communication procedures will be discussed in the following sections in the context of the remarks made by the 13 participants in this study. The values and practices will also be discussed in the context of existing corporate culture theory and research.
5.8 Results

5.8.1 Company X’s Espoused Values

As depicted in Figure 5.3, while the participants did not recite the espoused values verbatim, the participants’ versions were consistent with the firm’s stated values as described by the company’s managing director and listed on their internet site. An associate described the values in what he termed his “own words,” which typified the remarks made by the other participants:

“There is a link to the vision and the mission, which is about delivering the best service to clients and about achieving a balance that ensures that you retain people long term.”

Another associate said that she could not remember the exact words of the official version of Company X values, but emphasised that the values were associated with being the best in everything the company did, said and communicated:

“But being the best is making sure that you are bringing others along with you. So there’s a very strong culture of developing people, much stronger than I have seen anywhere else, actually. So that comes out in mentoring and coaching and everything else.”
5.8.2 Leadership and the Selection Process

Company X employees interviewed for this case study were asked for their views of the selection process, specifically about the qualities that the selectors were looking for in prospective employees. Their comments are summarised in Figure 5.4.

Consistent with the type of work undertaken by this organisation, the participants believed that problem-solving skills, leadership capabilities, and intellect were important prerequisites for employment. However, as indicated in Figure 5.4, Company X was looking for people who had a range of abilities including communication and interpersonal skills. A Company X manager explained why people skills were as important as problem-solving capabilities at Company X:

"If you think about consulting, you need a high problem-solving capability. At the end of the day, we need that for the work we do. So it is finding the
balance between people who are good at problem-solving, but are also good at communicating and at client relationships.”

Figure 5.4
Qualities Looked for in the Selection Process and Mentioned by Company X Employees

A Company X partner echoed the idea that Company X was looking for a balance of attributes in new employees:

“I think there is a whole battery of formal things that we look for in new people, but it fundamentally comes down to two things: (a) one is the ability or the intellectual capacity to solve complex problems; and (b) the ability to lead clients and to lead Company X people. But that requires a whole bundle of interpersonal skills.”

A Company X director explained that it was important that new employees shared the corporate values: “I would guess that the selectors were looking for personal
characteristics. I think that this means that people coming into the firm must adhere to our values."

A Company X manager with responsibility for assisting with associate reviews described the personal characteristics that he felt were crucial to success at Company X. However, he concluded many times the selectors were looking for people who may not necessarily have the qualities they were looking for, but were likely to adapt successfully to the norms and culture of the organisation:

"Through its whole recruiting and selecting process, this company is going to sift out people who think in a certain way. Not psychometrics, but even when we are talking to people it comes out. The people who rate individual responsibility are the type that we try to hire. There is the selection effect and then there is the culture effect. If they spend more than a year here, (we are looking for people who can be) baked into that culture."

5.8.3 The Encounter Stage

It is at the encounter stage that the expectations of the new employee are confirmed or otherwise. The participants were asked whether their initial expectations were matched by reality. The remarks are summarised in Figure 5.5.
Figure 5.5
*Were the Expectations of New Employees Met by Reality of Life at Company X?*

Four of the 10 participants who commented on this topic said that their initial expectations were met by the reality of life at Company X, with an associate principal commenting that, “I am getting everything that I want here and in the general terms of what I thought it would be like.” Before joining the firm, a senior director stated that he was impressed by Company X’s professional values, the client lists and the people. He believed that all of these areas lived up his initial expectations:

“I liked the people when I met them, and I thought the client lists were best of all the firms that I looked at. I also liked the professional values which were an important element in my decision to join the firm. So when I joined on the basis of these criteria, all of these things lived up to my expectations.”
5.8.4 The Behavioural Adaptation Process

Participants in this case study were asked to describe how they have adapted their behaviour to conform to Company X's corporate culture. Five of the 13 participants mentioned that they had to adapt to Company X's 'up or out culture,' which referred to the relatively high attrition rate created by the organisation's stringent policy of terminating the employment of people who do not live up to its exacting standards. As a participant observed, “after three attempts (to be promoted to the next level), it is obvious that you aren't going to make it. Then this is very much the 'up or out culture' and you will be asked to leave.” (See Figure 5.6).

For example, a senior director commented that Company X employees were required to adopt a language style centring on the corporate philosophy that deemphasised commercialism in the culture. As a result, employees avoided speaking about billings or selling work; instead referring to 'negotiating engagements.' This senior director concluded that the adaptation process was not always easy and many people were surprised at the extent to which they have to adjust their behavioural approach to be consistent with the Company X corporate culture: “When people join Company X they have to change their behaviours in ways that totally shock them. They have to change their language and I would say that language is really the most visible part of the culture.”

To ensure that new employees conform to the culture and its practices, and to reinforce and reward new behaviours as they are adopted, employees of Company X are frequently assessed, informally by their project managers and formally by a panel comprised of senior people (this will be discussed in further detail in Section 5.8.7). Each new employee is given several opportunities to demonstrate their effectiveness within the organisation, or they will become victims of the 'up or out culture.' A Company X manager described the adaptation process as rigorous and demanding and concluded that
while some people successfully adapted to the culture, others do not make the grade, and after unsatisfactory assessments are asked to leave the firm. He explained:

“There are a lot of reasons why people leave the company. There are fit problems. It could be strictly performance related problems. The whole Company X model is predicted on fresh blood percolating through (the company). People who stall are out. They either leave on their own or they are asked to leave.”
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*Figure 5.6*

_How Company X Employees Adapted to Company's Corporate Culture*
A partner recognised that although he was expected to conform to Company X's work practices, particularly in terms of problem-solving processes, which are strictly dictated by corporate policy, he had not made any fundamental changes to his value systems or his thought processes. He acknowledged that he would not be comfortable working in the Company X way. Nevertheless, he realised that his behaviour had to conform to Company X procedures:

"I have to present things in a particular way, otherwise it raises all kinds of cultural flashing lights that it's not the Company X way of doing things. It took a couple of years to work that out. I have seen other people run into that as a career barrier."

5.8.5 Specific Behaviour Changes

When asked if they had adapted their behaviour to conform to the norms, values and attitudes of Company X, participants indicated that their behaviour had changed in a number of specific areas: (a) client interactions, (b) task vs. a process approach to decision-making, (c) a direct vs. an indirect approach to communication, and (d) leadership style. See Figure 5.7 for a summary of the comments made by the participants concerning the types of behaviours that had adapted as a result of corporate values and culture.
5.8.5.1 Decision-making

The participants were asked whether a task or a process approach most represented the predominate style of decision-making in Company X. In Chapter 3, a task orientation to decision-making was described as a style centring on quick and efficient decisions, and a process approach referred to an approach that focussed on gaining consensus, getting buy-in, and ensuring that all elements involved in the problem had been thoroughly discussed (see Chapter 3).

The Company X model was associated with a process approach to problem-solving, and employees had been encouraged to follow the corporate style. However, the remarks suggested that opinions were divided over whether Company X's decision-making style involved a task vs. a process approach (see Figure 5.8). However, this divergence of views was consistent with the remarks made by a participant cited in Section 5.8.4, who
admitted that while he followed the form of the company's problem-solving style when presenting his conclusions, he nevertheless used his own particular style in developing the issues and solving the problem.

Five participants interpreted the company decision-making style as involving a task approach that centred on the idea that it was important to make quick decisions and get consensus later. A partner stated that a task approach was important in the beginning stages of the problem-solving process: “we need get to the right answer quickly and then work out how we get to the buy-in.” A senior director emphasised that the organisation was very task-orientated, but, “our clients sometimes don't like it because we tend to sort it out, but we leave bruises. Other firms tend to be more process. They facilitate more.”

However, three participants believed that the company was more process driven in its approach to decision-making. While the clients might be more interested in task completion than in the processes such as consensus and buy-in, a manager commented that the company was nevertheless a process-driven organisation: “We are process driven as a company. The managers are encouraged to be process managers.” Another participant believed that the style of decision-making at Company X was a mixture of both task and process approaches:

“There is a real culture around here about having a hypothesis, about having views. So what you are trying to do is solve 80 percent of the problem in half a day. Then you start getting buy-in and getting the relevant facts.”
Figure 5.8  
*Company X's Style of Decision-Making as Described by the 13 Company X Employees*

Consistent with idea that problem-solving and decision-making style was more related to national cultural rather than corporate cultural differences (see Chapter 3), one manager commented that while different partners had different styles, “the British around here are all about relationships. It's all about details. All you have to do is provide a huge quantity of facts and everything else will take care of itself.” An American manager believed that the Americans in the organisation preferred a more task approach:

“In the US (Company X office) it seemed more like a quick and dirty, rough and ready type of decision-making. It's more of a ‘let's try it and fix it if doesn't work’ sort of mentality. In the UK office, there is more of a thing around getting the problem defined, getting some options on it, and looking at different ways of doing things.”
5.8.5.2 Style of Speech

The participants had differing views about the dominant style of speech in Company X (see Chapter 1 for a discussion of style of speech). Four participants indicated that the culture was direct, and that directness was a result of the client orientated corporate philosophy (see Figure 5.9). As a manager explained, values dictated that the communication style at Company X should be direct:

“Our values lead us to telling the clients what we think, regardless of whether it's what they want to hear. It doesn't always make us popular and sometimes we have a reputation for being abrasive.”

The values and norms of the culture had changed their style of speech, according to three participants. One person explained that if the culture didn't dictate that people be direct, he would have a different approach to conversation:

“It is a cultural thing that people will just be upfront. If I wasn't dropped into this environment, then I wouldn't be like that. Directness is really the culture of the company.”

However, a senior partner remarked that while the corporate culture professed to be direct, the culture is really not very confrontational:

“The fact that we are non-confrontational is really a strength and a weakness. It is probably more of a weakness, because we don't confront directly people in the firm. We never get into a shouting match. While the right thing, the values thing, is to talk to people directly, what actually happens is that you just ignore it. We are big conflict avoiders.”
Three of the non-English participants (two were American and one Mexican) indicated that the differences in speech were related more to national, rather than corporate culture. This was consistent with results presented in Chapter 3, which suggested that American managers preferred a direct style of communication, while their English counterparts preferred a more indirect style. An American participant summarised the views of these three participants by suggesting that the differing styles of communication between Americans and English people centred on their approaches to confrontation. As she explained:

"Company X in the UK and the Company X in the US are entirely different in (the way they handle confrontation). People in the UK are much more hesitant and much more cautious about confronting people and providing any sort of feedback."
5.8.5.3 Attitudes to Leadership

The participants were asked whether or not the corporate culture affected the leadership style of the organisation, both internally and externally. Comments made by the participants concerning leadership were varied. However, most centred on the idea that Company X had a team orientated, or a non-hierarchical culture (see Figure 5.10). As a senior director explained, the culture was non-hierarchical and the role of the leader was to develop a supportive and non-directive environment:

"People are given a temporary role to provide leadership to the firm. It's rotational and it's at the gift of your other partners. Your job is to help the partnership succeed. You are not to be seen as pursuing a personal agenda as that would be breaching the values of the firm first, self last."

Two people suggested, however, that more than one style of leadership worked in Company X, with a partner commenting that there were people who lead with individual style: "Quite a few styles work here and people respect that to a degree." Two people believed that the corporate style was individualistic, which was often dictated by purely practical considerations such as time constraints, particularly when more senior members were too busy to provide the necessary input to junior members. An associate observed: "although we are supposed to work in teams, it sometimes feels as though we are individualistic, as though the teams aren't functioning as well as they should. It doesn't feel very 'teamy' to me."
5.8.5.4 Client Interactions

One of the stated aims of Company X's corporate policy is to provide a high level of service to its client base. The objective is to support its stated aspirations, centring on increasing their clients' performance, with a set of core values. The participants were asked whether or not the values, culture and stated aspirations had affected their own style of interacting with clients. A summary of the comments made by the participants are included in Figure 5.11.
As depicted, the eight of the nine people who responded to the question indicated that their behaviour associated with client interactions had adapted as a result of working in the Company X culture. These behaviour changes were associated with the firm's core values and principles, which were described in Section 5.6. As a manager commented, the themes of 'client first' and quality were constants in the firm, pointing out that the company's values also affected the type of client work undertaken:

"I now have the mindset of a service provider, which I didn't have at my last job. My starting point with clients is that they are right. This is associated with the firm's value of always being at the centre of any client's core agenda, which means that we don't take on peripheral work. We don't take on low impact things."
5.8.6 Organisational Support

Company X uses a variety of support mechanisms to assist the acculturation of new employees and a summary of those mechanisms mentioned by the Company X employees is included in Figure 5.12.
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**Figure 5.12**

*Support Mechanisms Mentioned by Company X Participants*

Company X employees indicated there were a number of ways in which values and norms of appropriate behaviour were communicated to them. These included 'town hall' meetings, which a Company X associate described as being: “pretty much value related, so you know where the company is going and how it is going to achieve these things. We also have focus groups, which are more often than not, about cultural things and how you are feeling about lifestyle, for example.”

Eight participants mentioned that Company X held a number of courses to support new and existing employees, which included a two or three week induction course where joiners are taught the basic skills they will need to create charts and reports in the
Company X format. Throughout their careers, employees also attend courses in how to improve their position in the firm, which is underpinned by messages about what the company stands for, the firm's values and what is expected of them as a Company X employee. A senior director commented on the courses offered by Company X:

"The main idea is getting people to understand more about the firm, the firm's socialisation process and just getting them socialised into the firm really. It is about learning the firm's values, although they can't really miss the values as they see them on the wall, on the boards, and most offices have them on the wall by reception."

Role-modelling was also mentioned by five participants as a method whereby the firm's values and procedures were communicated to its new workforce. A senior director commented that role modelling has a formal and an informal element and is very much consistent with firm's mission to develop and encourage people within the organisation:

"The formal aspect is that everyone is assigned a development group leader, who really isn't a mentor per se. There is mentoring, but we don't really formalise this, it just happens. But we do evaluate partners as to the extent to which they help new members to develop and succeed. When a partner is coming up for election, we look at the four or five people who have helped others to become principals because of their mentorship guidance."

