

INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM AS PREDICTORS OF FUNCTIONAL
ROLES AND COMMUNICATOR STYLE OF INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF
MULTICULTURAL TEAMS

Presented to the Faculty

Regent University

College of Communication and the Arts

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master of Arts in Communication

by

Glenn Martin

April 15, 1998

Thesis Committee Chairman - Dr. Rodney A. Reynolds

Member - Dr. William J. Brown

Member - Professor Donald E. Piper, Jr.

Abstract

Cultural individualism-collectivism as expressed in self-construals is expected to predict functional group roles and communicator styles on multicultural teams. Team members who exhibit an interdependent self-construal are expected to gravitate toward maintenance roles in the group and a preference for a friendly, attentive communicator style, whereas members who exhibit an independent self-construal are expected to gravitate toward task roles and a preference for a contentious/argumentative, open, and dominant communicator style. A survey was conducted of 124 members of multicultural teams located worldwide. Results supported a moderate positive relationship between interdependent self-construal and maintenance group roles, and between independent self-construal and task group roles. Support for a relationship between self-construal and communicator style was mixed.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank the faculty and staff of the College of Communication and the Arts for the privilege of sharing in this academic community. You have enriched my life in ways I can hardly begin to express, and I carry with me the mark of having been with you. Special thanks to Dr. Rodney Reynolds for the caring and competent instruction in the writing of this thesis. More than that, special thanks to Rhoda, whose sacrifice and encouragement enabled me to excel; I continue to be amazed at how beautifully you live out Proverbs 31. May you be blessed! And above all, honor and praise to God whose faithful love is the fountain of all for which we give thanks.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	6
Thesis Statement	9
Review of Literature	9
Groups	9
Group roles	10
Cultural diversity	13
Dimensions of cultural diversity	16
Individualism and collectivism	18
Communicator style	23
Summary and hypotheses	25
Chapter 2: Methodology	28
Participants	28
Procedure	29
Independent variable	30
Dependent variable	31
Chapter 3: Results	33
Measurement	33
Hypotheses	34
Chapter 4: Discussion	36
Hypotheses	36
Limitations	39
Suggestions for Future Research	40

Endnotes	42
References	43
Appendix A: Survey Form	50
Appendix B: Codebook	55
Survey Data	57
Appendix C: Biography of Youth With A Mission	63
Appendix D: Foundational Values of Youth With A Mission	65

Chapter 1

Introduction

The world is getting smaller. Thanks to communication and transportation technologies unheard of a century ago, people have a much greater liberty to travel than ever before in history. A lot more mixing of race and culture is taking place. In the United States, often thought of as a predominantly white nation, it is estimated that the majority of public school-age children will be non-white by the year 2000, and that roughly 45 % of the net increase in the American labor force during the 1990s will be made up of ethnic minorities (Cox, 1993, p. 3). Cultural heterogeneity is becoming the norm.

These changes have not escaped the notice of academia. The present emphasis on research in this field traces back to the landmark study “Workforce 2000” (Johnston & Packer, 1987). Commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor, this study surprised the business community with its prediction that white males would make up only 15 % of the net additions to the labor force between 1985 and 2000. A flurry of research and discussion on the effects of diversity in the workplace has followed (Fine, 1996; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Nelton, 1995).

Diversity research has focused on various expressions of diversity, such as differences of race and ethnicity, gender, age, personality characteristics and values, and skills and knowledge (Jackson, 1992; Milliken & Martins, 1996). This paper is most concerned with diversity of race, ethnicity, or culture, though other aspects of diversity will be considered from time to time as they apply to the topic at hand.

How will organizations be affected by the increased diversity in their midst? Is this diversity primarily a good thing or a bad thing? Research to date has suggested that there are cognitive and symbolic benefits to diversity (Cox, 1993, pp. 14-40; Milliken & Martins, 1996). Nonetheless, the research has also found that diversity bears important psychological and social costs (Milliken & Martins, 1996). The same diversity that enhances breadth of perspective also inherently increases potential for irreconcilable differences of opinion; the critical issue then becomes the *management* of diversity (Jackson, 1992; McLeod, Lobel, & Cox, 1996; Thomas & Ely, 1996). This is a communication issue: diversity, managed and mediated by communication, can enhance a team's effectiveness (Adler, 1986, pp. 111-118; Jackson, 1992; Maznevski, 1994). These studies found that productivity was dependent on communication in teams made up of diversity of membership. When effective communication existed within the team, diverse teams outperformed less diverse teams; when communication within the team was poor, the diverse teams were much less productive than their homogeneous counterparts.

The challenge to researchers in this field is to facilitate the management of diversity by improving the understanding of the process by which group diversity affects performance. Uncertainty reduction theory (URT) provides a theoretical framework for our research into this topic (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). URT suggests that the primary motivation in human relationships is the reduction of uncertainty, leading to the establishment of norms for behavior, and thus to predictability in interaction. This has been applied to small group research (Booth-Butterfield, Booth-Butterfield & Koester, 1988) and is arguably a good explanation for communication behavior in teams with a

diversity of members (see also Gudykunst, 1989). URT offers an explanation for the process by which team members negotiate and find their place. For both researchers and members of such groups, a better understanding of these processes could help to relieve primary tension in teams and promote more effective interaction.

To date none of the diversity research reviews (Cox, 1993; Fine, 1996; Jackson, 1992; Maznevski, 1994; Milliken & Martins, 1996) address the effect of membership cultural diversity on the selection of functional roles (Mudrack & Farrell, 1995) by team members. It is expected that in multicultural teams, cultural values will be found to predict the selection of functional roles by members. It is suggested that this gravitation of individuals towards roles for which they have been socialized in turn leads to the interaction that makes for more productive teamwork. In other words, if a culture tends to value group harmony over individual autonomy (i.e., collectivistic culture), then an individual from that culture would be more likely in a multicultural setting to gravitate towards a functional role of, for example, “harmonizer” (Mudrack & Farrell, 1995). In contrast, an individual from a culture that values giving constructive criticism and speaking one’s mind even in dissent (i.e., individualistic culture) would more naturally fill the role of, for example, “initiator-contributor” (Mudrack & Farrell, 1995).

These tendencies to do what comes most naturally to them would naturally proceed from the individuals’ desires to reduce the uncertainty of their environment. In turn, this understanding provides us with an explanation for the success of diverse groups: the joining together of a group of “experts,” whose expertise may have as much to do with group process or maintenance as with group product or task. If our understanding is correct, then the deliberate facilitation of this process should enhance

team effectiveness. In any case, a better understanding of this issue could enhance the understanding of *how it is* that diversity is related to productivity. It is the purpose of this paper to make a contribution towards the filling of that void in the current research.

Thesis Statement

On multicultural teams, members who exhibit a collectivistic orientation will more likely gravitate to maintenance roles, whereas members who exhibit an individualistic orientation will more likely gravitate to task roles. A relationship is also expected between cultural orientation and preferred communicator style.

As this is something of a multidisciplinary endeavor, the pursuit of this empirical research agenda requires us to review literature on groups, group roles, cultural diversity, individualism-collectivism, and communicator style before we address methodology and begin the empirical research itself.

Review of Literature

Groups. The study of groups and group communication has been recognized as an important field of study in its own right for a long time. Lewin (1939), one of the early pioneers of social scientific group research, suggested the following definition of a group: "Each member recognizes the existence of every other member as an essential part of the total group, and his behavior reflects their expectations." Shaw (1976) presents a useful definition as ". . . persons who are interacting with one another in such a manner that each person influences and is influenced by each other" (p. 8). As Brillhart and Galanes (1992, p. 6) suggest, this definition emphasizes interaction and mutual influence, both of which imply communication. Further, this definition allows us to distinguish between an aggregate of people who may be in one place at one time, but who really are

not interacting with or influencing each other, and a similar aggregate which is functioning as a group. Provided that mutual influence and interaction are taking place, a group may be made up of members who are separated by geographical distance.

