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ABSTRACT

This study examines the question of whether communication between superiors and subordinates in a multinational organization is affected by culture. The study assumed that there would be differences between managers' perceptions related to the differences between cultures.

The employee performance appraisal, one tool for evaluating the effectiveness of communication within an organization, was used for examining similarities and differences in perceptions. There were three basic hypotheses:

Hypothesis #1: There are significant differences between expatriate managers' and host managers' values in a multinational corporation.

Hypothesis #2: Differences in perceptions.

#2A: The agreement in perceptions is greater when 1st level and 2nd level managers are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures.

#2B: The accuracy of perceptions is greater when 1st level and 2nd level managers are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures.

Hypothesis #3: There is a positive correlation between the differences in values of 1st and 2nd level managers and the accuracy of perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers.

A single-case study of a Chinese-owned multinational
organization located in the U.S was undertaken. The value survey developed by Hofstede (1980) was used to explore the different values of the two cultures. Direct and meta-perspective perceptions of employee performance were used to examine the perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers with the same or different cultural backgrounds. Both surveys (quantitative) and follow-up interviews (qualitative) of the 1st level managers were conducted to increase the validity of this study.

The 1st hypothesis was supported on only one of the four value dimensions. Namely, Chinese respondents had a significantly higher Uncertainty Avoidance Index than the U.S. respondents. The 2nd hypothesis was also only partially confirmed. It was found that when the 1st and 2nd level managers come from different cultural orientations, there are significant differences in the accuracy of their perceptions of "the quality of work". With respect to the 3rd hypothesis, there was a positive correlation between the differences in masculinity values of 1st and 2nd level managers and the differences in perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers.

Although these findings yield little evidence for supporting the general hypothesis that cultural differences will help to explain misperceptions in employee appraisals,
other findings obtained from the 1st level managers interviews and corporate documents reinforce the importance of culture in explaining differences in managerial practices in a multinational organization.
"The principles and functions of management are universal, but the process of management is culture-bound; hence, culture (i.e., customs, laws, and conditions of a country) is significant as a determinant of managerial effectiveness." (Meggison and McCann. 1965. p. 24).

1.1 A Controversy in Management Research: Culture-free vs Culture-bound

Meggison and McCann (1965) have developed two related but contrasting ideas. The first is that the universal applicability of management principles is accepted by management theorists because the organic functions of management are deemed to be the same at all levels of management and in all organizations. The second states that the effective utilization of the principles of management may be modified by two factors that help a manager achieve success: one is the manager's own unique managerial philosophy which encompasses his/her sense of values, customs, beliefs, and assumptions about the culture in which the organization
exists; the other factor is the manager's knowledge of this culture. This knowledge is vital because one's management philosophy must be compatible with the culture in which the organization exists. Hence, a manager's philosophy may be modified by the culture in which s/he is operating. Therefore, although the universal principles may be true, in some situations it is assumed that they may be affected by the mitigating circumstances of culture. Actually, the results of the research done to determine if management is culture-bound produced opposing conclusions.

Koontz (1969) analyzed the question of whether management is culture-bound by reviewing several studies by other researchers. He indicated that "those who take the position that management is culture-bound reason that since management practices differ and people and their cultural environments vary, management theory and principles (the framework by which management knowledge can be organized) that apply to a developed economy like the United States are not applicable in materially different cultural environments." (p. 418) Simply stated, since cultures differ more or less from country to country, it is easy to assume that the different cultures will be reflected in different management styles. Therefore, it may be assumed that "management is culture bound."
However, Koontz also summarized some persuasive evidence of the universal nature of management which has arisen from studies and analyses of other scholars. For instance, Harbison and Myers (1959) not only found a common "logic of industrialization" but also stated that "organization building has its logic, too, which rests upon the development of management" and that "there is a general logic of management development which has applicability both to advanced and industrializing companies in the modern world." (p. 117) He also found that those who question the transferability of managerial knowledge and the universality of management principles admit that the application of U.S. management knowledge in other countries has often been successful. Haire, Ghiselli and Porter (1966) in a study using 3600 managers in 14 countries, found a high degree of similarity in managerial behavior patterns, but that many of the variations disclosed were due to identifiable cultural differences.

In spite of the research that has been done, the argument still exists. Knootz says "managing as a science and practice is complex enough. But when it is put in the operating framework of enterprise functions and surrounded by a myriad of environmental influences, its complexity becomes virtually incomprehensible." (p. 429)
Several researchers have used cultural explanations in their studies. Most of these researchers chose their samples from different companies in different countries. However, recently some researchers have chosen their different culture groups from multinational organizations. The reason for choosing from multinational organizations is that their number is increasing, and researchers have sought to develop new approaches for improving management practice or to explain this process in multinational organizations. Since, each multinational organization has at least two different cultures represented it makes a good laboratory for cross-cultural research. Along with the question of whether the management process is culture-bound, one might also ask if managerial communication is culture-bound?

This thesis asks if culture is a factor in explaining the differences and similarities of management communication between different cultural groups. The question will be studied in a multinational organization. The following sections will define some key concepts which represent the basic constructs of the present study and review the relevant research for the proposed hypotheses.
Since cultures differ from country to country, much the research about culture has focused on the nation as a unit of analysis. Many questions have been asked concerning identity groups within units of analysis, linkages among identity groups, and the relative strengths of unit and group identities. When we look at managerial studies, we find that those studies using a cultural explanation for managerial differences have a widely divergent concept of culture. Ajiferuke and Boddewyn (1970), analyzed those articles that do provide explanations of culture and concluded that there are several different definitions. For instance, some define "culture" as the attitudes, beliefs, and values of a society. This definition of culture is "enumerative rather than exhaustive, it is useful since it at least identifies certain cultural elements." (p. 155) In contrast, others offer a more general description of culture as "the whole complex of distinctive features characteristic of a particular stage of advancement in a given society." (p. 155)

This definition is not only broad, it also assumes that there is a dynamism inherent in every culture, an assumption which contradicts the concept of culture as stat-
ic and unchanging. Some scholars use the term in the anthropological sense, equating "culture" to either tradition, social customs and attitudes, values, religion, language, or a combination of any of these elements.

Even with these diverse concepts of culture, Ajife-ruke and Boddewyn draw a simple explanation for the interaction of management and culture --"comparative management is usually equated with the study of management in different cultures. Since cultures differ more or less from country to country, it is easy to assume that their differences are reflected in any phenomenon found in them--including their managements." (p. 160)

Culture is the independent variable in most comparative management studies and is equated with values and beliefs. The following study is more specific in explaining how management differs by examining organizations and their culture.

1.2.1 Cultural Dimensions

Adler and Jelinek (1986) have developed a model for explaining cultural variance and locate U.S. organizations within that model. The model has six basic dimensions to describe the primary variability of a society's cultural
Individual: to determine the nature of individual differences, the investigators asked questions related to how people saw themselves and how they perceived the nature of the individual. The U.S. perspective has traditionally viewed people as a mixture of good and evil, and therefore as needing to choose good over evil. Other cultures see people as basically evil or as basically good. Societies which consider people good tend to trust them a great deal. Societies which consider people evil tend to suspect and mistrust them. These differences may explain organizational practices. For example, managers who believe employees can change will emphasize training. Those who believe that people's ways are fixed will emphasize selection.

World: to ascertain people's relationship to their world, Adler and Jelinek looked at three dimensions: dominance, harmony, and subjugation. The U.S. respondents tend to see themselves as dominant over both the man made and the natural environments. Therefore, the U.S. executives see situations as problems to be solved. By contrast, executives in other parts of the world see situations as realities to be accepted.
Human Relations: when judged according to their relationships with others, the U.S. respondents are one of the world's most individualistic peoples; they use personal characteristics and achievements to define themselves. Thus, the individual welfare is placed over that of the group. By contrast, in group oriented societies, people define themselves as members of clans or communities and consider the group's welfare as most important. Individual-ly oriented personnel directors tend to hire those best qualified to do the job according to technical or task criteria, that is, based on the individual's skills and expertise. However, in a group oriented company, management believes that only people who are known by other employees in the company will act responsibly and can be trusted. Therefore, they often hire other employees' friends and relatives.

Activity: activity can be divided into "doing", "controlling", and "being". U.S. managers are "doers," they plan their work, deciding what they will get accomplished by when. By contrast, people from "being" oriented cultures tend to accept the natural pace of life without trying to force or influence it. In other words, they believe that the plan will be completed when it is complete; the task will be done when it is done; it is neither good
nor possible to try to hurry the natural order of events. Therefore, while the doer "lives to work", the being-oriented person "works to live."

Time: "future," "present," and "past" can indicate how societies use time. The U.S. respondents have a present to slightly future time orientation. For them, the past is unimportant, but improvement and progress toward identified future goals are of primary importance. Therefore, the projects in a U.S. firm are usually long-term, but their employment practices are short-term. If employees do not perform well during their first year, they are fired or, at best, not promoted. However, managers in past-oriented cultures believe that they should evaluate plans based on social customs and traditions. Therefore, those companies who conserve past traditions use a more long-term, future oriented time horizon. For instance, most Japanese companies' employees are employed for life.

Space: there are private, mixed, and public dimensions involved in the concept of space. The U.S. respondents tend to be more private. For example, an employee's salary is a subject of high security among employees. By contrast, in Taiwanese companies, salaries are public knowledge and widely discussed among employees.
From these six dimensions of culture, we can see that different cultures produce different behaviors and expectations in its members.

1.2.2 Behaviors and Attitudes

Other research on the relationships between cultural values and employee attitudes was conducted by Whitehill (1964). The basic assumption in this study was the so-called "theory of reciprocal role expectation" which means that "behavioral decisions are made at least partially on the basis of what we feel is expected of us and how well others are fulfilling our expectations of them." (p. 70) Whitehill's basic proposition is that there is a pervasive impact of cultural values upon worker attitudes and behavior. A survey of 2,000 production workers, equally divided between Japan and the United States, was conducted in this study. Six categories (employment continuity, economic involvement, personal involvement, identification with organization, status transfer, and motivational sources) were identified in order to explore the influence of the organization's cultural values on employee attitudes.

The question related to employment continuity asked how long management should feel responsible for a willing but incompetent worker. Fifty-five percent of the Japanese
workers responded that their employment should be continued until they retired or died; but only 23% of the respondents in the U.S. agreed. In addition, 20% of the U.S. respondents recommended terminating the employment of unqualified workers after giving about 2 weeks notice; but only 4% of the Japanese agreed that the employee should be fired on such short notice. These differences support Adler and Jelinek's assumption that in the U.S. we have a present time orientation and Japanese have a future time orientation.

With regard to attitudes concerning economic involvement in aspects of employees' lives not directly related to their work, it was found that 29% of the Japanese expect management to provide company housing at no charge; but only 2% of the U.S. respondents felt that way. On the other hand, 56% of the U.S. respondents expect that management should provide low-interest loans to assist workers in owning their own homes, as opposed to 29% of the Japanese. Obviously, managers anxious to succeed in these cultural settings must proceed quite differently.