Company X uses a form of storytelling to communicate to its employees its values and associated patterns of behaviour. An associate, new to the firm, described the 'town hall meetings' where senior people in the organisation talk to people in the company about values and other aspects of Company X's corporate culture:

"Most of the time, someone very senior talks to us about values. These are things that you are initially sceptical about. They tell you about values, which is a very difficult thing to talk about and it's usually something you have to
have role-modelled. But they do it very well, usually in relation to some work that they have done. They talk very openly, very candidly and I think it is a really good idea.”

5.8.7 Performance Appraisals

Five participants mentioned that performance appraisals had a profound effect on supporting behaviour change, including a senior director who sits on one of the committees that evaluates the principals. He remarked that the performance review process appeared to be a rather indirect approach to appraisals, as the employee was not present during the review process. However, he emphasised that performance appraisals were nevertheless an important method of shaping the company's corporate culture:

“We put more time and effort into evaluating people and partners than any other firm that I know. Lots of us in the organisation are insecure overachievers in that we both crave feedback, but are extremely bad at both giving it and receiving it. That's why we generally don't confront one another but we do it through these depersonalised committees.”

However, many of the review mechanisms are much more informal, and can be more frequent than the six monthly performance reviews. According to an associate, people are told quickly and emphatically when their behaviour is not consistent with company standards:

“When people are doing something that is contrary to the values, they will just be told about it. The real emphasis, though, is on evaluations, particularly on the client side, client relations, behaviour, upholding the values. These things are never in the background.”

An associate principal emphasised that the reinforcement of corporate values was an important objective of the performance and review procedures:
"The integrity of our values is directly linked to how we appraise people. Values are communicated very explicitly and reinforced in very public environments, repeatedly. Much of what we do is continuously driven by many things in different situations, time and time again."

The participants were asked for their views on the performance appraisal and review practices at Company X. Their responses are included in Figure 5.13. Six of the nine participants who gave an opinion said that they felt the review system was inconsistent and the remarks passed on by the development manager from the cohorts to the associate were not clear and very meaningful. A senior director commented on his reviews when he was an associate, admitting that he was confused by the remarks made by his development manager at the time, but was reassured that procedures for review had improved since he was an associate:

"When I was an associate, the feedback I was given wasn't really very clear and I didn't really know what I was being told. However, in the last year, we have insisted on written feedback from the committee, twice a year, which the chairman of the committee would read aloud to make sure it was sufficiently clear and succinct."

A senior director admitted that people were occasionally surprised by the results of their review, but that the ethos of the company was not to argue with the conclusions of the review committees. However, he believed there are fewer surprises in the director group because these evaluations are only done every two years, which limits how far up or down the scale the director can go. He explained:

"You tend to know whether you are going up or down and while there may be arguments about the results, you aren't expected to argue with the evaluation system. While you may know that this is the decision of 30 of my respected
colleagues, you know your own decision may have been quite different. But you know the rules of the people who govern around here and you don't argue with it, and that's the way it is."

Figure 5.13
Participants Views of Company X's Performance Review Procedures

Five of the eight participants who commented on performance appraisals, said that overall the system appeared to be quite transparent and fair to all people appraised by this committee system. A manager commented that his appraisals held few surprises:

"I've never been particularly surprised by my performance appraisals. Usually people are able to evaluate themselves. If they are honest, there's usually not a big surprise."
5.8.8 Culture and Economic Performance

The participants in this case study were asked for their views on the relationship between corporate culture and economic performance at Company X. The comments made during these discussions are summarised in Figure 5.14. Seven of the nine participants who mentioned this topic believed that the Company's values were linked to and enhanced economic performance. An associate principal explained why adhering to the corporate values has resulted in a stronger organisation with hope for a stronger reputation in the future:

"Values definitely enhance long term economic performance. Values also affect the type of work that Company X does and determines the type of work that we refuse to do. While this may involve a lot of short term pain and heart rendering agonising over the decision not (to take on a job), you will end up with a stronger organisation and a stronger reputation in the future."

An associate explained that because values supported the aims and objectives of the company, specifically the desire to serve clients in the best possible way, they inevitably have had an impact on the economic performance of the company:

"I am sure that serving clients is made easier by having these values that we live by. The values are worth a premium in the workplace, I suspect, and I think we are able to trade on it. It is our trademark and our brand name, which is very respectable and professional."
However, one manager believed that the association with the corporate values and economic performance was not strong, suggesting that economic performance is a consequence of the way people in the organisation behave, rather than an objective. He explained:

"We don't even use the words 'economic performance' and we don't have profit and loss statements. But if you mean what we would be without values, I suspect it would be better in the short term. But I don't think that we would exist in five or 10 years without our values."
5.8.9 The Global Organisation

The participants in this case study were asked whether they believed that the Company X corporate culture was consistent in all of the 82 offices in 44 countries around the world. Six of the nine participants commenting on this issue said that the culture was not consistent, and varied according to the national culture, the local firm's clients, the size of the office, and the leaders of the local organisation.

"The culture is 80 percent consistent throughout the world. National characteristics do come through in terms of style and how some people do things. But we have the same values and use the same appraisals and corporate lingo. But the emphasis between values and priorities can vary between offices. There are local nuances."

5.8.10 Negative Aspects of Company X Corporate Culture

While participants in this case study were not asked directly about any negative aspects associated with Company X's corporate culture, 10 of the 13 people interviewed mentioned there were a number of downsides associated with the corporate culture (see Figure 5.15). Six people made comments about the 'up or out culture,' which was described in Section 5.8.4 and related to Company X's policy of dismissing employees, within a relatively short period of time, who do fit into the organisation in terms of values or standard of work. A manager explained that, "the Company X corporate culture is strong and if people don't like it, then they leave." An associate explained that not everyone leaves on their own volition: "There's a high attrition rate. It's 'up or out' alright, and a lot of people are pushed." A manager explained why she believed the 'up or out culture' did not always benefit the organisation:

"You know at the beginning that you will either make it to the next level, or you are out, and that's very tough. I think that 10 percent of the people that we
lose are people we shouldn't be losing. If Company X has a strong reputation about people, and then we start losing these people, then everything is lost."

While aware of the uncertain nature of employment at Company X, participants commented that they understood the risks and were prepared to work within the culture because of the personal benefits the organisation could offer them. As a new associate commented:

"I don't think that everyone who joins the firm wants to be a partner. This is just the best place to learn. A lot of people just want to (take what they have learned) and go off and do their own thing. By definition, everybody is achievement orientated, and they will end up having their own ideas about things anyway."

![Figure 5.15](image)

*Problems with Company Culture*

Figure 5.15

*Problems with Company Culture*

Other comments that related to the downside of the Company X culture were associated with the idea that the company demanded too much of its employees' time. As
an associate remarked, “the hours are long and I miss having control over my days.” This associate also stated that it was frustrating that the behaviour of some people in the firm was not consistent with espoused corporate values: “there is a lot of inconsistency between the values and people's behaviour, which I find very irritating. This undermines the whole thing.”

5.9 Discussion

5.9.1 Corporate Values and Behaviour

An objective of this case study was to examine the relationship between corporate culture and its associated values, and Company X's employee's behaviour and communication styles. Specifically, this study investigated whether corporate values influenced behaviour, e.g. decision, client interaction, or speech styles. For instance, according to company literature, Company X prefers its employees to use a process approach to decision-making, which focuses on problem analysis, data interpretation, consensus gaining, and leadership development. The participants were asked for their interpretation of the predominate style of decision-making within the organisation, i.e. did corporate policy dictate a task or a process approach, and is this style associated with corporate values and procedures? Secondly, they were asked whether the behaviour of Company X employees was consistent with these stated corporate values. The results indicated that, although the Company X decision-making model appeared to centre on a process approach, opinions were divided over whether Company X's style of decision-making reflected a process or a task approach. It was possible that participants may have interpreted the terms task and process, in a different way than presented in Chapter 3. Here, task was defined as a style emphasising task completion and efficiency, and process referred to a style associated with obtaining buy in and ensuring that all elements of the problem had been discussed. It is also possible that people may continue to use their own style, regardless of corporate practice. However, as Company X has been described as the
'up or out culture', it is likely that people who deviate from corporate practice could risk poor performance appraisals or dismissal. However, many comments were consistent with the remarks made by a participant cited in Section 5.8.4, who admitted that while he followed the form of the company's decision-making model when presenting his conclusions, he still used his own, task-related approach in developing issues and solving problems. Thus, although he preferred to use his own task-related style, he had aligned his behaviour with corporate practices. He subsequently was rewarded by positive performance reviews, which made it more likely these behaviours would be repeated in the future. Although Maznevski & Peterson (1997) suggested styles of decision-making often reflect people's societal value systems, Schein (1985) and Huczynski and Buchanan (2001) concluded that corporate culture may change behaviour, even when the new behaviour appears to be inconsistent with the person's fundamental societal value system. This suggested that people may change their outward behaviour, but they may not change their personal set of societal values and beliefs. The remarks made by Company X employees were also in line with Hofstede et al. (1990) who suggested that corporate culture shapes behaviour by influencing people's styles of working, or work practices, while people's fundamental societal values remained constant over time. Hofstede et al. concluded that work practices centred on a number of elements, which included results vs. process goals and people vs. getting the job done orientations. These were similar in concept to the task vs. process styles of decision-making and leadership, which were discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively. Here it was concluded that English managers had changed their process and people related decision-making styles to be consistent with a more task-orientated corporate approach.

The view that Company X employees had adapted their behaviour to align with corporate values and practices was also consistent with the prediction that corporate culture
and corporate values, like national cultural values, personality, emotions and stereotyping, may be important elements people have stored in their memories and use to analyse organisational stimuli, and develop appropriate behavioural responses (see Chapters 3 and 4). Consistent with this view, the remarks made by participants in the case study also indicated that because the company's corporate values dictated approaches to organisational events, Company X employees had adapted behaviour in:

1. Speech. The remarks suggested the company style appeared to be associated with direct speech. However, some participants remarked that while they had changed to a direct style, they nevertheless preferred a more indirect style.

2. Client interactions. Values dictated that the focus should be on service and honesty.

3. Leadership. Most comments centred on the view that the company was non-directive, supportive and non-hierarchical, which influenced the style of leadership within the organisation.

5.9.2 Corporate Values and Company Events

Hofstede et al. (1990) concluded that more research should focus on the relationship between corporate values and organisational systems and processes. Consistent with this view, the participants were asked for their opinions concerning a number of issues relating to corporate culture, its associated values and their impact on the organisation. Specifically, the participants were asked if they believed the corporate culture influenced behaviour and the structure of organisational processes, which was discussed in Section 5.9.1. They were also asked to: (a) to describe how they were socialised into the corporate culture; (b) if they were supported in their behaviour and values changes; (c) how they were reinforced and rewarded for behaviour change; and (d) if culture affected performance of the company.
The comments suggested a strong relationship between corporate culture and company processes and structures. This was consistent with Deal and Kennedy's (1982) definition, and supported the view that Company X had a strong corporate culture. As Deal and Kennedy suggested, in successful cultures, people behaved in a manner that was consistent with corporate values. The remarks made by participants suggested that, for the most part, behaviour was in line with corporate values, also supporting Deal and Kennedy's definition. It also appeared that employees had successfully translated values into behaviours, through extensive socialisation procedures. This was also consistent with Deal and Kennedy's suggestions for maintaining a successful culture. The remarks indicated that the organisation was successful in subsequently reinforcing new behaviours with appraisals and reviews. This suggested that participants believed the firm's appraisal process was integral in reinforcing new ways of thinking and behaving that have been adopted by its employees. This was consistent with Huczynski and Buchanan's (2001) view that in successful corporate cultures, employee reviews were essential elements in the socialisation process.

The concept of organisational culture has been popularised by a number of writers and researchers who have suggested there is a link between excellent economic performance and a strong corporate culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982). However, critics suggested that there is no empirical evidence to imply a relationship between corporate culture and performance (Saffold, 1988), while others suggested that a strong culture can actually restrain performance by inhibiting innovation and the development of new working practices (Hope, 1990). Deal and Kennedy (1982) concluded that corporate values supported organisational excellence by suggesting workable management practices, and provided a framework where employees were supported and could develop and prosper. Company X employees' comments were
consistent with the official version of the firm's espoused values, and supported the view that values were instrumental to the organisation's success, in terms of serving clients and in developing its workforce. The view that economic performance and employee development were associated with a strong corporate culture was contrary to critics' views of corporate culture, which suggested that the link between performance and corporate was weak (Saffold) and that corporate culture could inhibit performance (Hope).

5.9.3 The Global Organisation

A number of researchers have investigated the relationship between national and corporate culture. Much of this research has focused on whether or not multi-national organisations could successfully transplant a corporate culture, with its associated values, practices, rituals and language, into an international setting (Grey & Thone, 1990; Hofstede et al., 1990; Norburn et al, 1990). This type of research centred on the question of whether national values held by host country employees would inhibit the implementation of a corporate culture, which was foreign in origin and involved values and practices that were dissimilar to societal values. (A discussion of national value orientations is included in Chapter 1). Although some research found differences in the approaches of European and American managers (Grey & Thone), other research (Hofstede, et al; Norburn, et al.) found that while societal values varied cross-nationally, the pattern of corporate cultures, values, and beliefs were similar in different international settings.

The comments made during the interviews suggested that Company X's corporate culture was similar across its 82 offices in 44 countries, with differences centring on dissimilarities in working practices, such as working hours, the client base, and office size. This was consistent with Norburn et al. (1990), who concluded that despite obvious differences in national cultural values in the various countries in which multi-national organisations operate, the pattern of corporate values and beliefs appeared to be consistent.
across national boundaries. Company X's mission to serve clients and develop its workforce was also consistent with the belief that serving clients and employee development were aspirations that identified successful corporate cultures, which was also in line with Norburn et al.

5.10 Summary

Norburn et al. (1990) suggested that the similarity of corporate values in companies operating in countries that supposedly had different sets of national cultural values was evidence for the support of convergence theory. This referred to the idea that as scientific discoveries and industrial technology are diffused throughout the world, all countries will become more similar in terms of value systems, making studies in cross-cultural differences an “archaeological curiosity” (Smith & Bond, 1998, p. 310). While the convergent theory perspective may be relevant in a discussion of corporate values, Norburn et al. concluded there were a number of variations in managerial attitudes, beliefs, and values that were related to the effect that societal values have on the patterning of people's behaviour. Hofstede et al. (1990), however, suggested that corporate culture was characterised by work practices that were taught to new members, varied over time and in different circumstances, and were similarly held by people who had different sets of societal values. In contrast, societal values were acquired during childhood and remained stable throughout adulthood.