Research on groups has attempted to further distinguish between groups in general and what are identified as small groups. How many people can be in a group before it is no longer a small group? This is normally very difficult to establish conclusively on a simply numerical basis. Conceptually, Brillhart and Galanes (1992) suggest that “The essence of *small* is not the number but the *perceptual awareness*, with the upward limit being the number of persons one is able to include in awareness and recall” (p. 6). This conceptualization will be important to us as we consider roles in groups: in order for group roles to be meaningfully considered by a member, an awareness of the contribution of each member must be possible.

Group roles. Group roles can be defined as “a position in a group (a status) with rights and duties toward one or more other group members” (Hare, 1994, p. 434). A long history of research accompanies this topic, with various theoretical frameworks for the analysis of roles having been presented. From the perspective of *functional* roles, important early work was accomplished by Benne and Sheats (1948) who identified three categories of functional roles in groups. Each category included several roles, each with related behaviors. Task roles were identified as those which facilitate and coordinate group problem-solving; maintenance roles were identified as those oriented to alter or maintain the functioning of the group as a group, and individual roles were identified as those directed towards meeting an individual need in an effort not relevant to either the group task or the functioning of the group as a group.

Bales (1950) developed Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) as a system for the measurement of interaction within groups. As summarized by Goldhaber (1993, p. 264), Bales conceptualized group interaction as a sequence of questions, answers, and reactions to those questions and answers. Bales' approach in assessing interaction behaviors as positive or negative (or self-serving) closely parallels the functional roles identified by Benne and Sheats (1948). More recent research on interaction process analysis has been developed using such instruments as PROANA 5 (see also Allen, Comerford & Ruhe, 1989; Lashbrook & Bodaken, 1969). Important additional work on group roles was contributed by Schutz (1958), whose theory of fundamental interpersonal relations orientation (FIRO) suggests that people join groups in order to meet their needs for inclusion, control, and affection.

In the past four decades a great deal of small group research has been conducted. Hare (1994) provides a summary of the research on *roles* in small groups, identifying a number of different theoretical perspectives from which this research has been conducted. Hare also notes considerable debate over the phases of group development, contending nonetheless that for the identification of roles in small groups it is not necessary to accept any particular theory of phase development. Hare suggests that it is enough "to agree that different types of activities are required for the conceptualization and completion of a task and that one or more individuals in a group may specialize in meeting these requirements." Underscoring the need to analyze formal, informal, and dramaturgical roles in groups, Hare concludes that the dimensions of people-orientation and task-orientation are at work in all of these.

The desire to accurately measure group role variables has led to further refinements since Hare's review of 1994. Citing a lack of empirical research on functional group roles, Mudrack and Farrell (1995) conducted empirical research that supported the original typology of roles identified by Benne and Sheats (1948). Their research findings suggest that some changes to the original typology may be warranted. Some of the roles were found to be redundant, and the maintenance set of roles was found to suffer poor reliability in their study. Nonetheless Mudrack and Farrell acknowledge that this weak showing of the maintenance category in their research may be an artifact of the timing of the survey administration. (Their research had been conducted among teams of undergraduate students, with measurements being taken at the end of a semester of working on projects in small groups; predictably respondents with little expectation of future interaction would indicate less concern for maintenance issues once the project in question was completed.)

Salazar (1996) suggests additional changes in the conceptualization of group roles. Rather than identifying three categories of roles, Salazar reduces that number to two by subsuming the individual roles into the categories of task and maintenance as *process-hindering roles* positioned on the extreme ends of those categories. Additionally, Salazar rejects the notion of task and maintenance existing as bipolar opposites on two ends of the same continuum. He proposes a positioning of group members in two-dimensional role space, where their degree of task-orientation is measured on one axis and their degree of maintenance-orientation is plotted on another axis. The resulting chart potentially allows for the graphing of individuals as high in both

task and maintenance, or low in both, or higher in one than the other. This is a very important understanding and will be utilized in the present study.

Cultural diversity. In 1987 the Hudson Institute published its projections for the American workforce to the year 2000 (Johnston & Packer). Though 47 % of the American workforce in 1985 was made up of native white males, Johnston and Packer projected that by the year 2000 native white males would comprise only 15 % of the new growth in the labor force. More recent statistics indicate that women and minority men will make up 62 % of the American workforce by the year 2005 (Nelton, 1995).

As could be expected, the Hudson Institute report spawned much discussion in business and academic circles. Though some research on cultural diversity had been conducted earlier, the years after the Hudson Institute report saw the number of scholarly articles on the topic of cultural diversity increase rapidly (Fine, 1996). Fine reports that since 1994 special volumes addressing diversity in the workplace have appeared in no less than six scholarly journals. Nonetheless, Fine reports that “Despite this spate of attention to the subject, the research literature remains sparse and our knowledge about diversity, especially in organizational life, has increased little” (p. 486).

Progress has been made in several areas, however. Fine (1996) admits that significant forward strides have been made in providing general overviews and theoretical perspectives to diversity research. Examples of these include Jackson (1992), Cox (1993) and Maznevski (1994).

As an exemplary article, Jackson (1992) provides a summary of social psychological research results for group heterogeneity effects. The summary reports on the effect of heterogeneity of abilities, skills, and personal attributes (personality,

attitudes, demographic background) on outcomes of performance tasks, intellectual tasks, creativity and judgmental decision making, and cohesion and conflict. Although Jackson reported that in some areas research has been too sparse to draw conclusions, “evidence is fairly consistent that heterogeneous groups outperform homogeneous groups” in creativity and judgmental decision making.

The research on the value of diversity is summarized by Cox (1993, p. 27), in his suggestion that managed diversity allows an organization to accomplish the following: (1) attract and maintain the best human talent available, (2) enhance marketing efforts, (3) increase creativity and innovation, (4) improve problem solving, and (5) increase organizational flexibility. Cox attributed the improved problem solving of diverse groups to a greater variety of perspectives brought to bear on the issue at hand, a higher level of critical analysis of alternatives, and a lower probability of groupthink (p. 35).

As Fine (1996) reports, the literature of which the above article and book are a part is “important because it represents a shift to valuing differences in the workplace rather than suppressing and denying them” (p. 487). Value is given to difference in the recognition that “a diverse workforce can increase organizational effectiveness and market competitiveness” (p. 487).

One instructive example of an early perspective on “value in diversity” is that of Foeman and Pressley (1987). They contend that, although scholars began to identify differences between blacks and whites, no analyses had argued that black culture by its nature could consistently offer skills and attributes useful in organizational life. Using the research findings of several scholars on black/white communication differences, especially Kochman (1981), Foeman and Pressley identify five African-American

cultural values (assertiveness, forthrightness, ethical awareness, interpersonal responsiveness, and group identification) and two language patterns (verbal inventiveness and call/response) that they believe are beneficial in organizational interaction. Arguing against the perspective that posits white communication as the norm against which black communication is judged, Foeman and Pressley contend that black communication styles in the workplace should be seen as valuable in their own right. Their perspective is interesting in light of this present study, which argues that it is the value of our uniqueness as beings who have been shaped by our “culture” that is the reason for enhanced productivity in culturally diverse groups.

This perspective is also suggested in Milliken and Martins’ comprehensive review (1996). Their summary affirms that ethnic diversity within groups may positively affect the “number of alternatives considered, quality of ideas, [and] degree of cooperation in complex tasks” (p. 416).

In her report on the state of cultural diversity research, Fine (1996) also reports that by far the largest number of diversity studies have focused on documenting differences across national cultures, with less research having been done on organizational communication in multicultural contexts.