To examine "personal involvement" Whitehill asked workers what supervisors should do upon hearing about their subordinates' marriage plans. Seventy percent of the Japanese think a supervisor should offer personal advice to the
worker if requested; but only 29% of the U.S. respondents expected such advice from their employers. In addition, 60% of the U.S. respondents think a supervisor should not be involved in such a personal matter; but only 5% of the Japanese concur. According to this study, then, U.S. employees tend to be more private.

When asked about identification with the organization, once again, 57% of the Japanese think of their company as a part of their life at least equal in importance to their personal life; but only 23% of the U.S. respondents agree. Twenty-three percent of the U.S. employees think of their company as strictly a place to work and entirely separate from their personal life; only 6% of the Japanese feel that way. Obviously, as Adler and Jelinek found, U.S. employees are one of the world's most individualistic peoples. They value individual welfare over that of the group. By contrast, the Japanese are a more group oriented society, so their members emphasize group harmony, unity, and loyalty.

To evaluate "status transfer", the following question was asked: "If your immediate supervisor enters a crowded bus on which you are riding, should you remain seated?" Sixty-three percent of the U.S. respondents think they
should remain seated since a fair rule is "first come, first served,"; but only 5% of the Japanese respondents agree. The assumption here is that greater willingness in this respect is indicative of closer identification of the individual with the company and its goals. Obviously, these two groups are quite different.

Finally, Whitehill examined the sense of responsibility that employees feel for performing well on the job. He asked workers to complete the following "I believe workers are willing to work hard on their jobs because:" 41% of the Japanese showed that they want to live up to the expectations of their family, friends, and society; but only 10% of the U.S. respondents were motivated by these factors. On the other hand, 61% of the U.S. employees feel it is their responsibility to the company and to themselves; only 37% of the Japanese respondents acknowledged this.

In another study of managers, Graves (1972) assumed that the cultural impact upon managerial attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors would differ from England to France. In his findings the English tended to see personal authority as important; the French tended to have a clear conception of role authority. As far back as 1928, Madariaga found that the English preferred action to thought--the French, thought to action.
In 1979, Negandhi found that U.S. firms supported a free flow of communication and encouraged openness while in Latin American and Far Eastern firms a "great deal of secrecy and hoarding of information at all levels" was found. (p. 337)

These results clearly indicate that cultural forces indigenous to a given society have the power to mold the attitudes of workers. It is clear that national culture is a crucial factor in organization studies. Each culture is characterized by different attitudes, values, and beliefs and these are reflected in managerial behavior.

1.3 Culture and Multinational Organizations

The concept of culture has become a viable paradigm for approaching global human resource issues, especially as multinational firms expand throughout the world. The multinational firm involves a complex situation which has at least two cultures. As noted, each group has its unique culture which affects its members' attitudes, beliefs, and value systems. An understanding of these differences can help managers develop a more effective global organization. As this point, most human resource professionals have looked at selection, development, appraisal, and reward systems as reflections of the diversity of employees' cultural backgrounds.
The following studies examine the differences between two cultural groups working for the same multinational organization to see what effects culture has on management practices (communication).

Lee and Larwood (1983) review the earlier studies that have noted that management attitudes are culture related and argue that expatriates understand their own cultures but often not those in which they operate. The basic assumption of these studies may be labelled as "culture-bound" theory. In contrast with earlier studies, Lee and Larwood predicted that expatriates would come to adopt attitudes somewhere in between those of the parent and the host country by a process which they label "cultural resocialization." If this prediction is correct, it also supports the "culture-free" theory-- that an individual is able to choose his/her behavior with no significant effect from the culture in which s/he was raised.

Lee and Larwood developed a comparison study between a U.S. expatriate group and a Korean managers group in 8 multinational firms operating in Seoul. The hypotheses were that Korean and U.S. managers, having different cultural backgrounds, would also have different managerially related attitudes derived from their cultures, and that U.S. expa-
triates in multinational firms operating in Korea, since they have been partially resocialized by their experiences, would have attitudes that are closer to those held by Koreans than to those of U.S. managers in the United States.

The results confirmed that U.S. and Korean managers had substantially different attitudes. This supports the "culture bound" theory. However, the attitudes of U.S. expatriates in Korea were found to be midway between those of Korean and U.S. managers in the comparison groups. This supports a theory of "cultural resocialization".

There are many who maintain that Pacific rim cultures have quite different attitudes from Western cultures (Redding and Casey, 1976), and many cross-cultural studies comparing the U.S. and Japan have been published. Because the Chinese and Japanese people share a similar cultural heritage, one might be tempted to predict the attitudes of managers in Taiwan on the basis of findings from the many studies comparing U.S. and Japanese managers. However, differences exist between the Chinese and the Japanese. Thus, Chang (1985) conducted a comparison study of U.S. and Chinese managers in U.S. companies in Taiwan.

Chang probed several areas of managerial beliefs and attitudes in his study; general attitudes toward the job,
job satisfaction, paternalistic values and ethnocentric expectations and reactions. The respondents were 410 managers at the top level and second level of 70 of the several hundred companies listed in the 1984 Members of The American Chamber of Commerce in Taiwan.

The data indicate that "U.S. and Chinese managers have the same understanding of what is expected of them on the job." This result shows that many multinational corporations have been successful in imparting to their U.S. and Chinese managers the same understanding of what is expected of them concerning the qualitative and quantitative aspects of their jobs.

However, it is somewhat surprising that U.S. and Chinese managers have the same feeling that they cannot satisfy everybody in their jobs; in other words, both groups realized that in order to achieve goals, they had to upset some people. In traditional Chinese culture, the human-relations skill is to maneuver in a complicated situation without upsetting anyone at all--the so-called "saving-face" or "mientze". But this finding indicates that the Chinese respondents were becoming more issue-oriented and less person-oriented or "face-oriented" in handling human relations.
Another finding is that "American managers get more personal satisfaction from doing their job well than Chinese managers." This finding, once again, confirms the assumption of Adler and Jelinek (1986). The U.S. respondents are more individualistic and use achievements to define themselves. By contrast, the Chinese respondents were more group oriented and "personal satisfaction may have smacked of selfishness or an unbecoming lack of modesty."

The Chinese respondents were found to have had more interest in changing jobs within the company than U.S. managers did. Most Chinese managers felt that their present job was perceived as a career stepping stone viewed in long-term perspective. In other words, they were probably either anticipating a promotion to a top position or hoping for a different position to broaden their management experience for future career advancement. The U.S. managers, on the other hand, usually expected to move soon and were not interested in switching to a job of a different nature or in another department. They were more content to stay put.

There were six questions for examining paternalistic values and company behavior of these two groups. The data indicate that the Chinese respondents felt more strongly than the U.S. respondents that supervisors should help with
subordinates' personal problems and that companies should look after the welfare of employees and their families. This attitude is similar to that of the Japanese with respect to personal involvement. It may also slightly confirms the earlier studies that the U.S. workers are more concerned with their private lives than are those of the public-oriented groups.

The last part of Chang's (1985) study examined Chinese managers' ethnocentric expectations and U.S. managers' reactions. He found that the Chinese believe the U.S. expatriates should be adept at local ways of managing subordinates, but the U.S. respondents disagree with this belief. Furthermore, the Chinese believe that expatriates will be more effective if they socialize often with their Chinese colleagues, but, once again, the U.S. respondents disagree with this expectation. These differences may be explained by the traditional Chinese concern for human relations within a group. They express more positive responses about the importance of intercultural socializing between expatriates and host-country managers. In the meantime, the U.S. expatriates may disagree because of their individualistic culture.
According to Chang's (1985) study, some findings show that there are some incompatible differences between expatriate managers and host-managers (so-called culture-bound). On the other hand, other results show that there are somewhat similar attitudes between these two culture groups (so-called resocialization or culture-free). This is also supported by other researchers' assumptions. Singer (1987), for example, says that "Because biologic and environmental factors are ever changing, perceptions, attitudes, values, and identities are ever changing. Consequently, new perceptual and identity groups are constantly being formed, and existing groups are constantly in a state of flux." (p. 59) This constant change in one's identity might decrease the importance of culture as an influence on management style. It supports the theory of cultural resocialization in managerial comparison studies.

1.4 Operationalizing Cultural Differences

The similarities and differences between or among cultures are a central focus for cross-cultural studies. Some cultural differences and similarities can be distinguished by looking at appearance, language, dress, and food. However, there are other cultural characteristics which are not so readily apparent, and there are many approaches for
examining cultural differences and similarities. One common approach is to investigate "value systems", because, as Singer (1987) says, "These refer to our desires, wants, needs, or goals." (p. 21); and "values are closely intertwined with attitudes" (p. 10). Value systems have been used as an explanation for managers' behaviors and attitudes across cultures.

1.4.1 Defining Values

Approaches to the study of values differ widely and have been developed by a wide variety of behavioral and social scientists. Many philosophers and anthropologists, such as Clyde Kluckhohn (1951), and sociologists such as Fallding (1970) represent different approaches to the definitions of values, the level of abstraction or generality being considered, the measurement problems associated with them, and the purposes for which values are measured (England. 1973). However, it can be concluded that values are not directly observable and do not operate independently of the biological organism or social field.

How, then, are the concepts of values and value systems to be defined? Rokeach (1973) provides the following definition:

A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally
or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existences along a continuum of relative importance. (p. 5)

According to Rokeach's definition, the values referring to modes of conduct are called instrumental values and they include such concepts as honesty, love, responsibility, and courage. The values referring to end-states of existence are called terminal values and they include such concepts as freedom, equality, a world at peace, and inner harmony.

Research using theories related to the concept of values provides possible explanations for understanding the personal value systems of people and the impact of values on their behavior. England (1967) developed a theoretical model of the relationship of values to behavior for his management study. This model was designed in terms of the characteristics of managers and the behavioral relevance of values. The potential values which affect behaviors are made up of two classes: non-relevant values (those that would have little or no impact on behavior) and conceived values (those that may be intended or professed). However, these two types of values cannot be considered as dominating behavior without considering environmental influences and constraints. Because values develop in environments, different environments foster different values.
Every individual must inevitably be a member of a myriad of different perceptual and identity groups simultaneously. However, one shares a higher degree of similarity of perception and a higher degree of group identity with some groups than with others. Consciously or otherwise (usually subconsciously) one always rank orders these identities. Not only is each individual's rank order unique but that order varies as the context (environment) varies. (Singer, 1987, p. 49)

All of the identities we hold have some impact on our behavior. The more important our identity with a group, the more it influences our attitudes, values, and beliefs, and thus, our behavior.