The discussion of Company X's policies and practices presents a complex picture of the variables that make up a successful corporate culture. Based on the ideals of its founders, the company has set out a dual mission to serve its clients and develop in-house talent, which is based on the core set of values that are actively taught and reinforced to its members. The financial success of the company and its excellent reputation attest to the success of the culture and the implementation of its values. However, several questions
need to be addressed in discussions of Company X's corporate culture. Is Company X's corporate culture a new form of organisational control that aims to take over the 'hearts and minds' of its employees, as critics of the concept have suggested (Casey, 1995)? Do people change their value structures and beliefs to conform to the culture? Or do people merely change their behaviour patterns or work practices to avoid being victims of the 'up or out culture'? Is it ethical, or even practical to have in place an 'up or out' culture, a culture in which many employees leave the firm within a very short period of time?

The answers to the questions are not obvious. The remarks made by Company X employees suggested they were comfortable working within this corporate environment. This did not suggest that they were being controlled by the organisation, as suggested by critics of corporate culture. However, it may be those interviewed had a unique set of characteristics that made them successful in this competitive, somewhat ruthless, environment. Therefore, a study of people who have not been successful working in the culture, and who may not have the characteristics that facilitate acculturation into this environment, might provide greater insight into issues relating to the effectiveness and desirability of a strong corporate culture.

5.10.1 Conclusions

The comments of the interviewees suggested they had made fundamental changes in their patterns of behaviour in order to conform to corporate culture. Is it true, as Norburn (1990) and Hofstede et al. (1990) have suggested, that multi-national companies have been successful in transferring their American style organisational culture into foreign settings, even though the host countries' cultures may be characterised by national values, norms and attitudes inconsistent with the corporate values of the parent company? If Company X's experiences are typical of other American multi-national companies, the answer would have to be yes. However, the remarks made by the interviewees suggest there are a number of issues, which organisations planning a corporate culture in the style
of Company X may need to address. Firstly, the remarks have shown that corporate values, aims and associated company practices need to be carefully considered in the context of selection, socialisation, and reinforcement procedures.

Secondly, the comments have suggested there are a number of negative aspects of Company X's corporate culture. For example, the remarks indicated the culture "was up or out, alright, and a lot of people are pushed." Thus, the culture could be described as somewhat ruthless, particularly by those people who have been "pushed." As one Company X employee argued, employees are the company's biggest asset, and they need to be nurtured if the company is to remain competitive: "I think that 10 percent of the people we are losing, we shouldn't be losing. If we start losing good people, then everything is lost." Thus, perhaps companies considering the implementation of a strong culture may not want to implement a policy of dismissing people simply because they do not fit the company 'mould.' This policy may be detrimental to the company's performance and contrary to the best interests of employees.

Thirdly, the case study found that Company X appeared to be successful in translating a strong Americanised culture into a huge, global organisation, operating in 44 countries. Hofstede et al. (1990) similarly concluded that companies are able to export company practices into host societies who do not share the multi-nationals' values, beliefs and attitudes. However, Pfilzer (1986) observed that American companies have been hasty in trying to export their American based values and practices into other cultures, and have not considered how this may affect people who do not share the same societal values as their American corporate parents. Thus, companies wishing to develop a corporate culture and export it, in its entirety, to other societies, may need to consider that host societies may not accept the new work practices imposed by their American managers. These multinational companies may, instead, want to consider negotiating work practices at the
local level, to ensure that work practices reflect local values, beliefs and attitudes. This may increase work satisfaction, cultural harmony, and ultimately the economic performance of the company.
Chapter 6:  
Conclusions

Summary

The results of this research indicate that while American and English personal values are similar, there is evidence pointing to stereotyping and misunderstandings in this setting. The results also suggest differences in the American and English styles of decision-making. While there may be underlying differences in American and English societal values, these were not measured using this methodology. Like societal values, it is concluded that corporate culture may be another element influencing the perception and interpretation of organisational events, e.g. decision making, and language usage. This also provides insight into the way people process organisational events. It is proposed that studies of cross-cultural differences are important, as they provide information needed for successful adaptation into new cultures.
6.1 Conclusions

6.1.1 Measuring Similarities and Differences in Values

It was proposed that this study addressed a number of issues relating to the interaction of Americans and English at work. Previous research (Dunkerley & Robinson, 2002) has suggested these groups may differ in terms of their societal value preferences. These value differences may be associated with different styles of communication and approaches to organisational systems, i.e. performance appraisals, decision-making, and leadership. Consistent with the view that values are associated with behaviour, the first aim of this study was to examine the similarities and differences in American and English personal values. The results of Study 1 suggested that contrary to predictions, the American and English managers appeared to have similar value preferences as measured by Bales' (1980) revised SYMLOG instrument. These results suggested that both groups believed their own style of behaviour was associated with: (a) efficiency; (b) hard work; (c) rugged individualism; and (c) material success. The results suggesting that American and English value systems were similar was consistent with previous large group, values studies such as Hofstede (1980), Schwartz (1994), and Trompenaars (1993). However, these findings did not support the previous assumption that stereotyping and misunderstandings in this bi-cultural context were related to the fact that Americans and the English had different value systems, which had contributed to different styles of language (Hall, 1976; Johnson & Johnson, 1975).

However, the two groups believed there were differences in American and English values. Therefore, it may be the case there are actually underlying value differences, which were not measured successfully in this research context. For example, a number of researchers have used innovative methodologies to measure subtle differences between groups previously described as culturally similar. They have concluded these differences
may be related to various societal, political and economic factors (McClelland, 1987; Vandello & Cohen, 1999). For example, Vandello and Cohen found underlying regional differences in American preferences for individualistic vs. collectivistic values, using a methodology that was sociological in origin and compared a collectivism index with census and historical data. This suggested there may be underlying differences in value patterns within societal groups, and between national cultural groups that have been previously described as being similar in terms of value preferences. As discussed in Chapter 1, societal values influence socialisation practices in the home, where children learn how to behave and speak in ways that are consistent with norms, and values of a particular society (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Tannen, 1992). This would seem to suggest that underlying differences in value preferences may account for the differences in the respective styles of communication. These differences were remarked upon anecdotally and suggested by Dunkerley and Robinson (2002). However, as the current research did not indicate the two groups had different personal value systems, it was suggested that future research should focus on other variables that may influence approaches to communication in this bi-cultural context.

6.1.2 Stereotyping and Misunderstandings

This study aimed to examine the level of stereotyping and misunderstandings in this workplace. The results supported anecdotal (Brown, 1994) and research evidence (Dunkerley & Robinson, 2002), and indicated that each group has stereotypical views of each other's culture. These centred on the view that Americans in general were assertive, efficient, and individualistic. This supported research findings suggesting that Americans were characterised by these three values (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars, 1993). The view that stereotyping is occurring in this context was supported in several situations: (a) the Americans had views of their behaviour and American
behaviour in general, which were associated with efficiency and individualism; (b) the Americans believed the English were inefficient and were uncomfortable with direct speech and confrontation; (c) the English believed the American leadership style was task orientated, and authoritative; and (d) the English had stereotypical views of their own behaviour, compared to the behaviour of the English in general, i.e. they believed they were more efficient and less materialistic than the English in general.

Stereotyping was considered in the context of social psychological theory, and it was concluded that stereotyping has a number of positive and negative outcomes, which related to simplifying cognition, and increasing conflict, respectively. It was concluded that as conflict and anxiety were not measured directly in this study, it was difficult to determine whether or not there were positive or negative outcomes to stereotyping in this setting. However, the remarks made by the participants in Chapter 3 suggested the Americans appeared to be denigrating the out-group, i.e. they said the English indirect style of language was inefficient, while normalising the in-group, i.e. the American style of direct speech was better. It was concluded that this is consistent with Tajfel’s (1978) Social Identify Theory, which suggested that social biases are often associated with placing a positive view of in-group behaviour and a negative view of the out-group.

Chapter 3 also described misunderstandings that were occurring in this context. Americans appeared to be using their own set of guidelines, associated with efficiency and assertiveness, when describing the indirect style of speech favoured by the English. They admitted to feelings of frustration, which were also associated with cultural misunderstandings (Smith & Bond, 1993). Although these misunderstandings have been remarked upon anecdotally by Brown (1994), this study provided evidence they were occurring in the Anglo-American context.
Cultural misunderstandings are associated with groups that differ in terms of their value systems, and consequently have different approaches to language. Indeed, there is evidence suggesting that Americans do use a direct style of speech. Johnson and Johnson (1975) suggested the American direct style of speech reflects values associated with self-worth, assertiveness, achievement and honesty. It was concluded that these theories pointing to the antecedents to American speech were similar to those proposed by the GLOBE research (Ashkanasy et al., 2002) and suggested the American style of language was associated with assertiveness and individualism. This research has similarly indicated that American behaviour is associated with individualism and assertiveness (see Chapter 2). Others have pointed to geographical and social conditions which have favoured the use of direct speech in the US (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Trompenaars, 1993), and it was concluded this was also consistent with the results of this study.

The results, however, were inconclusive as to the style of speech preferred by the English, and the values that underpin this style. While Dunkerley and Robinson (2002) found the English said they preferred an indirect style of speech, they used a methodology that involved directly asking the English for their views on this subject. The current study did not ask either group for their views of speech style, and some participants did not volunteer opinions on this topic. The results suggested the Americans were more forthcoming about their views of language styles than the English. Perhaps there are societal differences in the way that American and English people volunteer information concerning these issues. As suggested by Brown (1994), Americans expect the English to be similar in terms of language style. As their expectation of similarity is not matched by reality, speech issues may be important to them. This may increase the likelihood Americans will bring these issues up in discussion. However, it is concluded this study did not isolate the determinants, or the character, of English speech in this research context.
6.1.3 Approaches to Organisational Systems

This research aimed to examine the similarities and differences in American and English approaches to organisational systems, i.e. performance appraisals, decision-making and leadership. This research has provided support for the view that Americans and the English prefer differing styles of decision-making. These differences, which seem to be associated with differing levels of uncertainty avoidance between Americans and the English, appear not to have not been addressed previously, in either the social or organisational psychology literature. Indeed, this study may have opened up a line of enquiry concerning decision-making issues in this context, which has been neglected in the past, particularly by those using a qualitative design (Schramm-Nielsen, 2001).

These results support the hypothesis that American and English managers differ in terms of a task vs. a process approach to decision-making. The Americans have a preference for quick and efficient task completion, while the English prefer a process approach associated with maintaining relationship goals, and avoiding risks. According to Maznesvski and Peterson (1997), people’s approaches to decision-making are associated with their societal value preferences. For example, those who emphasise behaviours associated with reducing uncertainty will favour a more process approach. In contrast, those with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance will have less need for behaviours that reduce uncertainty, and will use styles of communication that are direct and exacting. This was consistent with the remarks made by participants suggesting that English decision-making behaviour is associated with the desire to avoid making mistakes associated with completing tasks too quickly. It proposed that Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994) appears to be relevant in describing why Americans and the English differ in their approaches to decision-making. Hofstede and Schwartz have suggested that the US and England score similarly on this Uncertainty Avoidance dimension, which is in contrast to the results of this study. However, as discussed in Section 6.1.1, research has
suggested there may be underlying differences in values within groups scoring similarly on Hofstede’s and Schwartz’ dimensions. Thus, it may be true there are underlying differences in groups’ tendency towards Uncertainty Avoidance, even for those who are culturally similar (Ashkanasy et al., 2002). Therefore, it could be concluded that the differences between the American and English styles of decision-making may be related to differing levels of uncertainty avoidance.

6.1.4 Other Factors Affecting Style

The fourth aim of this study was to examine whether there are factors, other than national cultural value patterns, that may influence people’s speech and behaviour, particularly those in this cross-cultural setting. The results suggested that corporate culture may influence the cognitive processing of environmental information in this context. As discussed in Chapter 5, corporate values are related to the customs, values and traditions of work organisations. As depicted Figure 3.2, the Cognitive Adaptation Model, illustrates that corporate culture, like societal values, is one of the elements of prior knowledge that affect the perception and interpretation of environmental events, particularly those in organisational settings. Thus, it is proposed that corporate culture is an important element involved in the cognitive processing of organisational events that has been overlooked in previous research.

In this bi-cultural setting, it was found the English believed that corporate culture influenced their behaviour within theorganisation more than their national cultural orientation. Americans did not similarly say that corporate culture influenced their behaviour. It is concluded that when the English begin working in the Americanised work environment, they may quickly learn to adapt their behaviour to conform to corporate expectations. Thus, in this instance, for the English, the corporate culture of the organisation becomes a greater determinant of behaviour than their national cultural
orientation, i.e. their ‘Englishness’ does not appear to be a factor in determining their behavioural styles.

For the Americans, however, the situation appears to be very different. They seem very comfortable in the Americanised working environments, as their corporate environments already reflect their own societal values of assertiveness, efficiency and individualism. Thus, as they reported, their behaviour is already consistent with company norms, so they need not adapt. In fact, it appeared the expectation of similarity was associated with the problems Americans reportedly have with the English. As described by Brown (1994), when the Americans begin working with the English, they expect a similarity in cultures, which is not in fact the reality of the situation. Consistent with Miller (1995), it may not be the differences in communication styles themselves, which are creating the misunderstandings. Instead, the misunderstandings may be associated with the differing expectations and assumptions that each group has about the cross-cultural encounter. For example, if the Americans expect the English will speak in a direct manner, they will subsequently interpret their indirect speech using these expectations as a guideline. Consequently, they may conclude their English colleagues are behaving inappropriately, and they will view them as inefficient and inscrutable. This was consistent with the remarks made by the American managers. Thus, expectations with their element of prior knowledge, will influence how people interpret, and subsequently respond to their colleagues. This suggested that corporate culture and expectations may be two factors which, like societal values, influence the cognition of organisational events, in terms of language styles and approaches to specific organisational events.

6.1.5 Implications for Global Organisations

Chapter 5 suggested that as American work practices are based on American values, American organisations may be approaching their global expansion in an
ethnocentric manner, i.e. the American way is the best and the only way. Whether this approach is ethical or even practical is open to question. The evidence presented in Chapter 1 concerning the high failure rate of American expatriate assignments in England, and the negative emotions described by the participants suggest that a more appropriate approach to global expansion should involve a strategy where work practices were negotiated at the local level, thus reflecting the norms and values of the host countries. This was consistent with Fombrun (1984), McKenna (1994) and Ouchi (1981), who suggested that international companies need to look at the way they operate in foreign countries. They suggested that these companies need to understand how national cultural and societal values may affect whether or not the company, and its associated corporate culture, is accepted by host country employees.