In summary, the reviews of diversity research to date (Fine, 1996; Milliken & Martins, 1996) call for more empirical research and an adjustment of philosophical perspective. Fine suggests empirical evaluation of the results of diversity initiatives in organizations, documenting “the variety and scope of diversity initiatives, their short-term and long-term effects, and the organizational and personal prerequisites for successful diversity initiatives” (p. 498). This type of research would be especially

helpful, Fine suggests, in finding organizational policies, practices, and structures that facilitate the development of multicultural organizations.

Of additional interest for our study is the suggestion regarding further research proposed by Jackson (1992). Jackson argues that though it is not hard to affirm the idea that “groups composed of people with diverse skills and abilities outperform those with only a single ability represented,” knowing how to most effectively assign a diverse work force to a large number of dissimilar group performance tasks is a much more complex issue. The type of empirical research involved in this present study is intended to contribute to this body of research.

Finally, the study of “self-managing teams” is suggested by Jackson (1992) in order to learn how to maximize the positive effects of heterogeneity (increased productivity) without forfeiting the group cohesiveness that is typically related to homogeneity. This present study may also provide insights in this area.

Dimensions of cultural diversity. Early work in this field was initiated by Hall (1976, pp. 75-90). Hall identified what he called high-context cultures and low-context cultures. High-context cultures are those in which most of the communication or message is either in the physical context itself or internalized in the person, with very little of the message in the coded, explicit, transmitted parts of the message. In contrast, low-context cultures are those in which most of the information is contained in the explicit code. On the basis of this way of thinking, the nations and cultures of the world could be arranged on a continuum according to their orientation towards low- or high-context communication. As confirmed in other similar studies (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, p. 13), the lowest context cultures tend to be those from Northern Europe and North

America. Oriental cultures tend to be the highest-context, with others ranging between these extremes.

Another conceptualization of culture that has greatly affected scholarly research is that of Hofstede (1984). Hofstede conducted a massive survey of over 117,000 employees of a multinational organization in 66 countries, and identified four dimensions of culture: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, and individualism-collectivism. Power distance addresses the “specific value orientations regarding the appropriateness or role of status differences and social hierarchies” (Harper & Rifkin, 1995, pp. 47-57). Uncertainty avoidance describes “the extent to which cultures feel threatened by ambiguity, uncertain situations, and try to avoid them by establishing more structure” (Harper & Rifkin). Masculinity-femininity “reflects the degree to which a culture values behaviors such as assertiveness and competition (masculine) versus caring for others and the quality of life (feminine).”

The cultural variable of individualism-collectivism is concerned with the balance cultures maintain between a concern for self (“I”) and a concern for the collective (“we”). Individualistic cultures emphasize individual initiatives, rights, and achievements, while collectivist cultures emphasize the goals, needs and views of the ingroup over individual pleasure. Collectivists tend to value group harmony over the immediate rights or desires of the individual, whereas individualists tend to value the prerogatives of the individual over those of the group. Research on individualism-collectivism has found it to approximate low and high cultural context (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988), with individualistic cultures tending to use low context communication and collectivistic cultures tending to use high context communication.

Each of Hofstede's (1984) variables of culture has been further explored in more recent research. The most prolific field of inquiry has been individualism-collectivism (I/C), so much so that the 1980s have been proclaimed "the decade of I/C in cross-cultural psychology" (Kagitcibasi, 1994). We now turn our attention more specifically to this construct.

Individualism and collectivism. Since the early work by Hall (1976) and the groundbreaking research of Hofstede (1984), the construct of individualism-collectivism has received considerable attention. Attempts have been made to explain why some cultures have ended up individualistic and others are collectivist. Triandis (1994) suggests that individualism "is a consequence of (a) the number of available groups (e.g., urban environment), (b) affluence (one does not need groups as much if one is affluent, hence the upper classes in all societies are more individualistic), (c) social mobility, and (d) geographic mobility (if one is mobile, one can change groups more easily, and groups can not influence individuals as much)." Hofstede (1984) found that at a culture-level, individualism was correlated with per capita GNP to the extent of $r = .80$. Recent research supports this perspective, positing that social class has a greater effect on individualism than does culture (Marshall, 1997). Interestingly, both Marshall (1997) and Freeman (1997) found the middle-class to be less collectivist than the upper classes, suggesting that the upper classes may like the tendency for collectivism to support the status quo.

The construct of individualism-collectivism has undergone considerable development since it was first framed. To be considered here are the extension of collectivism to both vertical and horizontal dimensions, the distinction between

individual-level and culture-level variables (leading us to the discussion of allocentrism and idiocentrism, and self-construals), and the question of whether or not I/C is a bipolar construct. Each of these will be considered in turn before we proceed to discuss issues of research methodology.

The idea of vertical and horizontal collectivism was put forth by Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, and Gelfund (1995; see also Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997; Singelis & Brown, 1995). They suggest that within collectivism a distinction needs to be made between the relationship of an individual to other individuals (horizontal), and the relationship of an individual to the collective (vertical). They suggest that vertical collectivism tends to be expressed in the subordination of personal goals to those of the group, and the acceptance of inequality. On the other hand horizontal collectivism affirms that though the individual is part of a collective, equality between members of the collective is stressed. Chen et al. suggest that collectivists draw a distinction between the way people relate to collectivities of which they are members, and how they relate to each other as individuals.

The importance of distinguishing between culture-level and individual-level dimensions of constructs has been mentioned often in social psychology (Hofstede, 1994; Singelis & Brown, 1995; Triandis, 1994). To identify a culture as tending towards individualism or collectivism is one thing; to stereotype everyone in that culture as being a miniature prototype of their culture is another matter altogether. As Triandis (1994) suggests, I/C “consists of a set of contrasting elements that operate like ambiguous pictures. Just as in perceptual psychology one might see a ‘lady’ or a ‘pot’ in a particular picture, so a person can sample a collectivist or individualist element to construct a social

situation” (p. 42). Triandis goes on to suggest that if individuals in a culture tend to sample collectivist elements most of the time, in most situations, we identify the culture as collectivist. It is important to note that most researchers agree that both tendencies of I/C exist in all cultures (Gudykunst, et al., 1996). Thus at an individual level there may be people who deviate considerably from the societal norm. Singelis and Brown (1995) tested a theoretical framework linking variables at a cultural level to the individual level, and then on to outcome variables. The issue of this relationship between the cultural and individual levels of cultural constructs will be considered again in methodology and measurement: it is important to consider whether the variables being measured and correlated are of a similar level.

A related issue is the matter of etics and emics. Borrowed from linguistics via anthropology (Hofstede, 1994), these terms distinguish between what is broadly applicable to all cultural contexts, and what may be an expression unique to a particular culture. (In linguistics, *phonetics* is the study of the sounds used in all languages; *phonemics* is the study of the sounds needed to fluently speak a given language). In regard to individualism-collectivism, the etic considerations seek to identify individualistic or collectivistic values applicable cross-culturally, to all cultures (Freeman, 1996; Schwartz, 1994). Emic considerations, on the other hand, are focused on an understanding of the way these constructs work within a particular cultural context (Freeman, 1996).

Allocentrism and idiocentrism were suggested by Triandis, Leung, Villareal, and Clark (1985) as terms to identify the individual-level constructs that correspond to the culture-level construct of individualism-collectivism. Allocentric is the term used to

describe the individual who tends to select mostly collectivist solutions for social situations, whereas idiocentric describes the individual who selects mostly individualistic solutions. This conceptualization may be useful in identifying individuals who are countercultural: members of gangs in individualistic cultures might be identified as allocentric, for example (Triandis, 1994).