1.4.2 A Cultural Value System

In *Culture's Consequences*, Geert Hofstede (1980) argues that "people carry mental programs which are developed in the family in early childhood and reinforced in schools and organizations, and that these mental programs contain a component of national culture. They are most clearly expressed in the different values that predominate among people from different countries." (p. 11) Hofstede, conducting studies from 1968 to 1978, identified four cultural dimensions which dominate value systems in 40 different countries. In other words, these dimensions (labeled power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity) can affect individual thinking, organizations, and institutions in predictable ways.
The first of the four value dimensions of national culture is called "power distance" (PDI). The basic issue of this dimension is "human inequality." Inequality can exist in various areas, such as prestige, wealth, and power; different societies put different weights on these areas. For instance, inside organizations, inequality in power is inevitable and functional. Therefore, the differences in PDI among cultures can be expressed in the perceptions of the superior's style of decision-making, employees' fear of disagreeing with superiors, and with the type of decision-making which subordinates prefer in their boss.

The second dimension of national culture is labeled "uncertainty avoidance" (UAI). We try to cope with issues of uncertainty about the future through the domains of technology, law, and religion. It is believed that the perceptions of uncertainty are related more to personality variables (cognitive processes) than to perceptions of environmental conditions. Hofstede asserted that "If perceptions of uncertainty are affected by personality variables, it is more than likely that they will also be affected by cultural variables." Thus, "if different societies deal with uncertainty in different ways, this should also affect the ways in which they build organizations that react to uncertainty." (p. 157)
The third dimension of national culture is called "individualism" (IDV). It assumes that the degree of individualism/collectivism expected from its members will strongly affect the nature of the relationship between a person and the organization to which he or she belongs. For instance, in the Chinese tradition, individualism is evil; most Western thinkers are happy with individualism. The level of individualism/collectivism in a society will affect the organization members' reasons for complying with organizational requirements and also affect what type of persons will be admitted into positions of special influence in organizations.

The fourth dimension of national culture is "masculinity" (MAS). Masculinity/femininity is fundamental fact with which different societies cope in different ways. For instance, in a masculine society, males have a higher status than females and the good manager is expected to be aggressive, competitive, firm, and just rather than yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense. Hofstede emphasizes the connotations of low and high MAS scores: In high MAS cultures, achievement is defined more in terms of recognition and of wealth; we call this "ego accomplishment." In low MAS cultures accomplishment is defined more in terms of the quality of human contacts and of the living
environment; this is "social accomplishment". High MAS can be reflected by belief in the independent decision maker; the acceptance of a company's interference in private life; higher job stress; the support of theory X (employees dislike work); and greater value differences between men and women in the same jobs. In contrast, low MAS can be characterized as a belief in group decision; the rejection of a company's interference in private life; lower job stress; strong rejection of theory X; and small or no value differences between men and women in the same job.

In short, the four dimensions of national culture that were empirically found in Hofstede's studies are theoretically relevant. They describe basic problems of humanity with which every society has to cope; and the variation of country scores along these dimensions shows that different societies do cope with these problems in different ways. Some of the dimensions interact in their effects upon cultures. The combination of PDI and UAI in particular, affect organizational structures and functioning through the implicit models of the ideal organization which people carry in their minds. Therefore, Hofstede's values survey module has been recommended for future cross-cultural survey studies (Hofstede, 1980).
1.5 Operationalizing Organizational Communication

As has been mentioned, culture can be viewed as a factor in explaining how organizational behaviors differ; and value systems can be treated as an approach to examining cultural differences and similarities in organizational management. There are several practices in organizational management, such as planning, staffing, organizing, and appraising, which can be used to study differences in managerial practices. Employee performance appraisals are usually used in organizations as a basis for administrative decisions such as employee promotion, transfer, and employee development which includes identification of training needs and performance feedback. In addition, Brinkerhoff and Kanter (1980) state that "the performance appraisal process is not an independent, isolated set of activities but is structurally linked to a variety of other features and processes of the organization." (p. 8-9) This means that performance appraisal systems should never be analyzed without full consideration of the context in which the appraisal is being performed—such as organizational structure and the cultures of its managers. Managers who practice employee appraisal will base their employee evaluations at least partially on the basis of what is expected by his/her organization and his/her culture.
The following section will describe not only employee appraisal itself but also its implications and relevant relationships in multicultural studies.

1.5.1 The Employee Appraisal

Litterer and Kikoski (1982) analyzed a number of pressures--some traditional, others novel--which are increasing the use and significance of performance appraisal systems today. First is the general need for organizations to become more productive and more effective. Those who stress Human Resource Development argue that the best way to make organizations more effective is to make better use of human potential. Thus, performance appraisal is a management tool which can link organizational needs and individual capabilities. Second, the growth of unions is pushing public organizations to make their employment procedures more objective and rational. More objective, accurate, and fair performance appraisals will be required in conjunction with promotion, pay-raises, discipline, and dismissals. This environmental pressure has made performance appraisals a fundamental issue. Third, the passage of the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act not only demanded linkage between executive performance and pay, but also established performance appraisal as the principal method for its accomplishment.
Because of these strong pressures, employee performance appraisals can be expected to play an increasingly central and crucial role in both public and private organizations.

From a communications point of view, however, an employee's performance appraisal is one tool for evaluating the effectiveness of an entire organization; its function is not just the evaluation of one employee which ends in his or her reward or punishment. The process of performance evaluation involves a series of variables in the communicating process, from the written language used on the appraisal form to the communication of appraisals—-the way findings are relayed to the employee. Because of its complexity and its importance to organizations, employee performance appraisals have been studied from many perspectives. For instance, Decotiis and Fetit (1978) indicated that performance appraisal research has addressed various aspects of the process.

The model of the performance appraisal process and discussion of its components suggest three conclusions with respect to performance appraisal research: (a) it is voluminous; (b) largely unsystematic; and (c) at least as subject to fads and fashion as any other aspect of personnel research and practice. (p. 644)

Since employee performance appraisals have been studied from many perspectives, the following section will
review one organizational function that is indicative of effective communication; whether or not it motivates the employee.

1.5.1.1 Motivation

Motivation, a term generally used in the behavioral sciences, is an important element in the employee appraisal process. Specifically, in performance evaluation, it can be used to identify the behavioral dimensions that predict subordinate work performance.

Oldham (1976), based on his research, believes that the conditions in organizational environments (such as reward systems, feedback systems, and task structures) can have a crucial impact on individuals' motivation levels. Thus, a supervisor who creates a positive working environment for his/her subordinates is more effective in motivating them. The actual techniques supervisors use to create conditions that motivate subordinates can be labeled "motivational strategies."

Oldham identified nine specific motivational strategies which might be applied by supervisors: personally rewarding, personally punishing, setting goals, designing feedback systems, placing personnel, designing job systems,
materially rewarding, materially punishing, and designing reward systems. It is expected that subordinate motivation and performance can be increased by the use of these strategies. In short, the hypothesis was that the more effective a supervisor is in motivating his subordinates, the greater will be his subordinates' rated productivity. The results of this study indicate that five of the proposed strategies of motivation (personally rewarding, setting goals, designing feedback systems, placing personnel, and designing job systems) significantly support the hypothesis. The only strategy which failed in this study was personally punishing; the other three had no significant effect.

While Oldham was concerned with what supervisors can do to motivate employees, Decotis and Petit (1978) investigated motivation as a factor influencing supervisors' evaluations of subordinates' performance. They conducted a study based on Taft's (1971) theory, which indicates that the accuracy of performance appraisals can be viewed at least partially as a function of a rater's motivation to appraise accurately. Decotiis and Petit indicate that there are six determinants of a rater's motivation.

Without regard to the order of their importance, they are: (a). perceived consequence of accurate appraisal for both rater and ratee; (b). rater perceptions of the adequacy of the performance appraisal instrument used; (c). relevant organizational policies and practices; (d). rating format
itself; (e). availability of appropriate standards of performance; and (f). purpose of appraisal. (p. 636)

If we draw key-words from each of these determinants of rater motivation, they are "perceived consequences", "rater perceptions", "organizational policies", "rating format itself", "standards of performance", and "purpose of appraisal". The first two are personal perceptions; the other four concern the organizational structure. Thus, we may attempt to determine rater motivation by examining personal perceptions and the organizational structure.

**Personal Perceptions**

One definition of personal perception is suggested by Singer (1986):

Perceptions are the ways in which a person experiences the world. They also determine the ways in which we behave toward it. That "world" includes symbols, things, people, groups of people, ideas, events, ideologies, and even faith. In sum, we experience everything in the world not "as it is"--because there is no way that we can know the world "as it is"--but only as the world comes to us through our sensory receptors ----Hence, virtually every message to which we attend will be at least indirectly affected by our cultural conditioning. (p. 7)

According to Singer, our perceptions have to pass through the filters of our censor screens, our decoding mechanisms, and the collectivity of everything we have
learned from the day we were born. In other words, perception, one component of motivation, has to be affected by culture, and a rater's motivation towards his employee will differ from culture to culture.

Organizational Structure

Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (1985) have reached similar conclusions to personal perceptions about organizational structure, the other component of motivation, by saying that "Structure is an important cause of individual and group behavior." (p. 417) As we know, organizations are purposeful and goal-oriented, and the structure of organizations facilitates this. The process of organizational design consists of managers making decisions and taking actions. These decisions and actions may range from those about individual jobs to those about environmental factors. The design of a specific organizational structure may be explicit or implicit; it may be "one-shot" or developmental; it may be done by a single manager or by a team of managers.

Gibson and his colleagues propose four design decisions (division of labor, delegation of authority, departmentatization, and span of control) which result in the structure of an organization. According to these four determinants, organizational structure can be divided into
various types which will make different decisions and take
different actions. In other words, a manager perceives what
kind of organizational structure s/he belongs to, and then s/he
motivates his/her subordinates in the particular way
which is accepted by her/his organization.

These research reviews reveal that, personal percep-
tions and organizational structure (two key components of
motivation) are closely related to culture. Therefore, when
a rater evaluates his/her ratees, s/he will motivate them in
a way related to the organizational structure s/he belongs
to. The next section will review comparison studies to show
that different cultures produce different results in per-
formance appraisals.

1.5.1.2 Cultural Affects

The complexities of the appraisal process become
even more pronounced when one looks at employee evaluation
procedures in different cultures. In Western countries, for
example, many appraisal programs contain a three-step pro-
cess. The supervisor completes a numerical and prose evalu-
ation; the employee reads it and responds to it in writing;
and a second-level reviewer, usually the appraiser's immedi-
ate superior, evaluates both the appraisal and the response.
McGuire (1980) suggests that the problem with this pattern
is that the supervisor feels forced to deal with two diverse audiences in the same document. In other words, while the appraiser's ostensible task is to evaluate the employee, his or her own judgments are also being evaluated for their soundness, completeness, and the information they provide to the second-level reviewer. Facing this complex duty, the appraiser generally tends to overemphasize the employee's weaknesses and the declared purpose of helping the employee to improve performance fails to be accomplished.