The results of this research indicated that the English had adopted a more direct style of speech, in order to 'fit' into the Americanised corporate culture. It is proposed that people working in culturally diverse organisational environments may want to adopt a more direct communication style as this could decrease the likelihood of misunderstandings and misinterpretations occurring. A task orientation has also been demonstrated to be effective in the development of successful cross-cultural relationships (Maznevski & Peterson, 1997). Therefore, it is proposed, a communication style that is effective in an international context should centre on both direct speech and an orientation towards task completion.

6.1.5.1 Cross-Cultural Training

The results of this research indicate that cultural misunderstandings and stereotyping are occurring in Anglo-American organisations. Black and Mendenhall (1990) suggested that cultural training can have a positive effect on increasing the success of intercultural relations by providing international managers with realistic expectations about the cross-cultural assignment. Cross-cultural training could also provide a forum in
which people could sit down and talk about their differences in communication style. International managers would then be in a better position to clarify the intent behind cross-cultural messages, thus avoiding any potential misunderstandings (Mortenson, 1997).

While cross-cultural training may be one way of increasing cross-cultural harmony, according to Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, and Stroh (1999), most firms do not provide any cross-cultural training for expatriate assignments. They have also suggested that pre- and post-training may positively affect how well managers adapt to their new cultural environment. In a report prepared by Cendent International Assignment Service, International Assignments: Policies and Practices (1999), the statistics indicated that the figure was at that time closer to 60 percent of both American and European companies providing such training. As a number of managers in this study reported they had experienced difficulties when adapting to a different culture, this result does question the effectiveness of the existing cross-cultural training programmes.

Although the topic of cross-cultural training was not addressed directly in this study, several participants said that they had undergone some type of cross-cultural training; they nevertheless reported varying degrees of negative reaction to the use of the other culture’s communication style. As Triandis (1994) suggested, the effects of cross-cultural training can be variable and are related to: (a) the levels of resistance to the training itself, (b) the type of training, (c) when the training actually took place, and (d) whether or not other family members are involved in the training. Obviously, these are all areas that needed to be addressed when developing cross-cultural training programmes. As suggested by the model proposed earlier in Figure 3.2, anxiety caused by interacting in unfamiliar cultural environment could be lessened by providing realistic expectations about the new work environment, providing the necessary knowledge base to correctly perceive and process the organisational event, and develop an appropriate behavioural response.
Brislin and Yoshida (1994) suggested that one of the reasons for the apparent lack of success of these training programmes lies in their limited focus on the 'adjustment' of the expatriate manager, particularly in terms of how they adapt to the location, i.e. finding the shops or driving on the 'wrong side' of the road, rather than focussing on the meanings held by other cultures. This, they suggested, was related to their beliefs, norms and values, expectations and behaviours. By applying this cultural knowledge, managers should be able to use this framework to analyse successfully a cross-cultural encounter and develop skills for effective interaction and communication with cross-cultural colleagues. Thus, cross-cultural workshops focusing on aspects of cross-cultural interaction, which were described and illustrated in Figure 3.1, may be one way of enhancing inter-group harmony and increasing the success rate of international assignments.

As well as selecting expatriate employees on the criteria shown to predict successful overseas performance, it could prove useful to select host country employees as well on attributes that have been identified as compatible with corporate values and norms inherent in the American-owned, multi-national organisations. For example, to ensure that employees' attributes are consistent with the American organisation, it should be possible to identify methods of measuring attributes such as task orientation using a leadership or motivational inventory, for instance. Process orientation might be measured using a variety of assessment centre techniques. Of course, the criterion validity and reliability of these measures would need to be ascertained, i.e. do these scores actually predict subsequent organisational performance and effectiveness.

6.1.6 Final Thoughts

The world has changed beyond all recognition over the last few years as organisations have become more global in their orientation; this has resulted in the proliferation of cross-cultural work groups. According to one research project (Financial
Times, 2001), at the time of the study, 4½ million Americans worked for European companies; and approximately the same number of Europeans similarly worked for American companies. In the context of this research, this suggested there are potentially millions of misinterpretations, miscommunications, and misunderstandings that may result from the interaction of different cross-cultural work groups. Previous research has tended to focus on differences in value systems between cultural groups and did not investigate how value systems were reflected in ways of communicating within organisations; neither did previous research investigate whether misunderstandings and miscommunications were occurring in organisations in which employees with different value systems worked together (Adler, Doktor, & Redding, 1986; Granrose & Oskamp, 1997). As these researchers have concluded, little research has been focused on intercultural interactions in the workplace, and this is ironic as interaction is the essence of organisational behaviour.

This research has demonstrated that American and English colleagues, working together in Anglo-American organisations were experiencing some feelings of frustration, annoyance or irritation when other cultural members used their own styles of communication. The results indicated the Americans were misunderstanding the English style of speech, and were consequently annoyed or frustrated with the English approach. The results also suggested that cultural stereotyping was taking place in these organisations, with the view that the English are inefficient and the Americans assertive and individualistic certainly upheld in this instance. As stereotyping has been associated with conflict (Campbell, 1967), this may have implications for the efficiency of Anglo-American organisations and the morale of their employees.

Adler et al. (1997) suggested that culture does influence organisational behaviour, proposing that the correct way of managing these differences is to develop ways in which cross-cultural groups can live and work in harmony. According to these researchers, the
question of managing cultural diversity in organisations is not to ask if national culture affects behaviour in organisations, but when. This view was consistent with the objectives of this research, which aimed not only to identify the values affecting behaviour in cross-cultural organisations, but to pinpoint the specific areas of organisational life where cross-cultural interactions may lead to conflict and misunderstandings, a situation, which inevitably, may lead to the ineffectiveness of the organisation and the breakdown of inter-cultural relationships. The identification of possible areas of conflict and misunderstandings is particularly important as research has shown (Cushner & Brislin, 1996) that some people find it hard to adjust to another culture's way of doing things; on the other hand, some people, quite successfully adapt to their new surroundings.

As suggested by Cushner and Brislin (1996), successful cultural interactions may be a result of the ability to understand the point of view of the other cultural member. In terms of the cognitive models presented in Chapters 3 and 4, it is suggested that studies focusing on cross-cultural differences provide necessary information that contributes to the 'knowledge, assumptions and experience base' that people access when they perceive and process environmental cues and determine an appropriate behavioural response (Shaw, 1990). For instance, this information could be used by cross-cultural trainers to provide international managers with realistic expectations about cross-cultural assignments. It is proposed that the more knowledge that a person has about the values and social practices of other cultures, the more likely this person will be able to draw on this knowledge and experience when interacting in what may be unfamiliar cross-cultural situations. It is suggested that if a person is knowledgeable about the other culture, it is more likely that he or she will have successful cross-cultural experiences.

6.1.6.1 Directions for Future Research

The results of this study offer a number of potential areas for future work:
1. What is the true impact of corporate culture on the behaviour in cross-cultural organisations? Can it affect communication styles such as direct speech, or a task vs. a process approach to decision-making?

2. The results of this research have suggested that misunderstandings were occurring in this bi-cultural context. As Adler et al. (1986) and Granrose and Oskamp (1997) concluded, previous cross-cultural research has tended to focus on differences in value systems between cultural groups, and has not investigated what happens when people of differing value systems interact in the workplace.

3. What are the reasons behind unsuccessful expatriate assignments? Are they related to the differences in the style of communication between cross-cultural colleagues?

4. Are ineffective cross-cultural encounters creating anxiety in organisations? Can this level of anxiety be measured and can an intervention be developed to alleviate this level of anxiety in order to promote cultural harmony?

5. Can participation in cross-cultural training programmes predict whether or not cross-cultural working relationships will be successful? What are the elements of these training programmes that have the most positive effect on inter-cultural relations?

6. Are there historical, political, or sociological antecedents to the development of variations of cultural style? Can they be identified?

7. Do Americans and the English really differ in their propensity to take risks and can this value be measured on a quantitative scale?

8. Are there ‘symbiotic’ relationships between cultural groups? In other words, do the behaviours of one cultural group guide the behaviours of other cultural
members and are these differences detrimental or beneficial to either organisational effectiveness or the well-being of employees?

9. Is it possible to analyse the applicability of the proposed model of cognitive behaviour by actually observing behaviour in organisations? Are there other quantifiable methods of identifying the process of analysing, processing cues and developing appropriate behavioural responses?

10. In Chapter 5, it was suggested that a study of people who have not been successful in Company X’s competitive, perhaps ruthless environment, may provide insight into the desirability of developing and maintaining a strong culture.

6.1.6.2 Summary

Although the popular literature and anecdotal remarks have suggested the Americans are misunderstanding the speech of their English colleagues, this study appeared to provide evidence that misunderstandings are occurring in this context. Perhaps this information may be applied in cross-cultural training situations. As explained previously, this information may help to alter Americans’ erroneous expectations about their new cross-cultural working environment.

This study also appears to support the idea there may be underlying differences in the value orientations of people who have been previously described as being similar in terms of value orientations described by Hofstede (1980) and Schwartz (1994). Indeed, Hall (2000) and Schwartz and Bardi (2001) have concluded people may vary within cultures and across cultures, in terms of their value priorities, which may be linked to personal experience and heritage.

Thus, it has been suggested that a study of cross-cultural differences in this context was a viable approach, as it identified areas of differences in American and English communication styles and approaches to decision-making and leadership. By creating
awareness of cultural dissimilarities and acquiring a level of knowledge of codes and values of other cultures, people should be less likely to use their own frame of reference when interpreting the behaviour of other cultural members.

The results of this research have also suggested that organisations look at their structures, processes and corporate cultures to ensure they are compatible with the values, norms and work styles of different cultural groups. Developing an awareness of cultural differences, and creating suitable cross-cultural working environments, should minimise cross-cultural conflict and increase cultural harmony and organisational effectiveness in culturally diverse organisations.
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Appendix A1
Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ces) and Modified Bales

This questionnaire is part of my PhD research project. This project aims to study misunderstandings that may arise in Anglo-American organisations. These misunderstandings may be the result of the differing communication styles used by British and American co-workers, with style defined as the underlying aspects of language usage. For example, in earlier research I discovered that a significant number of both Americans and British believed that Americans prefer a more direct form of speech, while the British tend to wander around issues and use more words than Americans to describe similar issues. Both cultures reported feeling frustrated, confused and annoyed with each other's approach.

This portion of the current research aims to measure both general and workplace values. Psychologists have defined values as beliefs that influence an individual's behaviour as well as their style of communication, both within and outside the organisation. Over the years psychologists have pointed out that national groups vary in terms of their personal and corporate values. This means that different cultural groups may vary in their style of speaking.

*Before completing the two questionnaires, could you please complete the below section.* You may be assured, however, that all the participants' data will remain completely confidential. The results will be reported in aggregate form, with individual and corporate details unidentifiable within the pooled data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Your Nationality:</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Your Age:</td>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td>31-40 Years</td>
<td>41-50 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your position in company:</td>
<td>(i.e. Manager, Director, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Type of organisation in which you work: (i.e. IT, Manufacturing, Financial, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Your Sex:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many years have you worked in a cross-cultural work environment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS: People often have to choose between two things they feel they *should* do. In these choice situations, people must therefore place more emphasis on one activity over another. Below are pairs of statements that describe activities that people feel they should do. Read each statement carefully, and then place a check next to the statement that you feel you *should emphasise more* in your behaviour at work.

Example:

```
_____ Always being in control of your emotions while under stress

[ ] Looking forward to the future with a positive outlook
```

Both of the above statements represent activities many people feel are important and should be done. Imagine you’re in a situation in which you can only do one of them. Your task is to select the one statement of the pair that you feel should be emphasised in your behaviour. In the above example, this particular person felt the second activity should receive more emphasis than the first, while another person, of course, may feel just the opposite. Please read the following 24 pairs of statements and indicate which one in each pair you feel should receive more emphasis. Some choices will probably be difficult for you, but please do the best you can. Do not leave any questions blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Taking care of all loose ends on a job or project</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Taking actions which represent your true feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being impartial when dealing with others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to avoid hurting other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Encouraging someone who is having a difficult day</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Speaking your mind even when your view may not be popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considering different points of view before taking action</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working to meet job requirements even when your personal schedule must be rearranged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5. Making decisions which are fair to all concerned</th>
<th></th>
<th>6. Continuing to work on a problem until it is resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Expressing your true opinions when asked</td>
<td></td>
<td>__ Trying to help a fellow worker through a difficult time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Trying to help reduce a friend’s burden</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Being impartial in judging disagreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Admitting an error and accepting the consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td>__ Helping others on difficult jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Taking on additional tasks to get ahead</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Offering help to others when they are having a tough time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Admitting to making a mistake rather than covering it up</td>
<td></td>
<td>__ Doing whatever work is required to advance in your career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Always being truthful in dealing with others</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Judging people fairly based on their abilities rather than only on their personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Giving everyone an equal opportunity at work</td>
<td></td>
<td>__ Seeking out all opportunities to learn new skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Trying to be helpful to a friend at work</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Refusing to take credit for ideas of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Being sure that work assignments are fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>__ Maintaining the highest standard for your performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ___</td>
<td>Being determined to be the best at your work</td>
<td>16. ___</td>
<td>Trying to bring about a fair solution to a dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Trying not to hurt a friend’s feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>___ Admitting responsibility for errors made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ___</td>
<td>Finishing each job you start</td>
<td>18. ___</td>
<td>Refusing to tell a lie to make yourself look good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Making sure that rewards are given in the fairest possible way</td>
<td></td>
<td>___ Helping those who are worried about things at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ___</td>
<td>Trying as hard as you can to learn as much as possible about your job</td>
<td>20. ___</td>
<td>Sharing information and ideas which others need to do their job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Taking a stand for what you believe in</td>
<td></td>
<td>___ Always setting high performance goals for yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ___</td>
<td>Refusing to do something you think is wrong</td>
<td>22. ___</td>
<td>Allowing each employee to have an equal chance to get rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Providing fair treatment for all employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>___ Taking on more responsibility to get ahead in an organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ___</td>
<td>Correcting others’ errors without embarrassing them</td>
<td>24. ___</td>
<td>Providing fair treatment for each employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Holding true to your convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>___ Lending a helping hand to someone having difficulty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Values Questionnaire

The following items represent values that determine how a person behaves, develops social relationships and establishes ways of living. Please circle the number that you think best describes how often you *actually show the values described by each item*. Then, please how circle the number which best describes how often the English and the Americans, in general, *actually show the kinds of values described by each item*.