Gudykunst et al. (1996) found that measures of allocentrism and idiocentrism have had low reliability. They found self-construals to be a more reliable construct for intercultural research (see below). A possible explanation for the low reliability of the allocentrism and idiocentrism measures may be found in the emic-etic distinction introduced above. Measures of allocentrism and idiocentrism may serve to distinguish differences between two individuals sharing a common cultural context, without being generalizable to contrasting or comparing individuals from different cultures. In other words, though allocentrism-idiocentrism may be an individual-level construct, it is not automatically etic or *cross-cultural*. Another possible explanation for the poor reliability of measures of allocentrism and idiocentrism may be that the measures may be asking individuals to identify things about themselves that may not be recognizable to them. For example, though typical individuals from a collectivist culture are allocentric, they may not consciously be aware of being so, much as a fish is not aware of the water (having always been in it).

The preferred individual-level conceptualization of I/C, then, is self-construal (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Singelis & Brown, 1995). An explanation of self-construal can be found in Triandis' (1988, 1989) suggestion that individualism views self as a unique entity, whereas collectivism sees self in the context of group memberships. Markus and

Kitayama (1991) suggest the terms *independent* and *interdependent* to identify these contrasting views of self.

A great deal of discussion has taken place in regard to whether or not I/C is a bipolar construct. Hofstede (1994) contends that at a societal level, individualism and collectivism are two ends of the same continuum. He suggests that at the individual level, this may not be the case. Freeman (1996, 1997) found that idiocentrism and allocentrism are independent, unipolar factors, rather than opposites on a bipolar dimension. His research in Sri Lanka found demographic variables such as socioeconomic status, English-language fluency, occupational status, and urban residence to be correlated with the constructs of allocentrism and idiocentrism. The relationship of socioeconomic status (SES) to allocentrism and idiocentrism in this study is given as one example of the independence of these latter constructs. An increase in SES was found to significantly predict a reduction in allocentrism, while only minimally predicting increased idiocentrism. Rather than increasing the desire to “do one’s own thing,” affluence in Sri Lanka appears instead to decrease the need to “do things with others.” This sort of distinction is apparent in other parts of the study as well.

Though they are not exactly identical, it can be seen from our review that the concepts of high-context communication, collectivism, allocentrism, and the interdependent self-construal are closely related one to another. Similarly, low-context communication, individualism, idiocentrism, and an independent self-construal are also closely related. In order to identify the relationship between culture and functional group roles, this study needs to select one of these constructs as preferable to the others. On the basis of the research of Gudykunst et al. (1996) in which an investigation was conducted

into the correlation between cultural I/C, individual values, communication styles, and self-construals, the latter construct seems most useful for our purposes in this study.

Gudykunst et al. found that self-construals are better predictors of communication styles (low and high-context) than is cultural I/C. Similarly, they found that measures of self-construal were more reliable than measures of allocentrism and idiocentrism. For this present study, then, it is expected that self-construals are the best of the available cultural constructs for the prediction of functional roles on multicultural teams.

Communicator style. Communicator style has been of interest to communication scholars at least since the time of the ancient Greeks, and has been approached from multiple perspectives in social science research. As defined by Norton (1983), the construct of communicator style (CS) signals “how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood” (p. 19). CS (together with variations such as teacher communicator style, TCS), has been applied extensively, with particular application to instructional communication such as that taking place in education (Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1992). Related constructs include communication apprehension, defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78).

The communicator style construct was initially operationalized by the following nine independent variables or subconstructs: dominant, dramatic, animated, open, contentious, relaxed, friendly, attentive, and impression leaving (Norton, 1978), with communicator image being identified as the dependent variable in the construct.

“Precise” was later added to this list of independent variables (Norton, 1983, p. 238).

Norton (1978, 1983, pp. 64-72) explains that the “dominant” communicator tends to take charge of social interactions, the “dramatic” communicator manipulates stylistic devices (such as stories, exaggerations, and voice) to highlight or understate content, and the “contentious” communicator is argumentative. The “animated” style is recognized by nonverbal cues such as gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions. “Impression leaving” is related to communicating in such a way as to be remembered, “attentive” is related to empathy or listening, and “relaxed” is related to the level of anxiety in communicator style. The “open” subconstruct is related to being conversational, with a ready willingness to self-disclose (be frank, unreserved, gregarious). The “friendly” style variable ranges in meaning from simply lacking hostility, to inviting intimacy. The final variable of communicator style, “precise,” centers on the specificity or exactness of the communication; it is seen to be particularly important in instructional communication (Norton, 1983, p. 238).

A limited cross-cultural and intercultural application of communicator style has been made (Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1992). Sallinen-Kuparinen cites several studies which found significant differences not only in the communicator style, but also in how style was evaluated. A study of Japanese and Americans found that they were significantly different in all variables except dominance and friendliness (Ishii, Cambra, & Klopff, 1980), and the “contentious” domain was not found to be valid in assessing good teacher style in Finnish culture (Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1987). The variables of openness, informality, and ratios of talk and silence are not valued equally universally (Norton & Pettegrew, 1977; Rawlins, 1983). Sallinen-Kuparinen (1992) concludes that “additional

research is needed to enhance researchers' and teachers' understanding of communicator styles in different cultures" (p. 164).

Precisely *because* different cultural contexts interpret similar behavior differently, Norton's (1978) notion of style as "the way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood" (p. 99) may thus be found to be culture-specific. It is certainly plausible that of Norton's list of style variables, persons from an individualistic cultural background would tend to be more appreciative of a dominant, contentious (and perhaps open) style, whereas persons from a collectivist perspective would tend rather to appreciate a friendly, attentive style. The other independent variables (dramatic, animated, relaxed, and impression leaving) may fit equally well in either cultural perspective, and thus might more accurately be considered universal categories of communicator style.

Communicator style is thus included in this study in an attempt to add to the understanding of how this construct functions in intercultural contexts. If it is true that cultures interpret style differently, studying multicultural teams may prove more worthwhile than conducting comparative or cross-cultural research of groups totally isolated from one another. Communicator style may turn out to be a very salient issue to the members of multicultural teams.

Summary and hypotheses. This review of literature has discussed, among related issues, that functional roles in small groups involve the dimensions of orientation to the task and orientation to the maintenance of the group. In almost parallel fashion, the constructs of individualism and collectivism are oriented around the tension between

prioritizing the needs and desires of the individual as opposed to the needs and desires of the group. In light of this review of literature the following hypotheses are suggested:

H1: On multicultural teams, members' interdependent self-construal will be positively associated with their likelihood of functioning in maintenance roles in the group.

H2: On multicultural teams, members' independent self-construal will be positively associated with their likelihood of functioning in task roles in the group.

To test Salazar's (1996) conceptualization of task and maintenance functional roles as an orthogonal rather than a bipolar construct, the following hypotheses are projected:

H3: On multicultural teams, a negative association will be found between the interdependent self-construal and members' likelihood of functioning in task roles in the group.

H4: On multicultural teams, a negative association will be found between the independent self-construal and members' likelihood of functioning in maintenance roles in the group.

Preferred communicator style is also expected to differ from one culture to another, and thus to be predicted by self-construals (or individualism/collectivism) as suggested below:

H5: On multicultural teams, members' interdependent self-construal will be positively associated with a preference for friendly, attentive communicator styles.

H6: On multicultural teams, members' independent self-construal will be positively associated with a preference for dominant, contentious, and open communicator styles.

Chapter 2

Methodology

The methodology in this study aimed to measure self-construals, functional group roles, and communicator style. Issues faced in measuring these constructs will be considered after a discussion of participants.

Participants

Participants included 124 members of multicultural teams. Eighty-nine of these respondents were members of Youth With A Mission, a Christian missionary organization that was found in many respects to be ideal for this study. An additional 36 respondents were not members of Youth With A Mission, but were nonetheless members of multicultural teams.