In Asia, on the other hand, Saner-Yui Lichia and Saner-Yui Raymond (1984) contend that Confucianist management practices have contributed strongly to the spectacular business success of the "four dragons" of the Far East: Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. In Confucianist cultures, such as Taiwan's, the most commonly-used appraisal methods are rating scales, essays, and forced selections. These methods are embedded in a socio-cultural context characterized by collectivism and large power distances, which may differ from Western societies. Each department in a Taiwanese company is viewed as a family within a larger clan system. The department head is seen as the paternal figure in the whole family or clan. The staff of the departments are the "children" and each "child's" performance reflects the "parent's" (superior's) management
capabilities. In other words, if the staff does not perform well, the boss is to blame. Therefore, Taiwanese superiors reluctantly write critical evaluations, and to rate their own staff negatively is strongly resisted since it could result in disapproval from the top. "One does not hang out one's dirty laundry."(p. 28)

Comparing Western and Oriental cultures, then, we find that Western supervisors focus on their subordinate's weaknesses, but in the East, the ratees' weaknesses may be covered up by the raters. These studies by McGuire (1980) and Saner-Yui (1984) may give us a hint that a performance appraisal is purposeful, relevant, and pertinent to the organization in the context in which it exists. Thus, cultural, as well as organizational features, may affect an appraisal's practice and outcome.

The influence of cultural factors may be better understood by examining the results of the following comparison study which analyzes the differences between two cultures (Japan and the U.S.). Zierden (1983) believes that one of the most apparent differences is in the physical responses of U.S. and Japanese managers to problem situations. He observed managers' actions at the moment they spotted a problem and noted their responses to the situ-
The typical American manager responded to surprises by a sound of "aw-sh". On the other hand, the typical Japanese responded to surprises with "slss-honn". Zierden points out the implications of these different responses: the "slss-honn" requires an inhalation and the prolonged "honn" sound is akin to the widely known "oom" sound that is chanted while meditating and is associated with a state of deep relaxation. In contrast, the "aw-sh" response is accompanied by tension and a sharp exhalation. In other words, it would seem that the Japanese manager invigorates his mind and body with a fresh supply of oxygen and then experiences a short period of meditative relaxation. What the "slss-honn" reflects about the attitudes of Japanese managers is that it typifies their more positive response to circumstances. The "aw-sh" indicates that most Americans believe that business should run according to some perfect model where any discrepancy should be responded to with negative energy, criticism, stress, and anger.

This does not mean, of course, that attitudes will totally change by switching from an "aw-sh" response to a "slss-honn" sound or vice versa. However these two sounds may be indicative of a real difference in managers' and cultures' attitudes toward problems.
The differences between Taiwan and the United States in appraisal practices and between U.S. and Japanese attitudes toward problems cannot be explained without examining their culture background.

1.5.2 Communication and Employee Appraisals

Employee appraisals involve considerable communication between managers and employees, and employee motivation is central to this communication. Actually, it would be extremely difficult to find an aspect of a manager's job that does not involve communication. Therefore, the pertinent question is not whether managers engage in communication, because communication is inherent to the functioning of an organization, but rather, whether managers communicate well or poorly. In other words, as Gibson and his colleagues (1985) mention, "communication itself is unavoidable in an organization's functioning; only effective communication is avoidable. Every manager must be a communicator. In fact, everything that a manager does communicates something in some way to somebody or some group. The only question is, "with what effect?" (p. 531)

Since communication is inherent in any organization, the question of how superiors and subordinates interact and communicate to achieve both personal and organizational
goals has been an object of investigation by social scientists for most of the 20th century. Jablin (1979) reviewed empirical research examining superior-subordinate communication, and divided it into nine topical categories. Each of these categories represents a series of investigations. One of the nine is "semantic information" which has been described as the gap in information and understanding that exists between superiors and subordinates on specified issues.

Jablin drew ten basic conclusions from the early research on semantic-information distance. They can be related briefly as follows:

(a) The larger the semantic distance between superior and subordinate, the lower will be the subordinate's morale.
(b) Superiors tend to overestimate the amount of knowledge subordinate's possess on given topics.
(c) Management personnel tend to describe themselves by traits that are different from those that subordinates use to describe themselves.
(d) Managers and workers differ in the criteria that they use in making judgments about people.
(e) Significant gaps in semantic distance exist between union and management and between union leadership and their members.
(f) Superiors and subordinates have difficulty agreeing on the basic job duties and demands facing subordinates.
(g) Whether a superior has previously held his/her subordinate's job has little effect on reducing the semantic-information distance between them.
(h) Superior's perceptions of the attitudes of subordinates toward him/her is often unrelated to their actual attitudes.
(i) Serious semantic differences between superior and subordinate are frequent.
(j) There is some evidence that indicates that superiors "find it easier to communicate with subordinate managers
From the above results of earlier research there are many misperceptions in superior-subordinate communication. The last of Jablin's conclusions indicates that it is easier for superiors to communicate with subordinate managers whose attitudes are similar to their own. In a multinational organization (where superiors and subordinates come from different countries and carry different cultural attitudes), it can be assumed that the misperceptions will be larger than in those organization in which both superiors and subordinates carry the same cultural backgrounds.

1.6 A Common Communication Problem

Misunderstanding or disagreement has been studied as a common problem between superiors and subordinates. The following two studies investigated the perceptions of superiors and subordinates in their roles as performance rater and ratee.

Thornton (1968) formulated his assumption from the research results of Kirchner (1965) that subordinates tend to rate themselves more favorably than do their supervisors. Therefore, Thornton's research questions were as follows: what agreement and disagreement is there between performance
appraisal ratings by supervisors and subordinates? How accurate are the self-perceptions of executives in appraising their own performances?

Sixty-four members of management participated in the performance appraisal program. Twenty-seven items were chosen for analysis. The findings were similar to the previous results: there is a large degree of disagreement or misunderstanding between superiors and subordinates.

A more open appraisal system was examined by McConkie (1979). In the traditional approach to appraisals it is likely that managers play "God" in judging the personalities of subordinates. But Management by Objectives (MBO) is an approach in which subordinates participate in goal setting and performance. Hence, it is expected that there will be less misunderstanding in MBO appraisal processes. A review of the literature largely confirms that it is more objective than others; however, a great deal of confusion still exists concerning how MBO is actually used and its users evaluated.

McConkie attempted to explain this confusion by saying "This seems important because there are many factors—psychological forces, past work experiences, present working climate, and scores of others—which so forcefully impact
upon the individuals in the organization that their behaviors may be difficult to mold into the MBO appraisal format."

In 1981, Smircich and Chesser replicated Thornton's research, but they attempted to show that understanding or misunderstanding would be moderated by the nature of the relationship between superiors and subordinates. The specific moderating variable explored was the degree of authenticity in the superior-subordinate relationship. They assumed that high reality perceptions would be closely associated with authenticity in relating, since in a highly authentic relationship both parties would listen to one another and display a low degree of misunderstanding. In other words, in low authenticity relationships the subordinates feel that the superior controls the situation and does things without their knowledge—behind their backs. This belief may explain a high degree of misunderstanding. Surprisingly, the results showed that both high and low authenticity parties have significant misunderstandings. Their findings lead one to wonder why misperceptions exist in open organizations.
1.7 Summary

The performance appraisal is a management tool which can link organizational needs, environmental factors, and individual capabilities. The standards of raters for evaluating performance can reflect the value systems which are fostered in specific cultures. The concept of performance appraisal does not focus on the results of rewards or punishments, but on those implicit or explicit factors which underlie the appraisal practice. Motivation, for instance, is one of the important components for explaining different management practices. Decotis and Petit indicate that there are six determinants of rater motivation. Among those determinants, personal perceptions and organizational structure are the crucial factors.

Perceptions are defined as the process by which an individual selects, evaluates, and organizes stimuli from the external environment. Technically speaking, perceptions are taught by the groups with which people identify. Thus, perceptions are group-related and are also what constitute cultures. Organizational structures are divided into various types—closed, or open organizations, etc.—which may cause different decisions and actions in management practices. Therefore, a manager perceives what kind of organiza-
tional structure s/he belongs to, and then motivates her/his subordinates in the particular way which is accepted by his/her organization.

In sum, the personal perceptions and organizational structures that are important components in determining raters' motivation are group-related, and are sometimes used synonymously with the word culture. Studies that look at the employee appraisal in light of cultural factors use values to measure the differences between and among cultures. The four dimensions of values (labeled power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity) proposed by Hofstede are a significant attempt to categorize the values affecting organizational behavior.

As has been noted, a manager's perceptions, values, and attitudes differ in accordance with his/her culture. An assumption may be that there will be differences between managers' perceptions related to the differences between or among cultures. The work place of the multinational company usually has at least two different kinds of workers--those from the parent company who represent a foreign culture and the others from the native culture. Usually, each culture is characterized by different attitudes, values and beliefs that are reflected in managerial behavior. As mentioned,
misunderstanding between superiors and subordinates occurs in any type of organization; it is especially likely to occur in multinational organizations.

Communication is a process of expressing one's thoughts and reflects one's values, attitudes, beliefs and disbelief systems. It is especially important in the employee appraisal process. Actually, it would be extremely difficult to find any aspect of a manager's job that does not involve communication. Therefore, most organizational studies cannot be conducted without considering communication. Misunderstanding has been shown to be a common problem between superiors and subordinates; indeed, according to Smircich and Chesser (1981), misunderstanding is expected to happen in any organization even in high authenticity organization.

Because cultural values appear to play a role in understanding cross-cultural communication, the present study will modify the Smircich and Chesser study in a multinational corporation to focus on the bicultural nature of the corporation and the ability of cultural variables to explain managers' misperceptions. It will use Hofstede's values questionnaire to determine the value structures of the two cultures. The Hypotheses and procedures for the study are given in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER 2. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In organizational behavior research, there has been concern about the difference between superiors' and subordinates' perceptions. These differences can be viewed as "disagreement," especially when they occur in managerial communication. The implications of these misunderstandings can be explained as "dysfunction" between managers and employees. Two of the studies mentioned earlier have examined the misunderstandings between superiors and subordinates. Thornton (1968) discovered that there is a large degree of disagreement or misunderstanding between superiors and subordinates in performance appraisals; Smircich and Chesser determined that both high and low authenticity organizations have significant misunderstandings. Therefore, the first assumption of this present study is that misunderstanding will exist between supervisors and subordinates in most organizations.

One area of research that focuses on this perceptual disagreement has been employee performance evaluation.
Because the employee performance evaluation involves a series of variables in the communication process, the disagreement between superiors and subordinates will frequently occur in the performance appraisal.

As mentioned earlier, personal perceptions are the ways in which a person experiences the world; the "world" includes symbols, things, people, groups of people, ideas, events, ideologies, and even faith. Hence, every message to which we attend will be at least indirectly affected by our cultural conditioning. In other words, perceptions are affected by culture. Therefore, the culture (values, laws, customs, etc.) may affect the process of employee performance appraisal.