(0): Not often  (1): Sometimes  (2): Often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>Values expressed by me</th>
<th>Values expressed by the English in general</th>
<th>Values expressed by the Americans in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material success and power</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity and social success</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social solidarity and progress</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>UNF</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, strong effective management</td>
<td>A powerful authority, law and order</td>
<td>Tough minded assertiveness</td>
<td>Rugged individualism, self-gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES</td>
<td>Values expressed by me</td>
<td>Values expressed by the English in general</td>
<td>Values expressed by the Americans in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Equalitarianism, democratic participation</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF Altruism, idealism, cooperation</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Established social beliefs and values</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF Value-determined restraint of desires</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Individual dissent, self-sufficiency</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Social nonconformity</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES</td>
<td>Values expressed by me</td>
<td>Values expressed by the English in general</td>
<td>Values expressed by the Americans in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Unconventional beliefs and values</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Friendship, liberalism, sharing</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Trust in the goodness of others</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPF</td>
<td>Love, faithfulness, loyalty</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Hard work, self-knowledge, subjectivity</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNF</td>
<td>Suffering</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VALUES</td>
<td>Values expressed by me</td>
<td>Values expressed by the English in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Rejection of popularity</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB</td>
<td>Admission of failure, withdrawal</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Non-cooperation with authority</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPB</td>
<td>Quiet contentment, taking it easy</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Giving up all selfish desires</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elizabeth C. Ravlin and Bruce Meglino — Comparative Emphasis Scale

Robert F. Bales — Values Questionnaire
Appendix A2
A Summary of Bales and Cohen (1979) Item Definitions

A summary of the definitions of the 26 items included in the instrument used in the Modified Bales Values Questionnaire is included below:

- **Note:**
- U: Items beginning with U indicate behaviours that are perceived a dominant quality.
- P: Items beginning with P indicate behaviours that are perceived to be associated with friendliness.
- D: Items beginning with D indicate behaviours that are perceived to be associated with a submissive quality.
- F: Items beginning with F indicated behaviours that are perceived to be associated with keeping people 'on track.'
- N: Items having an ‘unfriendly’ dimension can be identified by beginning with the letter ‘N’.

1. **U** – The person can be located in the upward part of the group space and can be identified as having a feeling of power associated with the possession of material things. This person is talkative, and frequently initiates social interaction. Although this person appears to be confident, he has a tendency to overestimate his own abilities.

2. **UP** - This person is located in the upward-positive part of the 3-D space and is seen as extroverted and friendly. His values are orientated toward being popular and a social success.

3. **UPF** – Located in the upward positive part of the 3-D space this person is friendly and tends to take on the leadership of the group. Therefore he tends to realise his own values by creating an atmosphere of social solidarity and progress.

4. **UF** – Located in the upward, forward part of 3-D space, this person actualises his own values with his concerns around moving the group towards group loyalty and cooperation. This person’s primary concern is obtaining the cooperation of the group when working towards a common task achievement.
5. **UNF** – Located in the upward-negative-forward part of the 3-D space, this person is seen as domineering and unfriendly and tends to repeatedly take the initiative when completing group tasks. Regarding him or herself as the moral authority, this person is the type most disliked by other group members.

6. **UN** – Located in the upward-negative part of the schema, this person appears to be domineering, self-confident, aggressive and unfriendly. He or she tends to be ready to apply force to show power and authority and can often be described as aggressive.

7. **UNB** – Located in the upward-negative-backward portion of the schema, this person appears to be dominating, and rebellious toward authority. This person can appear self-centred, deviant and exploitative.

8. **UB** - Located in the upward-backward part of the 3-D space, this person sees him or herself as entertaining, jokey and extroverted and takes pleasure in play and creativity. This person is the least likely to be accepting of authority.

9. **UPB** – Located in the upward-positive-backward section of Bales’ 3D space, this person is seen as open, warm, friendly and responsive to others. This person is described as the most liked by other group members.

10. **P** - Located in positive part of the group space, the type P person appears to be friendly and sociable and is genuinely interested in the needs and motivations of other people. He or she quite often aims to have other people like and admire him or her.

11. **PF** – Located in the positive-forward part of the 3-D space, the PF type is seen as friendly and agreeable. While he or she responds to the task-related behaviour of other people in the group, this person rarely takes the initiative. The PF type tends to agree with values and ideas of others and indeed this propensity to agree with the point of view of others is this person’s most characteristic feature.

12. **F** – Located in the forward part of the 3-D space, this type is seen as task and value orientated in their behaviour. This person can be described as analytical and focussed on problem solving. Neither friendly nor unfriendly, this person does not try to impose his or
her views on others, but seems more determined to find the best solution to a problem or task. This person has a tendency to resist changes that conflict with traditional beliefs and political arrangements.

13. NF – Located in the negative-forward part of the 3-D space, the NF type can be described as conscientious and persistent. While concentrating on group tasks, this person tries to be objective and tends to be concerned with always doing the ‘right thing.’ Group observers rate this person as highest in terms of group dislike.

14. N – Located in the negative part of the 3-D space, this person is seen as unfriendly and disagreeable. He or she seems fairly self-concerned and negativistic and can appear to be alienated from the group. The person is highly individualistic.

15. NB - Located in the negative-backward part of the Bales spacial schema, this person can appear to be unfriendly, evasive, stubborn and extremely nonconforming. He or she can also appear to be cynical about conventional values and pessimistic about people and events.

16. B – Located in the backward part of the space, he or she tends to disbelieve much of what is told to him and rejects most conservative beliefs and values. This person can easily fantasise about improbable ambitions, but is unable to make decisions and realise dreams.

17. PB – Located in the positive-backward part of the space, this person is not task-orientated. However, he or she interacts easily with other people in social situations. This person is described as the person that groups most likes, dislikes least and admires the most.

18. DP – Located in the downward-positive part of the space, this person is friendly, calm and tends to like people in general. This person is not task-orientated, and believes in the basic goodness of others.

19. DPF – Located in the downward-positive-forward part of the space, this person appears to be friendly as well as task and value-orientated. He or she believes that to gain
respect and love from other people it is important to be both good and submissive to
other's wishes and demands.

20. DF – Located in the downward-forward part of the 3-D space, this person may appear
submissive and willing to follow a task a value-orientated leader. He or she is somewhat
introverted, and is afraid of disapproval of others. This person can be serious and work-
orientated.

21. DNF – Located in the downward-negative-forward part of the space, this person can
appear submissive and dutiful, and can be self-pitying and resentful. He or she can appear
unfriendly and anxious.

22. DN – Located in the downward part of the group, he or she may appear self-conscious,
unfriendly and resentful. He or she prefers to be alone and may be indifferent to the task-
orientation of the group.

23. DNB – Located in the downward-negative-backward part of the Bales space, this
person appears passive and unfriendly. Somewhat cynical, he rejects both the other people
in the group and their task-orientated behaviour. He or she feels to a greater or lesser extent
that there are few goals worth achieving.

24. DB – Located in the downward-backward part of the group space, this person appears
anxious and tends to reject the demands made by group leaders and authority figures.
Neither friendly nor unfriendly, he or she appears to withhold cooperation with group as
they work towards completing their task. This person rarely seeks to influence the group,
but his silence can act as a restraint on the group as a whole.

25. DPB – Located in the downward-positive-backward part of the 3D space, this person
appears friendly and non-assertive and actively seeks acceptance by the group. Although
not task-orientated, he is responsive to the help of other people, expecting to reach his or
her goals without working very hard. This person is generally on the side of the underdog
and is concerned with social conditions rather than task accomplishment.
26. D – Located in the downward part of the group, this person appears to be passive, powerless and non-assertive. He or she is not interested in task completion.
Appendix A3
Chi-Square Tables Summarising the Results of the Modified Bales Values Questionnaire:

(Note: All Chi-Square statistics are calculated using a two-tailed test)

1. *What the Americans say about the English.*

**Table A1**
**UF - Efficiency and Strong Effective Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, N = 69) = 6.4, p < .05 \]

**Table A2**
**NB - Social Nonconformity and Noncooperation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, N = 70) = 9.9, p < .05 \]
### Table A3
**NF - Value Determined Restraint of Desires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(2, N=68) = 17.03, p < .001 \]

### Table A4
**F - Established Social Beliefs and Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(2, N=68) = 16.2, p < .01 \]

### Table A5
**DB - Noncooperation with Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(2, N=70) = 7.8, p < .05 \]
Table A6
*U – Material Success and Power*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(2, N=70) = 14.5, p < .01$

2. Chi-Square Results: What the Americans report about their own behaviour compared to the behaviour of Americans in general

Table A7
*NF – Value Determined Restraint of Desires –*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(2, N=70) = 9.4, p < .01$
Table A8  
**DNB – Admission of Failure**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(2, \ N = 70) = 11.6, \ p < .01$

Table A9  
**DNB – Rugged Individualism**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(2, \ N = 70) = 20.8, \ p < .01$

Table A10  
**U – Material Success and Power**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(2, \ N = 70) = 22.6, \ p < .01$
### Table A11
**UN – Tough Minded Assertiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, \, N=70) = 14.3, \, p < .01 \]

3. **Chi-Square Results: What the Americans say about their own nationality's behaviour compared to what the English say about their own nationality's behaviour**

### Table A12
**UF – Efficiency and Strong Effective Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, \, N=69) = 13.8, \, p < .01 \]
### Table A13
**NF – Value Determined Restraint of Desires**
Frequency of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(2, N = 68) = 9.2, p < .05 \]

### Table A14
**DF – Hard Work, Self-Knowledge, Subjectivity**
Frequency of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(2, N = 70) = 13.8, p < .01 \]

### Table A15
**DNB – Admission of Failure**
Frequency of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(2, N = 70) = 14.8, p < .01 \]
### Table A16
**UN – Tough-Minded Assertiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(2, N=70) = 19.4, p < .001\]

### Table A17
**U – Material Success and Power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(2, N=70) = 27.6, p < .001\]

### Table A18
**UNB – Rugged Individualism and Self-Gratification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(2, N=70) = 23.0, p < .001\]
4. What the Americans report about their own behaviour compared to what the English say about their own behaviour

**Table A19**
*UF – Efficiency and Strong Effective Response*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(2, N=70) = 2.4, p > .05\]

**Table A20**
*DF Hard Work, Self-Knowledge, Subjectivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(2, N=70) = 1.2, p > .05\]

**Table A21**
*UNB – Rugged Individualism, Self-Gratification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(2, N=70) = 2.3, p > .05\]
**Table A22**

**UB – Having a Good Time, Self-Expression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2(2, N=70) = 3.2, p > .05\)

**Table A23**

**U – Material Success and Power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2(2, N=70) = .96, p > .05\)
Appendix B1
Interview Schedule, Decision-Making and Performance Appraisals

Name________________________
Nationality________________________
Company__________________________ Sex________________________
Years Cross-cultural Experience________________________ Position in Company___________

Interview Questions

I. Performance Appraisals

1.1. Brief background to their organisation’s appraisal system
   a. Their nationality/nationality of supervisor and/or subordinate
   b. Who last appraised them or whom did they appraise and what are their nationalities.

1.2. Describe briefly their last performance appraisal

1.3. Describe how they felt and/or thought about the appraisal, before, during and after the appraisal.

1.4 If the appraiser/appraisee was a different nationality, was their approach different to what you had expected? (Direct vs. Indirect) What did you think of their approach?

1.5 If there had been problems the appraiser/appraisee may have wanted to address, how did they address these issues:
   Indirectly? Directly?

1.6 Are there differences in the way that Americans and the English appraise employees? Do the English and the Americans prefer the same approach to performance appraisals? Do they prefer different approaches? Are there differences in the preferred appraisal styles/systems. Explain.

1.7. Ideally, what would be an ideal performance appraisal? What would be the objectives? How would the appraiser tackle sensitive issues? Would there be two-way feedback?
II. Problem-solving and Decision-making

2.1. Think of two recent decisions that you have made, relevant to the organisation, which involved other people in the decision-making process.

2.1.1. Who was involved in the process, English, American?
2.1.2. How was the decision reached:
   - Brainstorming in a meeting
   - Formalised, chaired meeting with prepared presentations
   - Individual consultation with other colleagues
   - Unilateral decision by team leader
   - Other

2.1.3. Do Americans and the English approach decision-making in the same way or are their approaches different. Does the different culture differ in the way that they analyse problems.