Youth With A Mission was selected as the major source of respondents for this study because its members represent a diversity of cultural backgrounds and work within multicultural teams. Founded in 1960, Youth With A Mission (YWAM) is now one of the largest interdenominational Christian ministries, with over 9,000 volunteer staff based in about 600 locations in 130 countries (see Appendix C for a more complete biography of the mission). YWAM's 9,000 volunteer staff come from virtually every nation on earth, with the percentage of non-Western staff being 38 in 1994, up from 31 % in 1991 (G. Dryden, personal communication, October 28, 1997). The mission's leadership actively encourages cultural diversity (see the document "Foundational Values of Youth With A Mission," Appendix D).

In addition to the above, Youth With A Mission was selected for this study because, in regard to functional team roles, the fact that the teams of volunteers both live

and work together suggests that they face a continual need to balance task and maintenance needs in the group. This lends significance to our assessment of these dynamics. Also, as our earlier review of group diversity mentioned, the study of successful diverse groups may provide clues as to *how* diversity affects group effectiveness (Fine, 1996; Milliken & Martins, 1996). YWAM has been enormously successful in its relatively short lifespan, and some clues to that success may be uncovered in this present study.

Slightly over half of the respondents were females. The mean age was 36.8 years. Over 70 % had a university education, and over 70 % claimed English as their first language. Of the 124 respondents, 68 were born in either Canada or the USA, 20 were born in other parts of the western world (Europe, Australia, New Zealand), 13 were born in Latin America or the Caribbean, 7 were born in Africa, and 16 were born in Asia or Oceania. Eighty-three claimed to be of Caucasian descent.

Procedure

The research was conducted primarily by email. Contact was made with over 50 Youth With A Mission locations, both in Western and non-Western cultural contexts. Each of these locations represented a potential pool of from a handful up to a few hundred respondents. In addition, personal email contact was established with over 100 individual Youth With A Mission volunteers worldwide. An effort was made to involve a minimum of 300 respondents. Communication took place in English, the primary language of dialogue between YWAM centers, though its use excluded certain individuals from participation in the survey. In addition to the above, members of one

Youth With A Mission center located in Richmond, Virginia were approached in person by the researcher.

When the above efforts failed to bring in desired numbers of responses, additional respondents were recruited from the pool of international students at a graduate school on the East Coast of the USA. This was also conducted by email, via the International Student Organization of the university. Other additional respondents resulted from the fact that some respondents forwarded it to others not known to the researcher.

As suggested earlier, this research was undertaken from a quantitative perspective. A survey form was utilized, with most questions being of the five-point Likert-type variety. See Appendix A for the Survey Form, and Appendix B for a copy of the Codebook and the data.

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study is the self-construal of the respondents. This was measured using the INDCOL scale which had been used by Gudykunst, et al. (1996). A complete copy of the scale is included in the Survey Form in Appendix A.

A measurement of self-construals was selected as likely to be more accurate than simply assuming that participants are representative of their cultural background; one could potentially assign respondents an I/C value on Hofstede's (1984) scale (p. 158), for example, on the basis of their nationality. Direct measurement was expected to be much more accurate than this in light of the fact that team members' cultural values have been influenced by a multitude of factors (culture of origin, YWAM corporate culture, culture of residence, as well as things such as age, education, and socioeconomic status).

Dependent Variable

The first dependent variable in this study is the construct of functional group role, identified as having two distinct elements: task orientation and maintenance orientation. As suggested by Salazar (1996), a person may be high in both of these elements, or low in both, or high in one and low in the other.

This dependent variable was measured by responses on a Likert-type scale to statements of group roles (i.e., “I pull together ideas and suggestions and coordinate work of various subgroups”). Each of the statements corresponds to a functional role identified by Benne and Sheats (1948); the list is somewhat redefined as suggested by Mudrack and Farrell (1995) and Trenholm (1995, pp. 206-208). Though other studies have depended on observation by other group members to identify roles (Mudrack & Farrell, 1994, 1995), the structure of this study required self-reporting. For a complete list of the statements regarding functional group roles, see Appendix A.

The second dependent variable in this study is the construct of communicator style. A set of Likert-type questions was adapted from the Communicator Style Measure (CSM) of Norton (1983, pp. 285-289) to ascertain this information. Respondents were asked to identify on a scale of one to five how accurately each of the statements described themselves (for example, “I readily reveal personal things about myself”). Though there is some discrepancy over the accuracy of self-reported results of communicator style (Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1992), Hansford (1988) did find that satisfactory correlation exists between self-reported and observed data. With the nature of this present study (international, conducted largely by email), self-reporting was the only practical option.

Additional questions were asked of respondents in order to help clarify and interpret results. Included in this category, for example, are identification of age, gender, and education, as well as questions about the number of group members, number of cultural groups represented on the team, and the stage of the group's development.

Chapter 3

Results

Measurement

The internal reliability of each of the variables was assessed. Some of the constructs contained weak items; once these items were located and deleted, the reliability of the remaining items (and thus the variables) was found to be acceptable. The lowest overall internal construct reliability was found within the constructs of independent self-construal and the friendly/attentive communicator style. Highest levels of internal reliability were found for the constructs of task orientation and the cluster of the contentious/argumentative, open, and dominant communicator style.

Independent self-construal was found to have an internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of $r = .68$ ($n=122$). Three items¹ were deleted because they detracted from the overall reliability and failed to correlate with the total at .22 or above. Item-total correlations for the remaining items ranged from .22 to .44.

Interdependent self-construal was found to have an internal reliability of $r = .74$ ($n=122$). None of the items were deleted. Item-total correlations ranged from .21 to .41.

Group roles analysis revealed the construct of task orientation ($n=110$) to have an alpha reliability of $r = .86$. One item² was deleted because it detracted from the overall reliability and failed to correlate with the total at .30. Other item-total correlations ranged from .45 to .69. Maintenance orientation ($n=114$) was found to have an internal reliability of $r = .74$. None of the items were deleted for poor reliability. Item-total correlations ranged from .28 to .67.

Communicator style analysis was conducted with the items for the friendly and the attentive style clustered together (FRDATT), and the communicator style items for the contentious/argumentative, open, and dominant styles also clustered together (COD). FRDATT was found to have an internal reliability of $r = .67$ ($n=119$). Item-total correlations ranged from .24 to .46. COD was found to have an internal reliability of $r = .82$. Item-total correlations ranged from .31 to .66 ($n=118$).

Hypotheses

These results are summarized in the correlation matrix in Table 1.

Table 1
Correlations Among the Variables

	INDE	INTER	TASK	MAINT	FRDATT	COD
INDE	[$r = .68$]					
INTER	-.05	[$r = .86$]				
TASK	.26**	.12	[$r = .86$]			
MAINT	.04	.29**	.58**	[$r = .74$]		
FRDATT	.26**	.39**	.22*	.37**	[$r = .67$]	
COD	.00	.21*	.20*	.07	.25	[$r = .82$]

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Reliability coefficients in brackets.

H1 predicted that on multicultural teams, members' interdependent self-construal would be positively associated with their likelihood of functioning in maintenance roles in the group. H1 was supported. The correlation equals .29 and is significant at the 0.01 level with a 2-tailed test.

H2 predicted that on multicultural teams, members' independent self-construal would be positively associated with their likelihood of functioning in task roles in the group. H2 was supported, with a correlation of .26, significant at the 0.01 level with a 2-tailed test.

H3 predicted that on multicultural teams, a negative association would be found between the interdependent self-construal and members' likelihood of functioning in task roles in the group. H3 was not supported. No significant relationship was found between these variables (correlation = .12).