For the purpose of this study, the four main dimensions of value systems (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity) proposed by Hofstede will be used.

2.1 Hypotheses

To test the assumptions of misunderstanding, 1st level managers were asked to evaluate the organizational behavior of their 2nd level managers (1st direct perspectives), 2nd level managers were asked to evaluated their own
organizational behavior (2nd direct perspective), and how they think the 1st level managers evaluated them (2nd meta-perspective). Agreement of perception is equal to 1st direct perspective minus 2nd direct perspective and accuracy of perception is equal to 1st direct perspective minus 2nd meta-perspective (McLeod and Chaffee, 1973).

If the assumption that two different cultures possess two different value systems is accepted, it can be assumed that the misunderstandings between supervisors and subordinates who come from different cultures will be greater than those who are from the same culture.

Therefore, in the present study, the hypotheses are:

Hypothesis #1: There are significant differences between expatriate managers' and host managers' values in a multinational corporation.

Hypothesis #2: Differences in Perception

#2A: The agreement in perceptions is greater when 1st level and 2nd level managers are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures.
#2B: The accuracy in perceptions is greater when 1st level and 2nd level managers are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures.

Hypothesis #3: There will be a positive correlation between the differences in values of 1st and 2nd level managers and the accuracy of perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers, i.e., the more their values differ the greater will be their differences in perceptions.
2.2 Method

The case study is but one of several ways of doing scientific research. The single-case study, one type of case study strategy, is an appropriate design for testing a theory which has specified a clear set of propositions and circumstances in which the propositions are believed to be true. It may be possible to confirm, challenge, or extend the theory by looking at a single case. Furthermore, it can be used to determine whether a theory's propositions are correct, or whether some alternative set of explanations might be more relevant. For this reason, a single-case study will be conducted to implement the present research.

Although the case study is a distinctive form of empirical inquiry, many research investigators have pointed to some disadvantages of the case study, especially the fact that it provides very little basis for scientific generalization. To avoid possible disadvantages, the present study will supplement the traditional case study with quantitative data; thus, it may be called a "triangulation study." It will include both surveys (quantitative) and interviews and corporate documents (qualitative).
2.2.1 Sample Choice and Background

The first criterion for selecting an organization to study was that it be multinational. A local plastics Corporation (hereafter called "Plastics") was chosen because it is a large multinational company with a branch in Delaware. This branch is one of several of the company's subsidiaries. The corporation was established in 1957 and is well-known as a major company in Taiwan. Its management is considered successful and can be called typical of the Chinese style of management. The Delaware branch was established seven years ago, and Chinese management practices have been followed there.

Another reason for choosing this company is that it is solely owned by the Chinese. Therefore, the organization's own subculture and decision making is directed from Taiwan. If an organization starts a foreign venture with a local partner, a key question centers around who controls the venture. In the case of shared-control, it may be argued as to whether or not the multinational organization can impose its home culture. But this multinational company is completely Chinese owned and controlled from Taiwan.

The subjects are the following: (a). two Chinese first-level managers and two Chinese second-level managers;
(b). two American first-level managers and fifteen second-level managers. Their position distribution is shown in Figure 1.

The four Chinese managers are senior employees in the company. This means that they worked in the home company for a long time and then were trained and transferred to the foreign subsidiary. In addition, the Chinese managers occupy decision-making positions in this subsidiary, but it can be assumed that their values reflect their own home-culture. All the U.S. managers were hired in the United States. It is assumed that their value systems represent that of the U.S.
Figure 1:  Stratification of Subjects
2.2.2 Research Instruments

Three sources of evidence will be used in this study: documentation, interviews, and surveys. The type of data collected with each instrument is summarized below.

2.2.2.1 Survey

Hofstede's *Culture's Consequences* is concerned with identifying the specific elements (work-related values) of which culture is composed. The data used for the empirical part of his research were extracted from an existing bank of paper-and-pencil survey results collected within subsidiaries of one large multinational business organization in 40 countries, and covering, many questions about values. In his own research, Hofstede used an unusually large number of (national) cultures: at first, 40; later on, 53. Therefore, it overlaps at least partly with most other cross-national studies as far as the countries covered are concerned.

The population of Hofstede's studies included employees of different subsidiaries of the same multinational business corporation, a narrow but well-matched set of samples. His survey was taken twice, around 1968 and 1972, producing a total of over 116,000 questionnaires. Additional data were collected among managers participating in
international management development courses and unrelated to the first multinational business organization. Therefore, the four main dimensions (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity) on which cultures differ were determined by theoretical reasoning and statistical analysis.

These four dimensions of culture can be viewed as a combination of quantitative and qualitative characteristics. Hofstede computed the reliability scores for individual items on the values survey. The mean of these scores was 0.53 (p. 75). Therefore, the values survey (see Appendix A) developed by Hofstede will be used in the present study. It will be given to both the first and second level managers in order to examine the first hypothesis of the study.

The scale for perception of performance, which has been modified from that used by Sims and Szilagyi (1975), assesses six dimensions: quality of work, quantity of work, dependability, ability to get along with others, initiative on the job, and overall performance. Actually, these six items were developed by Porter and Lawler (1965). A factor analysis of this instrument yielded a single factor (Szilagyi, 1974). The split half reliability of this scale, corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula, was 0.94. (Sims and Szilagyi, 1975, p. 429)
Each superior rated the performance of his subordinates participating in the study (direct perspectives) using this scale (APPENDIX B). The subordinates completed a modified version of the rating scale, which asked them to rate their performance, not the way they perceived it, but, instead, the way they believed their superior would rate them—meta-perspective (APPENDIX C). They were also asked to rate their performance as they perceived it—direct perspective (APPENDIX D). This allowed an examination of the second hypothesis. A comparison of the differences in perceptions with differences in values allowed an investigation of the third hypothesis.

2.2.2.2 Documentation

Organizational documentary information may be relevant to the implicit or explicit data which will be utilized in this study. Therefore, a variety of documents was read, e.g., appraisal forms, company philosophy, etc., to help develop the corporate culture and obtain information about its value systems.

2.2.2.3 Interviews

Since the interview can be one of the most important sources in a case study, both manager groups were available
for interviews if the quantitative data warranted it, using questions of an open-ended nature (see Appendix E). However, the statistical data warranted only that the 1st level managers be interviewed. These were taped for a more accurate rendition of the interviews. These interviews enabled the researcher to follow-up the leads found with the questionnaires and the documentation.

2.3 Procedure

The perception of values questionnaire developed by Hofstede was administered to all the managers on both levels. Since there were only four Chinese subjects in the manager pool, the reliability for this group is questionable. For this reason, interviews were conducted to elaborate those items which were deemed necessary. An analysis of the differences between the values of the managers from the two cultures as recorded by the values questionnaire enabled the researcher to evaluate the first hypothesis.

The perception-of-performance questionnaire, which was developed from that of Porter and Lawer, was administered to determine direct perspectives (each superior rated the performance of his subordinates and each subordinate rated his own performance) and meta-perspectives (the subordinates rated their performance in the way they believed
their superior would rate them). By comparing the direct perspectives the degree of agreement/disagreement between the two levels of managers was calculated, and by comparing the 1st level direct and the 2nd level meta-perception the degree of accuracy of perception between Chinese managers and U.S. managers was calculated. These data were used to evaluate the second hypothesis in the present study.

A correlation of the differences between manager's values with the differences between the direct and meta-perspectives of the managers produced the information necessary to evaluate the third hypothesis.

2.4 Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative analyses were used. The qualitative analysis consisted of the interviews and documentation. The quantitative analysis consisted of an analysis of variance of the managers' responses to the questionnaires and correlations between differences in values and perceptions. The statistical results were augmented by the qualitative reports. The data and the results of these analyses are presented in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER 3. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Twenty-four questionnaires were sent to four departments of a large multinational company's branch in Delaware. Twenty-three surveys were returned and judged as usable (95 percent of the sample). There were four nationalities represented in the responding population: 17 Americans (74%), 4 Chinese (17.4%), 1 German (4.3%), 1 Iranian (4.3%). The questionnaires were administered only in English, since the foreign respondents, as expatriate upper-level managers and mid-level managers, had a good command of the English language. The survey consisted of two parts for both 1st level managers (N=4) and 2nd level managers (N=19): 1) a values survey—to examine the first prediction that the respondents' nationalities would influence their value systems, 2) a perception survey—to determine if the degree of misperception would be higher among different nationality groups.

The content of the value-system questionnaire (designed by Hofstede) was divided into five sections: the first consisted of demographic variables such as education,
sex, nationality, etc. For these items respondents simply circled the number of the alternative that best described their situations. The rest of the questionnaire consisted of ten work goals represented in 27 questions which indicated four different value dimension: individualism, power distance, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance (see Table 3.1 & APPENDIX A).

Eleven of the thirty-one questions on the survey were designed to elicit individualism values (IDV: 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 22, 25, 27); 3 of the items were to indicate power distance (PDI: 19, 20, 26); 14 items, for masculinity (MAS: 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25); and 16 items were concerned with uncertainty avoidance (UNA: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27); Some items were used for more than one subscale. Since some of the items were stated negatively, the order of the four dimensions on the Likert-type format (1=utmost importance; 5=no importance) sometimes had to be recoded into opposite scores when the data were computer analyzed. The sum of the item scores for each dimension was the value used for that dimension in the computer analysis.

There were six items for performance appraisal in the second questionnaire: quality of work, quantity of work,
Table 3.1: Ten Work Goals Used in Questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>Full Questionnaire Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2      | Challenge      | "Have challenging work to do - work from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment."
| 13     | Desirable area | "Live in an area desirable to you and your family."                                    |
| 11     | Earings        | "Have an opportunity for high earnings."                                                |
| 8      | Cooperation    | "Work with people who cooperate well with one another."                                |
| 4      | Physical conditions | "Have good physical working conditions."                                  |
| 7      | Freedom        | "Have considerable freedom to adapt your own approach to the job."                    |
| 6      | Employment security | "Have the security that will be able to work for your company as long as you want to." |
| 14     | Advancement    | "Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs."                          |
| 5      | Manager        | "Have a good working relationship with your manager."                                  |
| 1      | Personal time  | "Have a job which leaves you sufficient time for your personal or family life."        |

Number = Number on the questionnaire
(from Hofstede, p. 239)

dependability, ability to get along with others, initiative on the job, and overall performance. The questionnaires were structured with a Likert-type format where "1" meant
extremely low performance and "5" meant extremely high performance. The upper level managers were asked to rate their 2nd level managers' performance (APPENDIX B), and each employee also completed the same questionnaires twice: once to show how they thought their 1st level managers would rate their performance (APPENDIX C); and another time to indicate how they rated themselves (APPENDIX D). The data were treated as three sets: the 1st level managers' direct perceptions of the 2nd level managers, the 2nd level managers' meta-perceptions of the 1st level managers, and the 2nd level managers' direct perceptions of themselves.