Examples of styles:

- Efficiency is all
- Reach implementation stage quickly
- Search for creative solutions
- Search for pragmatic realistic solutions
- Wait and see what happens

2.1.4. If different how do the two approaches differ, how are they the same? (i.e. task vs. process issues). Possible areas of similarity/differences:
   - Focus on the process – ensuring everyone has a say. Provide examples. Focus on the task, getting the job done. Examples.
   - Leader made the decision

2.1.5. Other points of discussion:
   - Was culture an issue, i.e. did cultural differences enhance or inhibit the decision-making process.
   - Was the other culture’s approach more or less efficient?
• Do you prefer brainstorming to one to one consultation?
• Do you prefer to emphasise the task or the process.
• Which approach to decision-making is more thorough? More fair?
  How should group decisions be made.
Appendix B2
Chi-Square Tables Summarising Results of Interviews

1. What the English Say

Table B1
Is individual behaviour influenced more by personality than by national culture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(1, N=40) = 5.4, p < .05 \text{ for a two-tailed test} \]

Table B2
Is the style of decision-making related to the corporate culture of the organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(1, N=40) = 12.5, p < .01, \text{ for a two-tailed test} \]

Table B3
Does he prefer a process related approach to decision-making?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(1, N=40) = 19.5, p < .01, \text{ for a two-tailed test} \]
### Table B4

*Are Americans Team Orientated?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$X^2(1, N = 40) = 7.6, p < .01, \text{ for a two-tailed test}$$

2. What the Americans say

### Table B5

*Is he direct in his style of speech?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$X^2(1, N = 40) = 12.5, p < .01, \text{ for a two-tailed test}$$

### Table B6

*Are the English indirect?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$X^2(1, N = 40) = 8.5, p < .01, \text{ for a two-tailed test}$$
### Table B7

Do the English prefer a process approach to decision-making?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(1, N = 70) = 8.5$, $p < .01$, for a two-tailed test

### Table B8

Are the Americans Efficient?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(1, N = 70) = 5.6$, $p < .05$, for a two-tailed test

### Table B9

Are the English inefficient?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(1, N = 70) = 18.2$, $p < .01$, for a two-tailed test
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B10</th>
<th>Is a task approach to decision-making efficient?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(1, N = 70) = 8.1, p < .01, for a two-tailed test \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B11</th>
<th>Are the English uncomfortable with conflict?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(1, N = 70) = 22.6, p < .001, for a two-tailed test \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B12</th>
<th>Do Americans prefer a task approach to decision-making?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2(1, N = 70) = 13.1, p < .01, for a two-tailed test \]
### Table B13

*Appendix B3  
Tables Summarising Interview Results

A Summary of the Interview Results using the Binomial Distribution: What the Americans Say

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Binomial Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He prefers direct speech</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English are indirect</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He is task oriented</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Americans value task</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>English value process</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>He is efficient</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>English are inefficient</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adapted behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New behaviour result of experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>English are reserved</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Americans are aggressive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Problem solving: American are task orientated</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>English are process</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Decisions-American are task</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>English decisions-process</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Decision style - corporate culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>He prefers process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>English speech is confusing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: = All tests are reported at the two-tailed level of significance.
Table B14
A Summary of the Interview Results using the Binomial Distribution: What the English Say

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE ENGLISH SAY</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Binomial Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Americans are direct</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English are indirect</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He is task oriented</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Americans value task</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>English value process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>He is efficient</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adapted behaviour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New behaviour experience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>= .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>English are reserved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>English are task</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Problem solving: American are task</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>English are process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>American are task orientated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>English are process orientated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Corporate culture dictates style</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>He prefers process</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: = All tests are reported at the two-tailed level of significance

Table B15
A Summary of the Interview Results using Chi-Square: What the English Say

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT THE ENGLISH SAY</th>
<th>Chi-Square Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality determines behaviour</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N = 40) = 5.4, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of decision-making is related to corporate culture</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N = 40) = 12.5, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He prefers a process approach</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N = 40) = 19.5, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans aren't team orientated</td>
<td>$X^2 (1, N = 40) = 7.6, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT THE AMERICANS SAY</td>
<td>Chi-Square Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is direct</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 12.5, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English are indirect</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 8.5, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English prefer a process approach to decision - making</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 8.5, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Americans are efficient</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 5.6, p&lt;.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English are inefficient</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 18.2, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A task approach to decision-making is efficient</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 8.1, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English are uncomfortable with conflict</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 22.6, p&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans prefer a task approach to decision-making</td>
<td>$X^2(1, N=40) = 13.1, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B3

Comments Made by Participants Concerning Style of Communication and Approaches to Organisational Systems and Processes

1. Direct Speech

The following comments are typical of those made by both British and the Americans when discussing: (a) their own style of speaking, (b) the British style of speaking, and (c) the American style of speaking.

Americans: What they say about themselves

(JR): “To me it’s easy. You need to be honest in your approach and give constructive criticism and it should be done in the air of improvement. I wouldn’t blurt it out right away, but I would say it. I think you have to... with something that personal.”

(DOH): If I had a sensitive issue to address I would just come out and say it. And I would certainly want to have a face-to-face.

(BB): I believe in bluntness. Some people don’t take it very well.

Americans: What they say about the Americans concerning direct speech

(BM): Yes, Americans are lot more blunt. They are much about this is right, this is wrong. You need to improve...

(BM): Yes, Americans are lot more blunt. They are much this is right, this is wrong. You need to improve. But generally, I have found that Americans aren’t tactful.

(CH): I think that Americans tend to be more direct than the English.

(DP): I think that my American contractors would be more direct. The Americans are a little more confrontational, a little bit more direct; more openly obstinate.

The Americans: What they say about the English concerning direct speech

(DF): The English open less of themselves, on average.

(AB): In the UK if you try to make that point you have to say it quite eloquently, or you just say it quietly and soften it up a little bit or say it off-line.
I think that Brits are shy at telling you when you have pissed them off. Initially, they wouldn't say anything.

(BB): The English tend to construct gentle, roundabout ways of introducing their point... it's sometimes rude and unrevealing to be direct in British culture.

(BB): I think that the British way is designed to protect feelings and avoid embarrassments and to avoid situations where people have to save face in any explicit way. Avoiding embarrassment is really part of the English style in the first place.

(CM): The English approach is softer. It is because they don't want to upset people. If you're soft, people can misinterpret what you mean. It is a matter of how much they do they mean this.

(CM): They (the English) were solid in experience, but most of their inclination was to try to be as obtuse as possible.

(CM): There tends to be (in England) an emphasis on all the implied meanings. It is quite baffling.

(CM): The English don't want to be direct. Where they could have used a bullet point, they use too many words.

(DW): Because when the Americans were being direct and the English were trying to be oblique that is where the conflict comes from.

(HB): When I do a PA with an English person, I have to spend more time talking with them because they worry about not so much what I said, but what I really mean. It is the hidden meaning behind it — it's more important what is behind what I said.

(JD): When I was an associate it wasn't very clear and I really don't know what I was being told. It wasn't very clear, very English, very beat around the bush. I was saying that my supervisor was very English. I literally didn't know what he was telling me.

(RH): Yes. I felt that, in the UK there seems to be a reluctance to be that direct and it really permeates everything. My impression is based on my experience, is that bad news is definitely treated differently and is not as direct as it can be in the US.

WL: But, I have to very aware of the fact that the UK style is not very direct.
The English: What they say about themselves concerning direct speech

(ME): I mean with the (English) style of doing it, I feel that the problem is that people are left too much in the lurch as to how others feel about them. And that's a bad thing. I think that there is more onus on the person getting the feedback to figure out what is being said.

The English: What they say about the English concerning direct speech

(MS): English people aren't generally like that (direct).
(RD): They (the Americans) were quite straight, probably more open than UK people would be.
(AB): I don't think people (English) are that honest because they don't want to hurt people. I think that English people don't like to criticise.
(AB): Yes. It (being indirect) is more of an English thing.
(AT): I think that British managers are more subtle.
(JM): The British are a lot more reserved, private, more reserved. One of the things that comes out in PAs is that the English are not good at telling people when they are doing something right...while Americans will do that all the time. It is not a natural British thing, though I think it is a natural American thing.
(ME): Whereas, the English, and generally most Europeans, tend to be less candid, they tend to walk around it a bit more.
(FP): I have seen a more subtle approach in the UK: here in England it is more subtle, you are given more warning.
(PGB): All participants are encouraged to be honest, which it is felt will ultimately help the person and the organisation. Some people like that, some people (English) don't like it, and are very uncomfortable about the honesty, the directness of the feedback.

The English: What they say about the Americans concerning direct speech

(DS): I have noticed that the US management teams are much more open.
(MF): The stereotypical view of Americans by the Brits is quite that Americans aren't very subtle and they don't have a great sense of humour or sensitivity.
(MF): I think that it is true, in my experience that with Americans there is a
greater directness and a focus on issues than in the UK.
(PS): Again, the American approach has been more direct but with a hint of
less formality. Confronting the issues but it is not presented as a life-
threatening importance.
(RD): They (the Americans) were open, maybe a bit more open, a bit less
reserved than the UK guys. They were quite straight, probably more open than
UK people would be.
(AB): I guess you could say that American people get to the point quicker.
American managers are not very subtle at all. This is the stereotype and I think
that there is a degree of truth in this. Americans are louder – they like to make
themselves heard.
(GP): I find managers in the States more direct. They (American managers)
are more demanding. They are always very much to the point. Americans say
what they want to.
(JB): I think the Brits get exasperated with Americans because they say that the
Americans are just not implying any subtlety here.
(FP): I think that Americans can be more brutal, particularly when sacking
someone.
(JN): I think the key difference is that people are much more candid with
feedback here (in America). More direct. Sometimes, candid in terms of the
feeling is that if there is something wrong that they will tell you and they will
tell you very clearly. They (Americans) feel it is more humane to just say it
because you will otherwise suffer and the business will ultimately suffer in the
long term.

2. Task vs. a Process Approach to Decision-Making

The following comments were typical of those made by the participants in this
study concerning cross-cultural differences in a task vs. a process style of decision-making.

The American: What they say about themselves concerning task vs. process
(BP): But maybe a bit more focused on the task, on identifying the task, that's the best way. To be efficient and successful in getting the job done, the task should be the number one priority.

(JR): At the end of the day I am more focussed on the completion of the task and that means everything moving forward...and at the end of the day it is a numbers orientated scorecard. We have to be concerned with the results. If you can't get the job done, you're not effective; that is what you are getting paid for.

(AB): Focuses on completing the task. You are there to accomplish. That is the main priority.

(BM): Task means getting the job done (which is) important. If I have things that I need to develop, this has a slightly higher priority than people's feelings.

(AN): The bottom line is getting the proper decision, the right decision. I believe in substance over form.

(DW): I think that in the business that we are in, we need faster decisions and we don't need as much consensus. Let's talk about buy in and shut up.

The American: What they say about Americans concerning task vs. process

(PD): The differences in that in the States you get a few key people together and they will make a decision as quickly as possible... there is always that pressure and so we need a result right now.

(DF): If I were to paint it in broad strokes, the stereotype is that the Americans are quicker to make decisions and if they have to make decisions with the recognition that they had to make the decision with less than perfect information then they are willing to do that and take action.

(DF): In general, in the US it seemed more like a quick and dirty, rough and ready type of decision-making. It's more of a 'let's try it' and fix it if it doesn't work type of decision making.

(DF): I think the difference in task vs. process is a good way of defining the different decision making styles of the English and the Americans. I would say that the US side is more task and the UK is more process. If the task focus means that have to sacrifice the robustness or the comprehensiveness of the process then you can make a wrong decision. If over here you put too much
emphasis on the process you get bogged down and by the time you make the
decision the window for implementing can be passed.

(AN): But I would say that our salesmen in the US were even more ‘cowboy’
than the salesmen in the UK.

(BB): I think that Americans are generally more task focused – they expect the
team to just come along with them.

CH: Americans do tend to be a bit more cowboyish in our decisions and seem
willing to make a decision without all the information, without realising that
there is a bit of risk in the way that we are going. We will correct it later.
Sometimes we may start down a path and see if it works and if doesn’t, of
course we correct it.

(CM): I think that the stereotype is that Americans are more authoritative, less
patient, trying get to the task. There are legion stories ... Americans get to it
faster.

(DO): I remember when I first went overseas we had cultural sensitivity
sessions. They were aimed at Americans – when they were with other cultures,
they were told not to be so ‘a bull in a china shop, sort of thing.’ The
stereotype is there but I know a number of American managers who are of both
types.

(DP): Americans will be quicker to push towards a conclusion even if that
means being a little bit more confrontational and demanding...

(DW): They are saying that the British are still thinking that the Americans
aren’t detailed and the Americans are thinking that the British are getting
picky about things that don’t matter.

(HB): But, the Americans tend to be task focussed. You assume you can
achieve it.

The Americans: What they say about the British concerning task vs. process

(BP): The process provides a structure but it takes longer to get to the result.
I am sure that it is because (the English) do want to get it right – they don’t
want to make a mistake. They want to make sure they have addressed all the
issues that need to be addressed.
(JR): Yes, I think the (English) want to think through everything. Everything is evaluated. That they're not going to make a mistake.

(PD): What I have seen in England is that they want to make sure that all the important people are involved in the decision but anyone else that might be related to the decision are also called in so at least they are aware of it.

(AB): Brits take a decision, Americans make a decision. The English love to debate and talk and discuss. In England, they tend to have bigger groups and take longer and worry about everybody's feelings. I think they feel this approach allows more time for discussion, collaboration, debate of the alternatives.

(AN): I would say ... in the UK, that the structure, the decision-making structure was far more laid out, studied, formal, than the US. In the US it was a bit more shoot from the hip. In the UK they erred on the side of not making the decision because they were analysing it too much. Both of these are exaggerations, but in the UK there was far more of a structured process to get there and make sure that all the blanks were filled in. In the US again they erred on the side of making decisions too quickly without enough analysing.

(BM): The British are more consensus making. They want to make sure that people understand why that particular decision was made. They want more buy in. They are more interested in all the ins and outs of the decision.

(CM): In my experience, I would think that the consensus is really a UK type of thing. That is the way that people (UK) would act naturally.

(DP): Meetings are a little bit more evasive (in England), a little bit more indirect, a little bit more going a long way around the barn.

(DW): There is more decision consensus building (in England). The group in England is excessively process driven. If you have a problem in the UK they go through this process, define it, but if you could have fixed the problem in ten minutes it will take a month because that is how long the process will take. This is a much bigger deal in England; (Process) is a Bristol specialty.

(HB): I find that with a decision of this nature even if it is considered to be small, a lot of checking is needed to make sure (with the English). I find that is the case with agreements and things with a bunch of English people. They keep discussing and agreeing with it, rather than moving on.
Americans are more focused on the task. The English are more process orientated.

(MS): I can tell you that cultural training said that English people ... very much wanted a more collaborative type of relationship and feel comfortable in voicing their ideas and coming up with a common solution to problems.

(WL): The bias is that the people in the UK are biased towards process.

The English: What they say about themselves concerning task vs. process

(MF): On the whole, actually (the process approach) may be a better way of doing it when you have a highly unionised workforce; you have to take the time to get a buy-in. And actually you get a lot better and quicker results.

(JM): If you can, consensus is the ideal way to make a decision. It is better, because you have to get buy in.

The English: What they say about the English concerning task vs. process

(DS): The people who I work with are primarily British, very hands off, it's all about relationships, let's not get too bogged down in the details. Get the analytics right and everything else will be right. It's all details. There is a British way of doing things.

(PS): While the UK (meetings) are more formal and with a process, we have to remove ourselves from the situation and run through a cold analysis of the problem; this is the process. More formalized and not so direct and more behind the scenes. There is a lot more thought and discussion beforehand, before going in.