H4 predicted that on multicultural teams, a negative association would be found between the independent self-construal and members' likelihood of functioning in maintenance roles in the group. H4 was not supported. No significant relationship was found between these variables (correlation = .04).

H5 and H6 were based on the expectation that preferred communicator style would differ from one culture to another, predicted by self-construals (or individualism/collectivism). H5 predicted that on multicultural teams, members' interdependent self-construal would be positively associated with a preference for friendly, attentive communicator styles. This was supported with a correlation of .39, significant at the 0.01 level with a 2-tailed test.

H6 predicted that on multicultural teams, members' independent self-construal would be positively associated with a preference for dominant, contentious, and open communicator styles. This was not supported; no significant relationship was found between these two variables (correlation = .001).

Chapter 4

Discussion

Hypotheses

The most significant finding was that some correlation exists between self-construal and functional group roles, in support of H1 and H2. These will be considered together with H3 and H4, which suggest negative relationships opposite to H1 and H2.

H1 predicted a positive association between members' interdependent self-construal and their likelihood of functioning in maintenance roles in the group. The correlation of .29 suggests at least some relationship between these variables, on multicultural teams. It is difficult to know on the basis of this study how strong a relationship exists here, however, due both to the small number of respondents and the apparent weakness of the group roles questionnaire (see limitations section below). It may be that additional research would reveal an even stronger relationship than that found here.

H2 predicted a positive association between members' independent self-construal and their likelihood of functioning in task roles in the group. Though the correlation of .26 indicates something of note, the concerns noted for H1 need to be borne in mind. Nonetheless, it appears that when given the option on a multicultural team, members select roles that their cultures have best prepared them to fill. If found to be supported by additional research, this tendency will be of significance to management in an increasingly diversified workforce, and provides some explanation for *how it is* that membership diversity is associated with productivity.

H3 predicted a negative association between the interdependent self-construal and members' likelihood of functioning in task roles in the group. No significant relationship

was found between these variables (correlation = .12). H4 predicted a negative association between the independent self-construal and members' likelihood of functioning in maintenance roles in the group. No significant relationship was found between these variables either (correlation = .04).

The fact that H1 and H2 were supported while H3 and H4 were not seems to indicate that on the part of persons with an independent self-construal, no aversion exists towards maintenance roles, and that similarly, no aversion for task roles exists on the part of those with an interdependent self-construal. Each self-construal has its preferred set of functional group roles, without any conscious aversion to other functional group roles.

The fact that H3 and H4 were not supported should also be taken as a caution to the interpretation of H1 and H2. There is no indication that self-construal predicts level of ability on the team. Team members with an interdependent self-construal, for example, may be just as capable of the task functions as other team members who have an independent self-construal. These results give no room for racist or deterministic interpretation, but rather indicate that cultural conditioning may lead to preference for one functional group role over another, in the event that an option is given. That option is not nearly as available on a monocultural team as it is on a multicultural team (given that in the former case the group's success still requires that both task and maintenance roles be fulfilled).

Another possible explanation for the failure to support H3 and H4 lies in the organizational culture of Youth With A Mission (Appendix D). YWAM's emphasis on community living, servanthood, and sharing the workload (for example, everyone taking

turns in the kitchen), may socialize members to respond differently than would typical non-YWAM others with a similar self-construal.

H5 and H6 both relate to the association between self-construal and communicator style, and will be considered together. H5 predicted a positive association between members' interdependent self-construal and their preference for friendly, attentive communicator styles. The correlation of .39 indicates that something of note is happening here. However, as Table 1 indicates, the *independent* self-construal is also correlated with a friendly, attentive communicator style (FRDATT), to a lesser degree ($r = .26$). This suggests that our results in H5 are not as significant as might be thought. Though H6 predicted that the *independent* self-construal would be positively associated with a preference for dominant, contentious, and open communicator styles (COD), it was actually the *interdependent* self-construal which correlated with COD communicator style for a correlation ratio of $r = .21$. Contrary to H6, no significant relationship was found between COD and the independent self-construal (correlation = .001). These conflicting results may indicate measurement problems, which will be considered below.

An alternative interpretation of the results regarding H5 and H6 points again toward the organizational culture of Youth With A Mission (Appendix D). YWAM's emphasis on relationships may be the reason that both the interdependent and independent self-construals are positively correlated with the friendly, attentive communicator style. YWAM's emphasis on transparency, humility, and open communication no doubt also affects the relationship between self-construal and the contentious/argumentative, open, and dominant communicator style.

Limitations

There are three categories of limitations to this study. First, there are limitations related to the number of respondents. Second, there are limitations due to the demographic makeup of the sample. Third, there are limitations related to the variables themselves.

The greatest limitation to this study is its small size, in that 124 respondents do not give the degree of power for experimental (and statistical) test that a larger group would. The small number of respondents makes it difficult to know just how much of a problem actually exists with low internal reliability of certain variables.

Regarding demographics, it must be noted that a significant variance in population is inherent in any study on multicultural teams. This naturally presents additional challenges in measurement.

The demographic makeup of this group also means that conclusions drawn from this study may not be generalizable to other groups, due to the fact that the demographic makeup of this group of respondents is not necessarily typical of members of multicultural teams in general. The selection of respondents was affected by the fact that the research was primarily conducted by email, and involved a great deal of voluntary effort on the part of respondents. Respondents were those who had access to computers, and are generally well educated (over 70 % have completed a university degree). Also, the fact that over 70 % of the respondents claimed English as their first language, and that almost 70 % claimed to be of Caucasian descent, makes them atypical.

The significance of the nature of the respondents brings to mind a related factor, the nature of the nonrespondents. Because of the high degree of volunteerism required of

the respondents in this study in the process of gathering the data, it is reasonable to suggest that the sort of person who responds may well be different than the sort of person who fails to respond. This too affects the outcome. Nonetheless, the effect of all the above demographic concerns should be modulated by the fact that this study measured each respondent's degree of individualism or collectivism, rather than assigning it to them on the basis of their ethnicity.

Relatively moderate internal reliabilities of the independent self-construal and of the friendly, attentive communicator styles are also cause for concern. The reliability of the independent self-construal found here is in contrast with that found by Gudykunst, et al. (1996) for the same measure ($r = .68$ in the present study, versus alphas ranging from .80 to .85 in the study by Gudykunst, et al.). The higher alphas in the Gudykunst study may be related to the fact that their sample was much more homogeneous, within distinct groupings, than is the very broadly scattered sample of the present study.

The fact that the present measures of task and maintenance are positively correlated at .58 is also of concern. These measures were not used or tested previously in this self-reporting format, and appear to be in need of at least minimal revision. Accurate analysis of the present results requires us to bear this in mind.

That the friendly, attentive communicator style is positively correlated with the contentious/argumentative, open, and dominant communicator style ($r=.25$) is similarly problematic, and suggests some caution in the interpretation of results.

Suggestions for Future Research

The association between self-construal and functional group roles merits further study. A larger number of respondents and other measurement in a future study could

potentially result in confirmation of a significant relationship between these two variables. The importance of this to diversity research can hardly be overestimated. In light of the understanding that membership diversity's effect on team productivity is mediated by intra-team communication (Adler, 1986, pp. 111-118; Jackson, 1992; Maznevski, 1994), team managers could be trained to actively and deliberately encourage what is presently happening by default. Instruction on functional group roles could aid members in articulating their preferences to one another, thus facilitating healthy team dynamics and team productivity.

Future studies should also make use of other measures of task and maintenance orientation. Researchers could opt for self-reporting by respondents, as in the present study, or the use of observation, as in earlier studies. A combination of self-reporting, observation, and in-depth interviewing may be found to be most accurate in the identification of group roles. For future use of the group roles measure used in this study, additional testing and possibly revision is recommended.