The respondents in this case-study included 17 from the U.S., 4 from China, 1 from Germany, and 1 from Iran. Since this study was designed as a comparison between the United States and Taiwan the German and Iranian were omitted in the analysis of the first and third hypotheses, but they were taken into account when the second hypothesis was examined.

The data described in this section are based on the questionnaires and are presented in three parts. Each part relates to an hypothesis of this research. As the number of the subjects was very small (N=23), the significant P value was increased from .05 to .10 in the statistical calculations (Hays, 1973).
3.1 Results for Hypothesis #1

The first hypothesis predicted that there would be significant differences between expatriate managers' and host managers' values in a multinational corporation. The results of the analysis of variance of the four value dimensions are presented in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>NATIONALITY</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>2-Tail VALUE</th>
<th>PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALISM</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTANCE</td>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASCULINITY</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>*0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOIDANCE</td>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= Number of cases.  S.D.= Standard Deviation  
* Significant Difference

As noted in the last column of Table 3.2, hypothesis #1 was supported only on the uncertainty avoidance dimension (P < .10). This result indicates that the Chinese respondents' values on the uncertainty avoidance dimension (UAI) were significantly different from the U.S. group's. Accord-
According to Hofstede's explanation, there are various consequences of high and low UAI levels for organizational behaviors (see Table 3.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low UAI</th>
<th>High UAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Less structuring of activities</td>
<td>*More structuring of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fewer written rules</td>
<td>*More written rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*More generalists or amateurs</td>
<td>*Larger number of specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Organizations can be pluriform</td>
<td>*Organizations should be as uniform as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Managers more involved in strategy</td>
<td>*Managers more involved in details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Managers more interpersonal oriented and flexible in their style</td>
<td>*Managers more task-oriented and consistent in their style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Managers more willing to make individual and risky decision</td>
<td>*Managers less willing to make individual and risky decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*High labor turnover</td>
<td>*Lower labor turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*More ambitious employees</td>
<td>*Less ambitious employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lower satisfaction scores</td>
<td>*Higher satisfaction scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Less power through control of uncertainty</td>
<td>*More power through control of uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Less ritual behavior</td>
<td>*More ritual behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Hofstede p. 186)

Because the values on the other three dimensions were not statistically different, and since the sample was so small, it is advisable to look at each dimension's mean in order to discover some of the implications. According to
the findings of Hofstede's surveys (1971-1973), Taiwan has a higher power distance value index but lower masculinity and individualism value index than the U.S.A. (pp. 104, 279, 222). The mean scores presented in this study for IDV & PDI are in the same direction as Hofstede's findings, but not for MAS.

3.2 Results for Hypothesis #2A

Table 3.4 represents the findings related to hypothesis #2A, which is that the agreement in perceptions of the 1st level managers and the 2nd level managers from the same culture will be greater than those between the 1st level managers and the 2nd level managers from different cultures. The scores of 1st level managers' direct perspectives were subtracted from the scores of 2nd level managers' direct perspectives, and the absolute values were used for a one-tailed T-test (the smaller the absolute values, the greater the agreement in perceptions).

As noted in Table 3.4, only one of the six items (ability to get along with others) reached statistical significance for these two groups. However, it was statistically significant in the wrong direction; the mean for the same nationality group was greater than that for different nationality groups. The other five items showed no signifi-
Table 3.4: Perceptual Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>1-Tail PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Work</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Work</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAME = 1st and 2nd level managers have same nationalities (N=11).
DIFF = 1st and 2nd level managers have different nationalities (N=8).

Significant differences. An explanation for these results will be explored in the next chapter.

3.3 Results for Hypothesis #2B

Table 3.5 represents the findings related to hypothesis #2B, which is that the accuracy of perceptions of the 1st level managers and the 2nd level managers from the same culture will be greater than those between the 1st lev-
el managers and the 2nd level managers from different cultures. The scores of 1st level managers' direct perspectives were subtracted from the scores of 2nd level managers' meta-perspectives, and the absolute values were used for a one-tailed T-test (the smaller the absolute values, the greater the accuracy in perception).

Table 3.5: Perceptual Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>1-Tail PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Work</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Work</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt; .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAME = 1st and 2nd level managers have same nationalities (N=11).
DIFF = 1st and 2nd level managers have different nationalities (N=8).
* Significantly Different
As noted in Table 3.5, only two of the six items (quality of work and ability to get along with others) reached statistical significance for these two groups. From the index of means it can be seen that only the item quality of work supported hypothesis #2B, which was that the accuracy of perceptions of same nationality groups are greater than those of different nationality group (SN mean= 0.27, DN mean= 0.75—the greater the accuracy the smaller the mean of the differences). The item "ability to get along with other" was statistically significant in the wrong direction; the mean for the same nationality group was greater than that for different nationality groups. The other four items showed no significant differences. An explanation for these results will be explored in the next chapter.

3.4 Results for Hypothesis #3

Table 3.6 presents the data related to hypothesis #3, which is that there will be a positive correlation between the differences in values of 1st and 2nd level managers and the difference in perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers. This hypothesis predicted that the greater the difference in values systems or beliefs, the greater would be the differences in respondents' perceptions. Therefore, the data from the value survey and the perception
survey were analyzed using the Pearson's correlation coefficient which is used simply to summarize the strength of a linear relationship between two variables. As noted in Table 3.6, only one of the belief systems, masculinity, showed a strong relationship between values and perceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>INS</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCES</td>
<td>.1638</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.3435</td>
<td>.1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>(df=19)</td>
<td>(df=19)</td>
<td>(df=19)</td>
<td>(df=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEPTION</td>
<td>P = .251</td>
<td>P = .466</td>
<td>*P = .075</td>
<td>P = .335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INS= Individualism  PDI= Power Distance
MAS= Masculinity    UAI= Uncertainty Avoidance
* Significant Difference

These results will be discussed in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 4. COORIENTATIONAL MEASUREMENTS

In addition to the major examination of hypothesis #2 in Chapter 3, there are three other tests that can aid in interpreting the results of the managers' perceptions.

The first involves an examination of the differences in 1st and 2nd level managers' direct perspectives in the same nationality groups and different nationality groups (agreement of perceptions = hypothesis #2A). The mean scores presented in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 indicate that all the subordinates rated themselves higher than their supervisors rated them, whether they were of the same nationality or not.

Only one item (ability to get along with others) reached statistical significance in the same nationality groups; while three items (dependability, initiative on the job, and overall performance) were significant in the different nationality groups. When 1st and 2nd level managers have the same cultural background, the data show that there was a significant difference in the evaluation of "ability
Table 4.1: Direct Perspectives--Same Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different  Number of Cases= 11.

to get along with others." In contrast, when 1st level and 2nd level managers have different cultural orientations, significant misperceptions occurred in the evaluation of "dependability" and "overall performance". An explanation of these findings will be offered in the next chapter where the information obtained in the interviews will be discussed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&gt;0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly Different  Number of Cases = 8

The second explanation is generated by the coorientational measurement model shown in Figure 2.

This measurement model was proposed by McLeod and Chaffee (1973). They believe that "congruency" is not a true interpersonal variable from the objective social system point of view since it is indexed by the degree of similarity between
Person A

A's cognitions about X

Congruency A

perception of B's cognitions

Person B

B's cognitions about X

Congruency B

perception of A's cognitions

A-B Understanding or Agreement

Accuracy

A

B

Note: The boxes indicate the measures that are made on each person. Lines connecting the boxes are labeled to indicate the measures that are compared to construct each coorientational index (from McLeod, p. 484).

Figure 2: The Coorientational Measurement Model.
the person's own cognitions. The point is that the degree of similarity, or cognitive overlap, between the orientations of person A and B, which might be called similarity of perception, will increase the score of understanding in the research index, but not really mean a high understanding score between person A and B. Therefore, an accurate understanding of communication between the two groups requires a consideration of the relationships among these three orientational measures.

Since five of the six variables failed to support hypotheses #2A & 2B, the coorientational measurement model should be taken into account. To accomplish this, three basic variables were used. The first of these, congruency, is the absolute sum of the scores of the 2nd level managers' direct perceptions minus their meta-perceptions scores; the second, agreement, is the absolute sum of the scores of the 1st level managers' direct perceptions minus the scores of the 2nd level managers' direct perceptions; the third, accuracy, is the absolute sum of the score of the 1st level managers' direct perspectives minus the scores of the 2nd level managers' meta-perceptions. These three sums were analyzed using a two-tailed T-Test comparing the 11 cases of the same nationality group with the 8 cases of different nationality groups (see Table 4.4).
Unfortunately, there are no statistically significant differences between these two groups on any of these measures. This means that the more complex coorientational measurement model can not produce any further explanations for the failure of hypotheses #2A & B.

The third explanation was developed from the study of Lichia Saner-Yui et al (1984). They stated that in Confucianist cultures, such as Taiwan's, the boss-subordinate relationship counts heavily in performance appraisal. Thus,
to rate one's own staff negatively is strongly resisted. This personal view of the manager-subordinate relationship is called "mientze" or "face saving". On the other hand, in 1980, McGuire's study found that in Western cultures the appraiser generally tends to overemphasize the employee's weaknesses.

From these two extreme assumptions, we predicted that the two Taiwanese managers would rate their subordinates higher than the two U.S. managers, and indeed this was the case. The Taiwanese managers gave higher scores to their subordinates whether or not they were of different nationalities; while the U.S. managers gave lower scores to their subordinates. In two cases the Taiwan and U.S. scores were significantly different (Table 4.5).

These results indicate that for "Quantity of work" and "Overall performance" the Taiwanese managers rated their subordinate groups (N=7) significantly higher than the U.S. managers rated their subordinate groups (N=12). These data support our predication and might have implications for the failure of hypotheses #2A & B.

A possible explanation for the failure of hypothesis #2B may be that, since the data in Table 4.1 & 4.2 show that all the 2nd level managers tended to rate themselves (2nd
Table 4.5: Taiwan & U.S. 1st Level Managers' Direct Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>*0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant Difference

Direct) higher than their 1st level managers did, it follows that the 2nd level managers might expect the 1st level managers (2nd Meta) to rate them higher than they did. From Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 it is seen that this was indeed the case and forms the bases for the accuracy between 1st and 2nd level managers' perceptions.
Table 4.5: Direct and Meta-Perspectives--Same culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different  Number of Cases= 11.

In most cases, the scores of the 2nd level managers' Meta-perceptions are higher than those of the 1st level managers' direct perspective of the 2nd level managers.