(PS): Whereas the UK ones, they've thought about it a lot more and it's more formal and it is more like I have let you down. Well, the advantage of this (the English approach) is that the entire case (has been discussed) beforehand and so there are fewer surprises in the process. Everything is under control and you are less likely to trip over something. In the UK there is more pressure to be in a group, to be in a team.

(PS): The English want to consider the issues a little more carefully. Sometimes I think a bit too much. But generally the English want to debate
things a bit more, to make sure that there are no wrinkles that have been left out, that there are no issues that haven’t been addressed.

(AO): The stereotype would be that generally speaking, British managers would be more prepared to accept the views of other people and to accept that there are differences in views and to work. The English are much more skilled at getting consensus amongst people.

(BT): I think that the English are more afraid to make decisions on their own and prefer to make them in a group. If they were making a marketing decision, they would include the whole company in the review process.

(JN): I do think that English people prefer consensus. I think they hide behind consensus. It is an excuse not to get things done. It is total procrastination.

(PF): You see a lot of process approach in the UK. They will go to a meeting and want to talk it through and the come up with the decision. They want to analyse problems and go into some depth.

The English: What they say about the Americans concerning task vs. process

(PS): I would say yes in my experience of the last 17 years that (Americans) are more task orientated.

(PS): In the US it is more you will have a meeting and talk about it, but there is more of an urgency to frame the discussion of what we will be getting out of this and other action points. We have the same in the UK, but there is more pressure to be in a group, to be in a team.

(RD): I think that this (a task vs. a process approach to decision-making) is probably the biggest difference between the US and the UK. My view is that in the main, Americans probably have a very high determination to undertake the task in a very efficient way. I’m not saying that Brits are bad. I’m saying that there are fewer Brits that are as highly motivated towards the task than the US guys.

(AO): For the US people, it is more task orientated. US people are much less tolerant of differences between people and groups. They are much more inclined to be authoritative when solving problems basically.

(BT): Americans are less afraid to make decisions on their own without seeking outside input.
(GP): The American way, this is again, an average feeling, I would say a lot of them focus on completing the task; that is their number one priority. Completing the task is a very American characteristic.

(PF): Sometimes Americans do not have a long term regard for the consequences of their actions. They may not pause to consider what the possible outcome of the decision might be. In America there is more shouting, more telling people what they should do. I see less of this in the UK. I think of multiple examples where Americans have tried to force their way through.

(PS): Americans will try to implement things more quickly. The pressure is to get it done, not to get it right the first time, just get it done. It is important to your role.

(TB): Certainly Americans focus on completing the task. That is a big one.

3. What the Americans and the English say about efficiency

The following comments were typical of those made by the Americans and the English participants concerning efficiency.

The Americans: What they say about themselves concerning efficiency

(BP): It's a matter of how quickly you want to solve the problem – how you want to address the issue or the task... (task) is overall more efficient. Yes, you may end up with some rework – a little bit – but in terms of efficiency (task) is probably better. To be efficient and successful in getting the job done, the task should be the number one priority.

(JR): If you extend the decision cycle a month or two and then come to the same conclusion, you'll find yourself a month or two behind being where you want to be and the execution isn't as efficient. Profits are driving my performance appraisal. It's like everybody feels good but we lost the game. And we really don't care and you're fired. We have to be concerned with the results. I would hate to be a poorly performing company and then have everybody feel good, that wouldn't be a successful result at all.

(RH): Given my personality, (the English process approach) can be very slow and somewhat inefficient. I can understand it, but it does frustrate me. I am one of those people who wants to make the decision now. I will try to figure out
the information that we don’t have and get that information, make the decision and move on.

**The Americans: What they say about Americans concerning efficiency**

(CM): It is important for people to realise that the company culture is not operated for the sake of altruism. It has been developed because it was seen as the most efficient way of motivating people. It you get people to effectively work better with one another, then the company prospers.

(DO): If I think about, I think the American results orientated approach (which) is our goal; and we have to do everything we have to do to meet that goal. And that means that running at full tilt from the word go. Whereas, with the UK approach, this is where we are going, so let’s think about how we are going to set that up. How we are going to structure that. I think that it will prolong or lengthen that project as a result of doing that analysis and doing that team building upfront.

(DW): The US are more likely to use the John Wayne approach to solve the problem.

**The Americans: What they say about the English concerning efficiency**

(PD): So, (the English) prefer a process approach which makes the meeting last a lot longer than it had to. And while it resolved the problem, I can see that it happens all the time where you’re needing everybody’s buy-in. Because talking about it a lot, and then finally getting to the same point, an hour or an hour and a half down the road (doesn’t make sense).

(DF): The British leaders would be willing to sacrifice speed of action to make sure that it is more carefully considered, more carefully bounced off the rest of the organisation. You know, it just moved that much more slowly. Eventually we got there. It just took a lot more hashing out.

(AN): If there is a purpose to a meeting, let’s do it. But if (the English) say that you are going to have a two hour meeting every Friday then you will lose two hours every Friday.

(DW): If you have a problem in the UK they go through this process, define it, build a SWAT team, go through scientific method, blah-de-blah-de-blah. If you
could have fixed the problem in ten minutes, but it will take a month because that is how long the process will take.

The English: What they say about themselves concerning efficiency

(GP): And I think it is not effective to be honest.

(PS): Efficient functioning of the team – I don’t focus on efficiency, but it comes after I focus on the (processes). It is difficult to apply efficiency to research. You can look at efficiencies that are draining away but you can’t say how we can make research any quicker.

(JM): It (a process approach) is not efficient, mind, but it is the way you have to do things.

(ME): You know, I do think that English people prefer consensus. I think they hide behind consensus. It is an excuse not to get things done. It is total procrastination.

The English: What they say about the English concerning efficiency

(AT): Quite a few typical English managers, not at (his company) necessarily, are less concerned with the smoothness and effectiveness, than whether things are going to be carried out.

The English: What they say about the Americans concerning efficiency

(RD): Americans tend to want to (be efficient); in the rather simplistic sense, time is important to them. Let’s get through it fast. Let’s just march on.

Generally, speaking, this is the case with them. Americans are quicker to write people off. They’re impatient. My view is that in the main, Americans probably have a very high determination to undertake the task in a very efficient way.

(AO): When I suggest to (the Americans) that they should work more collaboratively like we do, the reaction is that this way (process) is really time consuming and a real pain to get 12 people in a room to actually agree on anything. They say it frustrates the hell out of then and they don’t want any part of it.
4. What the Americans and English say about personality

The following comments were representative of those comments made by the participants in this study concerning the impact of personality on organisational behaviour.

*The Americans: What they say about personality*

(JR): It depends on the individual (whether they value money or achievement).

(AN): I think that this varies more to do with the individual than by where they are from, their culture (Whether or not they prefer direct feedback).

*The English: What they say about personality*

(AN): I think that this (giving feedback) varies more to do with the individual than by where they are from, their culture.

(DS): We are big on Myers-Briggs type stuff. And so we would be told that everyone has a different preference.

(JR): I can't categorise because people are totally different in this way and that. Yes, it (how people react to performance appraisals) is more of a personality thing.

(MF): The difficulty is to distinguish between individuals and culture.

(JB): It (behaviour in organisations) is much more to do with individual characteristics.

(JM): It is very difficult because it depends on your own personality profile how you would like a leader to be.

(RB): I think that some individuals are very much task-focused. Other people are more process focused. I think it is more personality. I think that there are both types of people on both sides of the water.

(TB): But of course that (type of decision-making) style also depends on personality.

5. Corporate Culture – What the Americans and the English Say

The following comments were representative of those made by both American and English participants in this study concerning corporate culture.
The Americans: What they say about corporate culture

(DF): There is the selection effect and then there is the culture effect. If they spend more than a year here they are baked into that culture.

(BB): Managers are generally retrained in the more process-orientated approach of (the company).

(CK): The thing about (this) organisation, is that everyone's roles are defined.

(CM): It is important for people to realise that the company culture is not operated for the sake of altruism. It has been developed because it was seen as the most efficient way of motivating people. It you get people to effectively work better with one another, then the company prospers. The founders of the company knew what they were doing when they founded the system, the culture.

(DW): You won't get a big cultural difference (in behaviour) in (his company) because we use the same process and it is driven by an American company.

The English: What they say about corporate culture

(DS): Yeah. I think it's important and this is a cultural thing that people will just be up front. If I wasn't dropped into an environment that wasn't like this then I wouldn't do that. - I guess it's like being in a nudist camp, which I haven't done either. But in a sense when you get to the point that they're all nude, but you're not, you are actually more uncomfortable, right? So you're in an environment and told that this is what is expected and you don't give frequent feedback and people complain and you can actually get to the evaluation process and they mark you down. You're receiving it all the time. It's easier to give in than not to almost. It's not that difficult. As I say, it's a bit like being a nudist. You don't have to train yourself to be a nudist - you just take off your clothes. You may have to overcome feelings of uncomfortableness. You're just in an environment where people give feedback. This is a strong culture. And if you don't like it, then you will leave.

(AB): The culture of (his company) is very much get to the point. I think there is certainly a (company) cultural impact.

(AM): I think that once an individual has bought into this place and is in its process, (individual differences are) indistinguishable.
(AO): It is subtle, but there is definitely an influence of the culture of work and I think it is inevitable because if you are to be successful you have to display certain types of behaviours. If these behaviours are unnatural to you will find it quite difficult. These behaviours are reinforced by the PAs.

(GP): Again the particular style (of organisational behaviour) depends on the organization culture.

(HR): It is in the (company) culture to make the time to have a fairly lengthy discussion about performance, ambitions and all those sorts of things. So it is critical to find that kind of quality time. The (company) culture thing is of course a US thing, culture, a California culture.

(JB): In this particular case there are systematic differences between Americans and Brits but they are also differences due to company culture and I think that the experience tends to be that the differences of culture when different companies are put together are more significant than the differences in culture between Brits and Americans.

(JM): I think that you will find that how an employee or a company operates is based on the kind of (company) culture. That reflects everything.

(RB): You don’t tend to breed autocratic styles of leadership type people. (His company) tends to be much more consensus. Both Americans and English tend to be that way because of the culture.

6. What the Americans and the English say about how they have adapted their Behaviour as a Result of Corporate Culture or Work Experience

The following comments typified those made by both American and British managers participating in this study concerning the adaptation of behaviour as a result of corporate culture or work experience, which dictated the style and systems of an organisation; or due to experience of working in a cross-cultural environment.

The Americans: What they say about adapting behaviour

(AB): Yes. You know, just go on, keep your mouth shut and let them say their piece. Don’t make them feel stupid and an idiot. After hanging around for a couple of months, you just pick up that.
(AB): (Female manager) was site manager ... and she was very abrasive, if you can imagine the Ugly American, she was twice as bad, pounding the table. She was very confrontational. But I saw her style change the three years we were there. She became much more collaborative, much softer. She actually moved and made friends. As she was here longer, the hard edge of Detroit business wore off and she adapted quite well. Her style wasn't working before.

(AB): To be successful, you have to want to change the situation, but you also have to be open to change yourself. Because you are going to change. You could probably predict success rate with the ability to adapt to the culture.

(CM): It (company culture) doesn't work for everyone. There are always people that don't fit into the culture. But once you are surrounded by people that are successful in the culture, you tend to adapt.

(MS): I take all the feedback, look at all the numerical variables on the core competencies. I look for patterns. If something stands out, I will de-emphasise certain behaviours. My plan is to adapt my behaviours accordingly. I take an action to change my behaviour in certain areas.

(WL): Yes. I definitely need to pay attention to toning it down (with English colleagues). It is really hard. You know there are some people who aren't really able to change the way they approach these things. So I have to be aware of it. I instead try and pay attention to how I am being received.

The English: What they say about adapting behaviour

(JN): The differences that I have here is that I have to temper my comments here. So I have had to work outside of my comfort zone if you like. Part of my work role was to come here. Since I have moved here, I have had lots of adapting to do. I have had to adjust.

(AT): I think that as a result of working with Americans, the British have learned that if they want to be heard, they have to also state the obvious, even if it is banal. They need to get in there first. Before, it was noticeable that Americans would speak more and louder than the Brits – and it wasn't just British reserve. Then the Brits began to notice that this tactic worked – starting by stating the obvious, they eventually got credit for making salient points as well. They definitely became more like the Americans...
(AO): There is definitely a Darwinian thing about work. I am not behaving the same way at work and in my social life. Work encourages a certain style of behaviour and if you are going to be successful, you have to behave in certain ways at work which may not be completely natural to you.

(BT): I am a bit international really. Working abroad changes your view.

(JB): The skill to being an international manager is of course to actually recognise the different styles and to be able to accommodate them. It is about accepting that these differences exist. ... The smart way to approach it is to be sensitive to these things and use the best tools of the job.

(ME): I have learned to adapt (to being direct). And I appreciate both styles... Also, the first time I gave feedback, which was less candid, I just felt blank stares. So they didn’t understand me. So I quickly realised that if I was going to succeed in this environment you have to adapt your style that you are used to.

7. What the Americans and the British say about their Emotional Reactions to Differing Communication Styles

The following comments typified those comments made by American and English managers concerning their emotional reactions to differing communications favoured by colleagues in Anglo-American working environments.

The Americans: What they say about their emotional reactions

(CK): It’s best to do your job and not worry about anything else. Just let a lot of things go. It can be frustrating. I forced a confrontation (with a British colleague) because he just couldn’t ignore the issues, but I wasn’t responsible.

(BP): I feel that it is a little bit frustrating because it is sort of tends to make meetings much more drawn out that they need to be.

(BM): If someone tries to give you criticism, people may think that you don’t like them, just because you’re blunt. If you’re soft, people can misinterpret what you mean. It is frustrating. Task means getting the job done is important. If I think that there are things that I need to develop, this has a slightly higher priority than people’s feelings.
(DP): The Brits won't be confrontational and defy you to your face. It is not quite their style. I am not used to dealing with all that. I find this frustrating. You have to hold them to the letter of the law and this makes it really hard on you and you really have to be hard on them (the English). If you put a gun to their head, they will do it. It is a very confrontational job. But I don't like confrontation. It can be very difficult.

(DW): This gets me into a little bit of trouble because I feel (English) people are avoiding what they have to do in that process and I have to bring that out and I am completely in conflict in any decision making process.

(DW): It was frustrating to me because there were more managers in their group than they had to have (in the company structure). They were like a bunch of wildcats.