Better instruments for measuring communicator style than those utilized in this study may also be found. Gudykunst, et al. (1996) utilized an extensive list of 158 communicator style items drawn from several sources, including Norton (1983). The eight factors in Gudykunst, et al.'s questionnaire yielded alphas ranging from .63 to .89, but were not used in the present study primarily because Gudykunst's 158-item communicator style questionnaire was deemed to be too long for effective use in the email format. Future research should take into consideration possible use of this measure developed by Gudykunst, et al.

Endnotes

¹ Independent self-construal items 10, 11 and 15 were deleted because they detracted from the overall reliability and failed to correlate with the total at .22 or above.

² Task orientation item 8 was deleted because it detracted from the overall reliability and failed to correlate with the total at .30.

References

- Adler, N. J. (1986). International dimensions of organizational behavior. Boston: PWS-Kent.
- Allen, W. R., Comerford, R. A., & Ruhe, J. A. (1989). Factor analytic study of Bales' Interaction Process Analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49, 701-707.
- Bales, R. F. (1950). Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Benne, K. D., and Sheats, P. (1948). Functional roles of group members. Journal of Social Issues, 4 (2), 41-49.
- Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1, 99-112.
- Booth-Butterfield, M., Booth-Butterfield, S., & Koester, J. (1988). The function of uncertainty reduction in alleviating primary tension in small groups. Communication Research Reports, 5 (2), 146-153.
- Brilhart, J. K., & Galanes, G. J. (1992). Effective group discussion. (7th ed.). Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.
- Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hunt, R. G. (1997). Testing the effects of vertical and horizontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28 (1), 44-70.
- Cox, T. (1993). Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

- Fine, M. G. (1996). Cultural diversity in the workplace: The state of the field. The Journal of Business Communication, 33 (4), 485-503.
- Foeman, A. K., & Pressley, G. (1987). Ethnic culture and corporate culture: Using black styles in organizations. Communication Quarterly, 35, 293-307.
- Freeman, M. A. (1996). Factorial structure of individualism-collectivism in Sri Lanka. Psychological Reports, 78, 907-914.
- Freeman, M. A. (1997). Demographic correlates of individualism and collectivism: A study of social values in Sri Lanka. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28 (3), 321-341.
- Goldhaber, G. M. (1993). Organizational communication. Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1989). Culture and the development of interpersonal relationships. Communication Yearbook, 12, 315-354.
- Gudykunst, W. B. & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication. New York: Random House.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. Human Communication Research, 22 (4), 510-543.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (with Chua, E.). (1988). Culture and interpersonal communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. New York: Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Hansford, B. C. (1988). Self-reports and observations of dominant communicator style and communication apprehension. Communication Research Reports, 5, 44-51.

Hare, A. P. (1994). Types of roles in small groups: A bit of history and a current perspective. Small Group Research, 25 (3), 433-448.

Harper, L. F., & Rifkind, L. J. (1995). Cultural collision: Quality teamwork in the diverse workplace. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1994). Foreword. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. ix-xiii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ishii, S., Cambra, R., & Klopff, D. (1980). A comparison of communication styles of Japanese and American college students. Paper presented at the meeting of the Japan Association of Current English, Tochigi-Ken.

Jackson, S. E. (1992). Team composition in organizational settings: Issues in managing an increasingly diverse work force. In S. Worchel, W. Wood, & J. A. Simpson (Eds.), Group process and productivity (pp. 138-173). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnston, W. B. & Packer, A. H. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1994). A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G.

Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 52-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kochman, T. (1981). Black and white: styles in conflict. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lashbrook, W., & Bodaken, E. (1969). PROANA 5: A venture in computer assisted instruction in small group communication. Computer Studies in the Humanities and Verbal Behavior, 2, 98-101.

Lewin, K. (1939). Field theory and experiment in social psychology: Concepts and methods. American Journal of Sociology, 46, 868-896.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.

Marshall, R. (1997). Variances in levels of individualism across two cultures and three social classes. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28 (4), 490-495.

Maznevski, M. L. (1994). Understanding our differences: Performance in decision-making groups with diverse members. Human Relations, 47 (5), 531-552.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 4, 78-96.

McLeod, P. L., Lobel, S. A., & Cox, T. H. (1996). Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups. Small Group Research, 27 (2), 248-264.

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. Academy of Management Review, 21 (2), 402-433.

Mudrack, P. E., & Farrell, G. M. (1994). The need for dominance scale of the Manifest Needs Questionnaire and role behavior in groups. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 43 (3), 399-413.

Mudrack, P. E., & Farrell, G. M. (1995). An examination of functional role behavior and its consequences for individuals in group settings. Small Group Research, 26 (4), 542-571.

Nelton, S. (1995). Nurturing diversity. Nation's Business, 83 (6), 25-27.

Norton, R. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4 (2), 99-112.

Norton, R. (1983). Communicator style: Theory, applications, and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Norton, R., & Pettegrew, L. (1977). Communicator style as an effect determinant of attraction. Communication Research, 4, 257-282.

Rawlins, W. K. (1983). Openness as problematic in ongoing friendships: Two conversational dilemmas. Communication Monographs, 50, 1-13.

Salazar, A. J. (1996). An analysis of the development and evolution of roles in the small group. Small Group Research, 27 (4), 475-503.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. (1992). Teacher communicator style. Communication Education, 41, 153-166.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. (1987). A preoperational paradigm in instructional communication: Teachers' perceptions of their communicator style. In A. Sallinen-Kuparinen (Ed.), Perspectives on instructional communication (pp.1-21). Publications of the Department of Communication 5. Jyvaskyla, Finland: University of Jyvaskyla.

Schutz, W. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shaw, M. E. (1976). Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Singelis, T. M., & Brown, W. J. (1995). Culture, self, and collectivist communication: Linking culture to individual behavior. Human Communication Research, 21 (3), 354-389.

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfund, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. Cross-Cultural Research, 29 (3), 240-275.

Trenholm, S. (1995). Thinking through communication: An introduction to the study of human communication. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tse, D. K., Lee, K., Vertinsky, I., & Wehrung, D. A. (1988). Does culture matter? A cross-cultural study of executives' choice, decisiveness, and risk adjustment in international marketing. Journal of Marketing, 52, 81-95.

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. Harvard Business Review, 74 (5), 79-90.

Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism vs. individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In G. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes, and cognition (pp. 60-95). London: Macmillan.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. Psychological Review, 96, 506-517.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of individualism and collectivism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: theory, method, and applications (pp. 41-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M., & Clark, F. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies. Journal of Research in Personality, 19, 395-415.

Appendix A

Survey Form

Dear YWAMer:

Thank you for participating in this research project. Please fill in as much of the survey as applies to you. Your assistance is greatly appreciated!