This consequence may say that the smaller misperceptions between different nationality groups than between the same nationality group does not mean that the respondents
Table 4.7: Direct and Meta-perspectives--Different Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>2-TAIL PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Ability to get along</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Direct</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly Different  Number of Cases= 8

have the same perceptions or a high understanding of each other, but that Taiwanese managers have a tendency to rate their subordinates highly, and this coincides with the tendency of the subordinates to give themselves even higher self-evaluations. A detailed explanation will be discussed in the next chapter.
Since communication is inherent in any organization, the question of how superiors and subordinates interact and communicate to achieve both personal and organizational goals has been an object of investigation by social scientists for most of the 20th century. Most research indicates that although "effective communication" has been studied by social scientists and attempted by organizations themselves, misunderstandings or disagreements between superiors and subordinates are still a common problem. The present research was designed to help increase the understanding of the communication process between superiors and subordinates in a multinational organization. Three basic hypotheses were examined:

H1: There are significant differences between expatriate managers' and host managers' values in a multinational corporation.

H2: Differences in perception
   2A: The agreement in perceptions is greater when 1st level and 2nd level managers are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures.
   2B: The accuracy of perceptions is greater when 1st level and 2nd level managers are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures.
H3: There will be a positive correlation between the differences in values of 1st and 2nd level managers and the accuracy of perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers.

5.1 Research Method

A single-case study was conducted to implement this research. A multinational organization, headquartered in Taiwan with a branch in Delaware, was chosen for this case study. The Chinese expatriate subjects (N=4) are senior employees in this company and represent their own home culture (Chinese culture). The U.S. subjects (N=16) were hired in the United States, and represent the host culture (the U.S. culture). The value survey developed by Hofstede (1980) was used to explore the different values of the two cultures. Direct and metaperspective perceptions of performance were used to examine the perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers with the same or different cultural backgrounds. A comparison of differences in perceptions with differences in values allowed an investigation of the third hypothesis.

To increase the validity of this study both surveys (quantitative) and follow-up interviews (qualitative) for the 1st level managers (N=4) were conducted. This type of research is sometime called a "triangulation study".
5.2 Discussion with Interview Data

The primary intent of this study was to test for the importance of culture in influencing the communication between 1st level and 2nd level managers in questions dealing with employee performance appraisal. For this study communication was equated with perceptions. The major results were:

1. The 1st hypothesis, that there were significant differences by cultural groups in their work-related values was supported on only one of the four value dimension. Namely, Chinese respondents had a significantly higher uncertainty avoidance index than the U.S. respondents.

According to Hofstede's explanation, there are three factors involved in national levels of uncertainty avoidance: rule orientation, employment stability, and stress. Compared to the U.S. respondents, Chinese managers tend to favor work situations that are more task-oriented, more standardized and uniform, contain more written rules, have more structured activities and ritual behavior. They are less willing to make individual and risky decisions, and labor turnover is lower.

2. The 2nd hypothesis had two parts. Hypotheses #2A & 23 were that the agreement in perceptions and the accuracy of perceptions of the 1st level managers and the 2nd level managers were greater when they are of the same culture than when they are of different cultures. In #2A, none of six items supported the hypothesis. In #2B, only one item, "Quality of work," supported the hypothesis.
This indicates that when the 1st and 2nd level managers come from different cultural orientations, there are significant misperceptions in the evaluation of "Quality of work." The item, "Ability to get along with others," was statistically significant but in the wrong direction in both parts of the 2nd hypothesis.

3. The 3rd hypothesis, that there would be a positive relationship between the magnitude of differences in cultural values and accuracy of perceptions was supported only on the dimension of masculinity. This means that there was a positive correlation between the differences in masculinity values of 1st and 2nd level managers and the accuracy of perceptions between 1st and 2nd level managers.

Although these findings yield little evidence for supporting the general hypothesis that cultural differences will help to explain misperception in employee appraisals, other findings obtained from the 1st level managers' interviews and corporate documents reinforce the importance of culture in explaining differences in managerial practices and the communicating processes. However, they also indicate that factors other than culture may explain the differences and similarities in managerial practices in a multinational organization.

Through the interviews it was found that the U.S. 1st level managers think that organizational structure was affected by cultural orientation. The Chinese organizational structure tends to have more formal authority. They consider differing ranks and status to be natural and inevitable. In other words, the Chinese managers place more
emphasis on hierarchy; thus, the leader or manager is seen as making decisions autocratically and paternalistically, and subordinates usually fear disagreement with their superiors. This is one obvious contrast to the U.S. norms. When this factor of authority is transferred into Hofstede's four value dimensions, it can be characterized as power distance. In the primary results, although there were no statistically significant differences in the ratings of power distance between cultural cluster groups, the interviews indicate that the Chinese managers were seen as having greater power distances by the U.S. managers.

Another managerial difference, from the U.S. interviewees' point of view, is that the Chinese management style in this multinational corporation tends to be more group oriented. A possible explanation is that the traditional work hours in Taiwan are from Monday to Saturday, and the four Chinese expatriates (although they are in the minority) still maintain this schedule. They work longer hours than U.S. workers on every week day, and they work on Saturday if it is necessary. U.S. workers, on the other hand, are seldom willing to give up their weekends. In addition, the Chinese managers often define the individual commitment to the group and the functioning of the organizational entity as vital to human unity and harmony; individuality is con-
sidered to be evidence of immaturity. As opposed to normal Chinese perceptions, therefore, the U.S. managers admitted that they are more individualistic than the Chinese managers in this multinational corporation. Unfortunately, these conclusions are from the interviews and are not supported in the primary statistical analysis.

According to Hofstede's explanation, differences in the value of masculinity will affect the hierarchy of organizational work-goals. For instance, the advancement, supervising others, responsibility, working on problems central to the organization, earnings, and creativeness are more important for men. The congenial associates, ample leisure time, relationship with superiors, physical conditions, and variety are more important for women. These sex differences in work goals are expected to affect perceptions and evaluations of manager behavior. Because of a lack of information in this case study, it is impossible to draw conclusive results with respect to "masculinity."

In sum, by the statistical results and an analysis of the interviews, three of the four value dimensions have some support as factors to identify the differences between the Chinese respondents and the U.S. respondents.
Two other tests have provided evidence which might help explain the inability to fully support hypotheses #2A & 2B. One test finding supports Kirchner's research result (1965) that subordinates tend to rate themselves more favorably than do their supervisors. Thus, the scores for the 2nd level managers' direct perspective and for their meta-perspective of the 1st level managers' direct perspectives are higher than the 1st level managers' direct perspectives of the 2nd level managers' performance (see Table 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, and 4.6).

In addition, another test finding supports the earlier research results of Lichia Saner-Yui et al. (1984) and McGuire (1980) that the Chinese managers rate their subordinates more positively, while the U.S. managers rate their subordinates less positively (see Table 4.4). Thus, the scores of the Chinese managers' direct perspectives about their subordinates' performance is higher than that of the U.S. managers'. These combined results may indicate that the insignificant differences between the perception scores of different nationality groups do not mean that the respondents have the same perceptions or a high understanding of each other, but that Chinese managers have a tendency to rate their subordinates highly, and this coincides with the tendency of the subordinates to give themselves high self-evaluations.
Of course the possibility exists that the 2nd level managers under the 1st level U.S. managers would have been evaluated at the same level by the 1st level Chinese managers, and vice versa. Since we do not have sufficient data to test this possibility, it remains a limitation of the study and a suggestion for a future study.

Another implication which can be drawn from the information elicited from the two Chinese managers' during their interviews is that when Chinese managers perform employee appraisals, they rate their subordinates by assessing an individual in terms of his own cultural context rather than by applying specific standard criteria. In other words, the Chinese managers have two standards of evaluation. When they rate their U.S. subordinates, they realize that the U.S. cultural characteristics are different from their own, thus, they do not evaluate them in terms of Chinese values. In contrast, they rate their own national subordinates by Chinese cultural work values.

This implication not only explains why significant misperceptions did not exist between the different nationality groups, but also gives a hint for future research. This type of future comparison study might attempt to identify the criteria of evaluation for employees in a multinational
organization. If there are multiple standards, research can help determine if some of these criteria are more effective than others in motivating employees.

One unexpected finding with respect to hypotheses #2A & 2B. is that there is a significant difference in perception concerning ability to get along with others between 1st and 2nd level managers of the same nationality group, while this difference did not exist in different nationality groups. After follow-up interviews, one explanation for this unexplained finding may involve language. Language ability influences levels of communication. Although this multinational organization is owned by Taiwanese, the common language is English. Therefore, the communication among the Chinese managers and their U.S. subordinates may be more superficial and polite than that which occurs within the same nationality group. Although the Chinese managers have a good command of English, it still may be difficult for Chinese managers to distinguish a subtle verbal conflict. Thus, the U.S. managers are able to detect and so indicate when criticizing their subordinates' abilities to get along with others. This finding not only explains the unexpected results in the primary analysis, but also suggests an area for future research: the depth of communication in multinational organizations.
If we reported only on the statistical results of our study, it might be concluded that the communication between superiors and subordinates in this multinational organization is not heavily influence by cultural differences. To confirm or deny this conclusion, the question "Do you think there are any differences between the U.S. and Chinese cultures?" was asked during the interviews. All of those interviewed responded "yes, there are cultural differences--." A further question was posed: "Do you think these cultural differences will create a communication barrier or disfunction in your organization?" The managers we interviewed agreed that cultural differences used to be a problem when the Taiwanese company first bought this plant. But, after eight years, they agree that these differences are no longer a big problem. They think that neither the U.S. culture nor the Chinese culture dominates this organization, although both do exist. A combination subculture makes the organization effective.

This combination subculture is somewhat similar to the finding of Lee and Larwood's (1983) "resocialization," in which the behaviors of expatriate managers become more like those of the host culture. In addition, it can also be referred to as an "organizational culture." In Schein's book of Organizational Culture and Leadership, he defines
the concept of culture as being rooted more in theories of group dynamics and group growth than in anthropological theories of how large cultures evolve. The work "culture" can be applied to any hierarchy level. For example, at the broadest level, we have civilization and refer to Western or Eastern cultures; at the next level, we have countries with sufficient ethnic commonalty that we speak of American culture and Chinese culture. But within a country we also have various ethnic groups to which we attribute different cultures. To summarize, at any of these structural levels, culture will be defined as:

A pattern of basic assumptions--invented discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration--that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems." (p. 9)

The idea of a combination subculture found in the present research indicates that an "organizational culture" has developed. A fruitful approach to future research in multinational companies may be to define the organizational culture with respect to the country's culture from which it developed.