(RH): I have been termed at times to be too confrontational and hasty. Given my personality it can be very slow and somewhat inefficient. I can understand it but it does frustrate me. ... the percolation period does frustrate me at times.

The Americans: What they say about the Emotional Reactions of the English

(JR): Yes. I ask (English) people all the time whether they agree with this. I say that this is constructive criticism...This guy in particular had a rotten appraisal, lots of 1s and 2s. Of course I felt I had brought up all the reasons for it. But he told a professional acquaintance later on that he thought it was overly harsh. It's frustrating because I probably asked the question 1 dozen or 2 dozen times: Please tell me if I am being unfair. This is what makes me upset.

(BM): I believe in bluntness. (The English) don't take it very well. People need to work out the working styles between people. If people are very blunt, once they know what your style is, it's OK. There is a difference between blunt and being offensive. It's hard to distinguish between the two. People may try and think the worse.

(MS): I was very naive. I came over here thinking that folks here were like folks everywhere else. I thought that when you needed people to work extra time, you have deadlines to meet, that people (in England) would do that. They didn't. It was very frustrating.
(RH): I think that (confrontation) does make (the English) uncomfortable. If I can come up with a solution that isn’t going to create the possibility of confrontation then that is much more desired.

The English: What they say about the emotional reactions of the English

(RD): The Brits are much more reserved. Being reserved means things aren’t discussed, which is nonsense. I think that the Brits feel generally uncomfortable. Not true with everybody, but in the main, I’ve come across UK managers and directors who are not good at talking to people. They can’t say ‘what’s the matter.’

(PS): Yes. I think that certainly within teams you need to let people have differences of opinions. And just carry on. Whereas in the UK we tend to worry about (conflict) a bit more. And that does get frustrating for teams here because they say ‘why aren’t you committing, why aren’t you doing this.’

(PGB): In my group I have found that this honesty, this directness has created some fairly awkward moments. The messages have not been necessarily well received and I don’t think it has been very constructive.

The English: What they say about the emotional reactions of the Americans

(RD): Americans sometimes get annoyed (with a process approach to decision-making) because they just want to get on with it. But for the sake of another ten minutes or so it seems a nonsense to actually drive it on: you make a decision at haste and repent at leisure. Quite frankly, if you have experience and have been there you know that there are issues that the hip shooting approach can’t cover. There’s where the (English) frustration comes in. Americans don’t always learn by their mistakes. It’s the impatience thing again. I know many Americans who are outstanding.

(RB): Yes, I think that there are a lot of (English) people that get frustrated with the speed or the lack of speed of real decision-making.

(TB): Shall I tell you what my previous boss said to me about Americans and the English? ‘There is one thing that you have to remember about the Americans. They are more foreign than the Russians’. That type of approach is a good one to have because you can sometimes become extremely confused
when you are with Americans because they may think you understand what they are saying and you may think you understand what they are saying. But if you approach from that aspect then you are not going to be disappointed or get confused. I think it is a really good rule.

8. Beliefs and Stereotypes – The Americans Say the English are Uncomfortable with Conflict

The following comments were representative of those pertaining to the American comments concerning the English manager’s preference for an indirect approach to confrontation.

(JR): The English person in general is more uncomfortable in general about getting feedback, bad, good, or indifferent. It seems that the whole performance system is definitely not something that they are comfortable with. Maybe uncomfortable is not the right word. Performance appraisals seem to be a foreign concept to them. Perhaps they have been appraised before, but it hasn’t been ranking. Maybe it’s been softer, less formal, or less numerically orientated.

(DF): The English open less of themselves, on average.

(AB): Yes, I would have expected, though, (with the English) that there were a lot of conversations behind the scenes, amongst themselves, about the process (of Performance Appraisals). They weren’t upfront about it. I think that Brits are shy at telling you when you have pissed them off.

(BB): The English people that assessed me in particular seemed totally uncomfortable with the entire assessment process. Going into the assessment I had expected the process to be the same as I had experienced in the States. These had been entirely positive experiences. (In English PAs) the running commentary was roundabout, very indirect. I could see that they were discreetly squirming during the entire process. The English tend to construct gentle, roundabout ways of introducing their point. Sometimes the subtlety is just missed entirely by Americans. And you end up with mild frustration on these occasions because it’s sometimes rude and unrevealing to be direct in British culture. I think that the British way is designed to protect feelings and
avoid embarrassments and to avoid situations where people have to save face in any explicit way. Avoiding embarrassment is really the part of the English style in the first place. The difficulty of avoiding difficult issues is that they just fester, they don’t go away. Because of the subtlety and the English reluctance to talk about some things that don’t get talked about, everyone is assuming that everyone knows what is going on. There is just an acceptance of this. There is just a level of ignorance. Basically I feel that many English managers are not used to having discussions of this nature. I think that there is an attitude which sometimes borders on arrogance.

(BM): The English approach (to PAs) is softer, although they get the same information over and cover the same points. The English take a bit longer and you may have to catch onto their meaning, because they don’t want to upset people.

(CM): These were English managers and they didn’t quite know how to handle (criticisms). (The English) were solid in experience, but most of their inclination was to try to be as obtuse as possible. I remember vividly suggesting to one of my managers that she directly confronts these issues, and she came back to me and she was surprised that she got through it, got behind it and it really worked. Shocking. My experience is that I have encountered very few shouters and screamers in the UK. The English are much more subdued.

(DO): Yes. But I think that if I criticised some of those (English) people I think that they would take that personally, and would probably go find another job.

(DP): Because the Brits don’t want to be defiant or they don’t like confrontation. The Brits won’t be confrontational and defy you to your face. It is not quite their style. English people are just a little bit less confrontational about it; usually, they will give you just what they are going to give you and they just try to be pleasant about it, hoping that this will satisfy you and that you will just go away. They are more concerned with keeping things calm and just move on; let’s just try and get along.

(DW): Many times I have inherited (English) managers who would avoid a conflict with an employee even to the detriment of the employee. I had a
couple of English managers who fell into this category. The manager somehow doesn't feel that he can deal with that and says you are doing a great job and that is what he puts down on his PA. They don't want to deal with that directly... But I would say, there is less willingness to have or to deal with conflict (in England).

(MS): Tolerant of conflict and disagreement: It has been my observation that the English are willing to let conflict and disagreements happen and not deal with the underlying problems.

(WL): There is that idea that there is a big moose on the table. Smelly, stinky moose, but nobody talks about it. Working with Bristol, I noticed that if there was a problem, nobody would talk about it. It got to be a big problem sometimes, and still nobody would talk about it.

9. Beliefs and Stereotypes – the English say the Americans are individualistic

Comments which typified the English view that Americans tended to be individualistic, rather than team-orientated in their approaches to leadership and decision-making, are included in this section.

(MF): (The Americans) tend to be more head-on confrontational on individual issues.

(RD): In the past there has been stridency (with Americans). Off the subject, there have been attempts by the Yanks to shout so they will get their way. And it doesn't really work.

(AB): Americans are more directive. That may be people that I have come across. I see the style. They may listen, but they still want to make the decision.

(AM): And loyalty to the group is one of the most important things (in Europe). This is less true in America. Maybe more individualistic, but more alone, more mobile, more prepared to move on regardless of antecedents. Less importance paid to previous generations; less historical context.

(AO): I think that there is an acceptance in the US that you are working in a competitive environment and that you are competing with your peers for salaries and promotions. And that is the way that it is done. There is more of
an acceptance; Americans find it less uncomfortable. Americans are much less tolerant of differences between people and groups. They are much more inclined to be authoritative when solving problems basically.

(GP): I think it is because being second isn’t a good enough attitude; Americans have to be first in everything. I think that Americans are more individualists. Americans will partition things up more, saying what you will be responsible for and this is what you will be responsible for. They are like a puppet master, rather than taking the time to work as a cohesive group. This is my personal experience and I don’t think that being supportive of subordinates is a top priority in the American style. I think that Americans are very competitive. It is like some game. If one person wins, then another person loses. It could be just the people that I have worked with.

(ME): I think a lot of Americans are less team orientated. A lot of them default to working alone. But the best work is done in teams. Sometimes it can be true that Americans value individualism. It really can be – I really see it a lot. So you see a lot of (American) people who see the team only as important if it is helping them. Rather than thinking that it is the team that really makes it happen.

(PF): Americans are slightly more pushy, more competitive. In America there is more shouting, more telling people what they should do. I see less of this is in the UK. I think of multiple examples where Americans have tried to force their way through. In the UK, there are fewer instances of this. I think it happens more in the US

(PGL): Americans are much more likely to do that, to put forward their case, to push themselves forward.

(PS): (Americans) are concentrated on themselves, it is just their culture.

(PS): Of course, the in-built bias is that there is a lot more teamwork in the UK. The American boss doesn’t give a toss about the product, he just cares about his career advancement.

(RB): Generally, Americans will come across as confident and fairly assertive. They believe that they know how they will go about it.
10. Americans: They say the English are formal and follow protocols

The following comments were typical of the American participants' view that the English were formal in their approaches to relationships and tended to follow form and protocol to a greater extent than their American colleagues.

What the Americans Say

(WL): The stereotype of a British manager is very formal, very methodical, very careful, somewhat cautious; cautious and careful are fairly synonymous.

(BP): These meetings are very more structured than in the US. They tend have an agenda provided in advance, with minutes taken and actions captured and followed up. It is probably the same in the US in terms of actions but probably not so formally.

(DF): Yeah. I do think that the English appeal more to accepted norms when used for justification for a decision or a stance than I have seen in the States. In the States it is often all from the bottom up and you argue your way to the answer. You admit that you're doing that. While in England there is more appeal to this is the way it's done. Whether this is a written rule or just an established norm, I don't know. But to say that this is the way we've always done it is an appeal to something outside yourself, rather than pure logic.

(JD): Yeah, I think that the English are more concerned with rules and protocols. Sometimes the rules are implicit, sometimes explicit. English people want to follow the rules.

(CK): English people are more formal. In the way they dress, they speak, they behave. Everybody wears black.

(BB): The English are definitely more concerned about company rules and protocol. This is particularly true in labs where folks are more conscious of rules and look carefully at corporate precedents and laws and employee-employer contracts. There is just a general tendency in England to accept a lot of traditions.

(AN): In my experience there was more structural formality in the UK than in the US. Yes and I think there was more yes sir and less of a willingness to barge into an open door and say things to a person who was several levels above
them in the company. I think that the whole structure thing was more respected and followed in the UK.

(WL): In my observation of the English managers, they are much more formal in relationships with colleagues.

(RH): People in the UK are more formal in the office. You see more of the extreme in the UK than in the US
Appendix C1
Leadership Questionnaires

1. Leadership

1.1. Background – who are your immediate superiors and/or subordinates? What are their nationalities? If you have a working relationship as a manager/subordinate with members of another culture, describe this relationship. How is the same/different.

1.2 Ideally, what do you feel are the characteristics a good leader? In the first column, please mark five characteristics that describe ideal leadership qualities. In the second column please mark five characteristics that describe yourself as a leader. In the third column, mark five items that you think summarise English/American (opposite) leadership qualities in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Culture</th>
<th>Own Culture</th>
<th>Other Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative – takes control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative decision-making, ensuring everyone has a say in the decision-making process and team tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to let subordinates make decisions, take control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with the welfare of employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedient to company rules and protocol, follows views of superiors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views employees as involved and capable of decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty to the group, both at the team and the organisational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on efficient functioning of the team/the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive – prefers to make decisions unilaterally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant of personal friendships among subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of subordinates, encouraging career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal in terms of relationships with colleagues and subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant of conflict and disagreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on completing the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3. Can you name a leader that you admire, in either business, politics, industry or the military etc. What are the qualities and characteristics that made this person a good leader?

1.4. Using the below chart, describe your own style of leadership.

Using the chart below, describe the leadership style of your supervisor.
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Examples:

1.1: Low concern for getting the job done efficiently.

1.9: High Attention to the needs of people.

9.1: High concern for task completion and efficiency.
Appendix C2

Chi-Square Tables Summarising Results of Leadership Questionnaire

1. English Views of American Behaviours

Table C1
Do Americans prefer a task-related approach to leadership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(1, N = 37) = 7.9, p = .01\text{ for a two-tailed test}\]

Table C2
Do Americans have an authoritarian style of leadership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(1, N = 37) = 8.3, p < .01\text{ for a two-tailed test}\]
2. English Views of Their Own Behaviour

Table C3
Do the English own style of leadership centre on loyalty to the group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(1, N = 37) = 6.6, p = .01$ for a two-tailed test

3. American and English 'ideal' Leadership Characteristics

Table C4
Do the English agree that concern for the welfare to the group is an ideal leadership characteristic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(1, N = 37) = 7.3, p < .01$ for a two-tailed test
4. American Views of their Own Behaviour Compared to 'ideal' Leadership Style

Table C5
Do Americans say their “ideal” leadership style reflected concern for the welfare of employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Own</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2(1, N = 36) = 8.0, p < .01 \text{ for a two-tailed test}\]
Appendix D
Company X Case Study Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me about Company X’s espoused corporate values?

2. What do you think were the qualities that Company X was looking for in your selection process? Which of your qualities and/or strengths appealed to the Company X selectors?

3. After joining Company X, were your initial expectations matched by reality? Did they differ from reality?

4. How have you had to adapt your behaviour to conform to the Company X culture? How have you changed? Have you changed your thinking as well?

5. What behaviours have you had to change? How have you have been enabled to change? (Courses? Mentoring? Performance Appraisals?)

6. Describe the process of change. Do you think that these changes are permanent?

7. In what ways did Company X’s management help you to change? How was information about values and expectations about your behaviour communicated to you? How was your behaviour supported?

8. Do you think Company X’s culture and core values enhance economic performance? Do the values and culture support anything else? How?

9. In practice, do you think that Company X’s core values readily translate into actual behaviour in the organisation?

10. Specifically, how has your behaviour changed as a result of adhering to Company X’s core values?
    - Client interactions
    - Communication, behavioural styles:
      - Direct vs. indirect speech
      - Preference for a task vs. process style of decision-making
      - Leadership style
      - View of teamwork vs. individualistic leadership and problem-solving.
Performance appraisals. Are the results of the performance appraisal consistent with what the mentor suggested and alerted you to?

11. Do you think that the Company X corporate culture is consistent throughout its international offices?