-Glenn Martin-

I. Personal Information:

Age: _____ Gender: _____

Country of Birth: _____ Country of Citizenship: _____

Ethnic background: _____ Present Country of Service: _____

Years in YWAM: _____ Years at this location: _____

Highest level of education you successfully completed (circle one):

Primary Secondary University

Is English your first language? (Circle one) Yes No

II. More about You: *for each of the following sentences, circle a number from 1 to 5,*

(1 = "strongly disagree"; 5 = "strongly agree"):

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. It is important for me to act as an independent person. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I take responsibility for my own actions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I should decide my future on my own. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I enjoy being unique and different from others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I stick with my group even through difficulties. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. It is important to consult close friends and get | | | | | |

- their ideas before making a decision. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I am a unique person separate from others. 1 2 3 4 5
8. If there is a conflict between my values and the values of
groups of which I am a member, I follow my values. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I try not to depend on others. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I help acquaintances, even if it is inconvenient. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I don't support a group decision when it is wrong. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I should be judged on my own merit. 1 2 3 4 5
14. What happens to me is my own doing. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I am comfortable being singled out for praise and rewards. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I maintain harmony in the groups of which I am a member. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I prefer to be self-reliant rather than depend on others. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My personal identity is very important to me. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I respect decisions made by my group. 1 2 3 4 5
20. I respect the majority's wishes in groups of which I am a member. 1 2 3 4 5
21. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group. 1 2 3 4 5
22. I consult with co-workers on work-related matters. 1 2 3 4 5
23. I consult with others before making important decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
24. I will stay in a group if they need me, even
when I am not happy with the group. 1 2 3 4 5
25. My relationships with others are more important
than my accomplishments. 1 2 3 4 5

- 26. I remain in the groups of which I am a member if they need me, even though I am dissatisfied with them. 1 2 3 4 5
- 27. I give special consideration to others' personal situations so I can be efficient at work. 1 2 3 4 5
- 28. I try to abide by customs and conventions at work. 1 2 3 4 5
- 29. It is better to consult with others and get their opinions before doing anything. 1 2 3 4 5

III. Your Team: *As a YWAMer you are no doubt part of a team. If you are a member of more than one, please identify one (multicultural if possible) that you can think of as you answer these questions.*

How many members are on this team? _____

How many cultural groups are represented on this team? _____

How long have you been part of this team? _____

Which of the following stages of group development best describes your team at this

point (check one): Primary tension (initial anxiety of getting acquainted)

Secondary tension (conflict as we seek to define ourselves as a team)

Productive performance

Past our peak; stagnating

IV. Your Roles* On This Team:

*Please read the following statements and circle the **number** that describes how much of the time you play this role in the multicultural team you are a part of with YWAM.*

- 1. I pull together ideas and suggestions and coordinate work of various subgroups.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

2. I seek to find solutions for conflicts that involve my own ideas.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

3. I think of examples, offer rationales, or work out details of previous suggestions.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

4. I prod the group to action and stimulate greater levels of group activity.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

5. I develop standards for group functioning and compare group performance to standards

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

6. I offer facts or generalizations or relate experiences relevant to group problem.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

7. I accept and praise others' contributions.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

8. I ask for clarification of suggestions and for information and facts pertinent to the problem.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

9. I suggest new ideas to the group or offer new ways of regarding group problems.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

10. I summarize what has occurred or ask questions about the path the group will take.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

11. I expedite group movement by taking on routine tasks.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

12. I accept ideas of the group and serve as an audience.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

13. I keep communication channels open and facilitate others' participation.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

14. I relieve tension and mediate disagreements.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

15. I observe group process and offer feedback about maintenance procedures.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

16. I prolong or stop decision making by foot-dragging and nit-picking.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

17. I refuse to allow others to express their opinions, and dominate discussion.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

18. I distract the group by disclosing personal problems and by using the group for personal therapy.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

19. I spend time boasting about my own accomplishments in order to be the center of attention.

Never 1 2 3 4 5 All the time

*Adapted from Benne, K., & Sheats, P. (1948). Functional Roles of Group Members. Journal of Social Issues, 4, 41-49; Trenholm, S. (1995) Thinking Through Communication: An Introduction to the Study of Human Communication. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

V. Your Style**!

*Everyone has their own unique style of communicating. Please circle the **number** for each of the statements below that **best describes you** (Remember, every honest answer is a right answer!).*

1. I readily express admiration for others.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

2. *What* I say *usually* leaves an impression on people.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

3. I leave people with an impression of me which they definitely tend to remember.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

4. To be friendly, I habitually acknowledge verbally other's contributions.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

5. I am a *very* good communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

6. I have some nervous mannerisms in my speech.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

7. I am a very relaxed communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

8. When I disagree with somebody I am very quick to challenge them.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

9. I can always repeat back to a person *exactly* what was meant.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

10. I am a very precise communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

11. I leave a *definite* impression on people.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

12. The rhythm or flow of my speech is sometimes affected by my nervousness.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

13. Under pressure I come across as a relaxed speaker.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

14. My eyes reflect *exactly* what I am feeling when I communicate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

15. I dramatize a lot.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

16. I always find it *very* easy to communicate on a one-to-one basis with strangers.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

17. Usually I *deliberately react* in such a way that people *know* that I'm listening to them.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

18. Usually I do not tell people much about myself until I get to know them well.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

19. *Regularly* I tell jokes, anecdotes, and stories when I communicate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

20. I tend to *constantly* gesture when I communicate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

21. I am an *extremely* open communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

22. In a small group of strangers I am a *very good* communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

23. In arguments I insist upon very precise definitions.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

24. In most social situations I generally speak very frequently.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

25. I find it extremely easy to maintain a conversation with a member of the opposite sex
whom I have just met.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

26. I like to be strictly accurate when I communicate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

27. *Often* I physically and vocally act out what I want to communicate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

28. I readily reveal personal things about myself.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

29. I am dominant in social situations.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

30. I am very argumentative.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

31. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I have a hard time stopping myself.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

32. I am always an *extremely* friendly communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

33. I really *like* to listen *very carefully* to people.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

34. Very often I insist that other people document or present some kind of proof for what they are arguing.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

35. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

36. It bothers me to drop an argument that is not resolved.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

37. In most social situations I tend to come on strong.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

38. I am very expressive nonverbally in social situations.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

39. The *way* I say something *usually* leaves an impression on people.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

40. Whenever I communicate, I tend to be very encouraging to people.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

41. I actively use *a lot* of facial expressions when I communicate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

42. I *very frequently* verbally exaggerate to emphasize a point.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

43. I am an *extremely attentive* communicator.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

44. As a rule, I openly express my feelings and emotions.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

**Adapted from Norton, R. (1983). Communicator style: Theory, applications, and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Thank you so much for your help! If you want to receive a copy of the results of this survey, please print your name here: _____

The language on this survey was (Circle one): Very hard 1 2 3 4 5 Very easy

Appendix C

Youth With A Mission

Youth With A Mission is an international, interdenominational movement of Christians working to help make a difference in a needy world. Founded in 1960, it now has over 9,000 volunteer staff based in about 600 locations in 130 countries. In addition, tens of thousands more people from scores of nations are involved on a short-term basis each year (adding up to two million people since YWAM began).

From Afghanistan to Zimbabwe, YWAM's activities span the globe and the dictionary, utilizing everything from accountancy spreadsheets to zoom lenses in "taking the good news to the world." While many staff labor in remote places traditionally seen as "missionary fields," many also focus on the world's needy, vast urban centers. All YWAM projects and events help form one of these three strands of ministry:

1. **Training and education** aims to equip Christians to serve in everything from agriculture to drug rehabilitation and counseling. Through the University of the Nations, students can receive degrees in areas such as science and technology, communications, the humanities, and Biblical studies. Each year some 10,000 students combine classroom learning with practical application in one or more of YWAM's several hundred courses, spread out over the globe in over 130 different locations.

2. **Mercy ministries** meet some of the physical needs of over 300,000 people annually. Caring for street children in South America, aiding drug addict recovery in North America and Western Europe, and feeding and housing refugees in Africa and Asia, are just some of the ways helping hands are extended. An important part of YWAM's relief and development work is the Anastasis, the 12,000-ton flagship of the

four-strong Mercy Ships fleet. Complete with operating theatre and hospital ward, it offers free surgeries and health care to needy areas of the world.

3. **Evangelism and frontier missions** is an integral part of both training and mercy ministries, but also an emphasis of its own. Drama, music, performing arts and sports camps are among the creative tools YWAM staff use to share their faith in a way that makes sense to their audience--whether it be teenage punks, elderly refugees, or an “unreached people group.”

*For more information about YWAM, see their website at <http://www.ywam.org>