The information elicited in this study also points to some implications for future research in organizational
culture and leadership. As Harris (1985) mentioned, each of us, to a greater or lesser degree, is a product of our culture. Our behavior is influenced by our heritage; the national culture of our origin, which we can call our "macroculture." We are further affected by the many subgroups (or "microcultures") of which we are a part--such as a corporation, a religious group, or a profession (p. 31). Furthermore, as Albrecht (1987) pointed out "cultures are seldom homogeneous. They tend to be regional, that is, made up of various segments and subcultures within the main culture. Just as the formal organization is composed of divisions, branches, departments, and units, so the culture of an organization is really a combination of many subcultures." (p. 51) For instance, there may be many subcultural divisions in a purely U.S. organization. Jews, Catholics, New Yorkers, Southerners, people with college degrees, joggers and the like all have special interests. Thus, any formal organization combines many subcultures, especially a multinational organization. If a multinational organization can modify two very distinctive and powerful cultures into a subculture within the main organizational culture, it may be more effective in managerial practices.

One of the questions arising out of the consideration of corporate culture is how to combine or modify cul-
tures in an international organization. In our case, one key point learned from the interviews is that there are strong relationships between the organizational culture and the leader. Our findings reflect the ideas of Graves (1986). He indicates that the leader can be seen as a culture-giver, the epitome of behavior, the giver of meaning, moderator of the culture, and custodian of the culture. Thus, the leader has a complex relationship with the culture. The question of how leaders evaluate the "health" of a combination culture may also be a valuable subject for future study.

5.3 Concluding Remarks

The results of this study indicate that the organizational values held by the Chinese expatriate managers working in the United States are somewhat different from the values held by the U.S. managers and that the misunderstandings between 1st and 2nd level managers in performance appraisal are slightly influenced by cultural backgrounds; there is a partial correlation between value differences and perception differences between 1st and 2nd level managers. The findings of this study only partially support the author's initial assumption—the fact that culture can be an important variable in the analysis of misperceptions in a
multinational organization. The results are consistent, however, with the perspective that culture must be considered with other independent variables in cross-cultural research. Future research attempting to isolate culture as the most significant variable may be inconclusive.

It is still very important to recognize, however, that if a global manager is to be effective in the international marketplace, cultural awareness and skills are essential. Furthermore, a worldwide subculture of management is emerging, and one needs to know how to function effectively in it. For this reason, further research should be devoted to this area, and the limitation of the present study—such as the small number of subjects, the overlapping of variables, etc., should be taken into account. It would also be useful to add a Chinese managerial group who works in Taiwan and a U.S. group who works for a U.S. company. The additional data obtained by comparing the Chinese manager group in Taiwan with the Chinese expatriate manager group in the United States may yield some evidence for testing the assumption of "cultural resocialization". The emphasis should be on the empirical development of new propositions and a revision of the model used in this study. More importantly, a systematic consideration in this area will provide researchers and practitioners alike with a better under-
standing and more effective means of controlling the process of communication in any type of organization.
APPENDIX A: HOFSTEDE'S VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Please think of an ideal job--disregarding your job. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you to (please circle one answer number in each line across):

1 is of utmost importance;
2 is very important;
3 is of moderate importance;
4 is of little importance;
5 is of very little or no importance;

1. Have sufficient time left for your personal or family life? 1 2 3 4 5
2. Have challenging tasks to do, from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment? 1 2 3 4 5
3. Have little tension and stress on the job? 1 2 3 4 5
4. Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)? 1 2 3 4 5
5. Have a good working relationship with your direct superior? 1 2 3 4 5
6. Have security of employment? 1 2 3 4 5
7. Have considerable freedom to adopt your own approach to the job? 1 2 3 4 5
8. Work with people who cooperate well with one another? 1 2 3 4 5
9. Be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decisions? 1 2 3 4 5
10. Make a real contribution to the success of your company or organization? 1 2 3 4 5
11. Have an opportunity for high earnings? 1 2 3 4 5
12. Serve your country? 1 2 3 4 5
13. Live in an area desirable to you and your family? 1 2 3 4 5
14. Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs? 1 2 3 4 5
15. Have an element of variety and adventure in the job? 1 2 3 4 5
16. Work in a prestigious, successful company or organization? 1 2 3 4 5
17. Have an opportunity for helping
other people? 1 2 3 4 5
18. Work in a well-defined job situation where the requirements are clear? 1 2 3 4 5

The descriptions below apply to four different types of managers. First, please read through these descriptions:

Manager1: Usually makes his/her decisions promptly and communicates them to his/her subordinates clearly and firmly. Expects them to carry out the decisions loyally and without raising difficulties.

Manager2: Usually makes his/her decisions promptly, but, before going ahead, tries to explain them fully to his/her subordinates. Gives them the reasons for the decisions and answers whatever questions they may have.

Manager3: Usually consults with his/her subordinates before he/she reaches his/her decisions. listens to their advice, considers it, and then announces his/her decision. He/she then expects all to work loyally to implement it whether or not it is in accordance with the advice they gave.

Manager4: Usually calls a meeting of his/her subordinates when there is an important decisions to be made. Puts the problem before the group and invites discussion. Accepts the majority viewpoint as the decision.

19. Now, for the above types of manager, please mark the one which you would prefer to work under (circle one answer number only):
1. Manager 1
2. Manager 2
3. Manager 3
4. Manager 4

20. And, to which one of the above four types of managers would you say your own superior most closely corresponds?
1. Manager 1
2. Manager 2
3. Manager 3
4. Manager 4
5. He/she does not correspond closely to any of them.

21. How often do you fell nervous or tense at work?
1. I always feel this way
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. I never feel this way.
Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

1 is strongly agree
2 is agree
3 is undecided
4 is disagree
5 is strongly disagree

22. A company or organization's rules should not be broken—even when the employee thinks it is in the organization's best interests.       1 2 3 4 5
23. Most people can be trusted.                               1 2 3 4 5
24. Quite a few employees have an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if they can.         1 2 3 4 5
25. A large corporation is generally a more desirable place to work than a small company.      1 2 3 4 5
26. How frequently, in your work environment, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?
   1. Very frequently
   2. Frequently
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Very seldom
27. How long do you think you will continue working for this company or organization?
   1. Two years at most
   2. From two to five years
   3. More than five years (but I probably will leave before I retire)
   4. Until I retire.
28. Are you:
   1. Male
   2. Female
29. How old are you?
   1. Under 20
   2. 20-24
   3. 25-29
   4. 30-34
   5. 35-39
   6. 40-49
   7. 50-59
   8. 60 or over
30. How many years of formal school education did you complete? (starting with primary school; count only the number of years each course should officially
take, even if you spent less or more years on it; if you took part-time or evening courses, count the number of years the same course would have taken you full-time).
1. 10 years or less
2. 11 years
3. 12 years
4. 13 years
5. 14 years
6. 15 years
7. 16 years
8. 17 years
9. 18 years or more

31. What kind of work do you do?
   a. I am a manager (that is, I have at least one hierarchical subordinate) -- go to f.
   b. I am not a manager and I work most of the time in an office-- go to e.
   c. I am not a manager and I do not work most of the time in an office-- go to d.
   d. If you are not a manager and you do not work most of the time in an office, what do you do:
      1. Work for which normally no vocational training, other than on-the-job training, is required (unskilled or semi-skilled work).
      2. Work for which normally up to four years of vocational training is required (skilled worker, technician non-graduate engineer, nurse, etc.)
      3. Work for which normally a higher-level professional training is required (graduate engineer, doctor, architect, etc.).
   e. If you are not a manager and you work most of the time in an office, what do you do:
      4. Work for which normally no higher-level professional training is required (clerk, typist, secretary, non-graduate accountant).
      5. Work for which normally a higher-level professional training is required (graduate accountant, lawyer, etc.).
   f. If you are a manager, are you:
      6. A manager of people who are not managers themselves (that is a first-line manager).
      7. A manager of other managers.

32. what is your nationality?

33. And what was your nationality at birth (if different from your present nationality)?
APPENDIX B: FIRST LEVEL MANAGERS DIRECT PERSPECTIVES

Please rate each of your direct subordinates on the following aspects of their job performance. For each item, circle a number between 1 and 5.

1 is = to Extremely Low Performance,
2 is = to Low performance,
3 is = to Neither Low nor High Performance,
4 is = to High Performance,
2 is = to Extremely High Performance.

Name:

1. Quality of Work: 1 2 3 4 5
2. Quantity of Work: 1 2 3 4 5
3. Dependability: 1 2 3 4 5
4. Ability to get along with others: 1 2 3 4 5
5. Initiative on the job: 1 2 3 4 5
6. Overall Performance: 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for this information. Please turn the page and complete the following questionnaire on your work related values.
APPENDIX C: SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS
META-PERSPECTIVES

Please respond to the following aspects of your job performance the way you think your manager would rate your performance. (In other words, put yourself in your manager’s shoes and rate yourself as he would rate you.) For each item, circle a number between 1 and 5.

1 is = to Extremely Low Performance,
2 is = to Low performance,
3 is = to Neither Low nor High Performance,
4 is = to High Performance,
5 is = to Extremely High Performance.

1. Quality of Work: 1 2 3 4 5
2. Quantity of Work: 1 2 3 4 5
3. Dependability: 1 2 3 4 5
4. Ability to get along with others: 1 2 3 4 5
5. Initiative on the job: 1 2 3 4 5
6. Overall Performance: 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for this information. Please turn the page and complete the following questionnaire.
APPENDIX D: SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS DIRECT PERSPECTIVES

Please respond to the following aspects of your own perception of your job performance. For each item, circle a number between 1 and 5.

1 is = to Extremely Low Performance,
2 is = to Low performance,
3 is = to Neither Low nor High Performance,
4 is = to High Performance,
5 is = to Extremely High Performance.

1. Quality of Work: 1 2 3 4 5
2. Quantity of Work: 1 2 3 4 5
3. Dependability: 1 2 3 4 5
4. Ability to get along with others: 1 2 3 4 5
5. Initiative on the job: 1 2 3 4 5
6. Overall Performance: 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for this information. Please turn the page and complete the following questionnaire on your work related values.
APPENDIX E: GENERAL QUESTIONS ON THE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

1). Do you think there are any cultural differences between or among you and your co-workers?

2). Before you worked here did you understand any Chinese cultures? and then, now how much do you think you understand it?

3). What are the differences between the first day you worked here and today in terms of cultural issues.

4). What is the most difficulty things for you in getting along with others in your company?

5). What do you think are the most important things you contribute to this company?

6). What values does your company emphasize?

7). What criteria do you use to evaluate your subordinate for each item: quality of work, quantity of work, dependability, ability to get along with others, initiative on the job, and overall performance.

8). Do you have freedom to consult or not consult with your subordinates before making a decision?

9). Do you see yourself as needing support from your subordinates?

10). Do you see your subordinates as being afraid to disagree with you?

11). Do you feel a need for more written rules?

12). Do you feel a need to be more task-oriented or interpersonal-oriented in your job?
13). Do you feel that having autonomy or security is more important in your job?

14). Do you feel socializing with other employees in this company is important to your job?

15). Do you feel males and females have equal opportunity for advancement in this company?

16). Do you feel a lot of stress in your job?
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