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Community on a global scale. Think of it: a cross-cultural, cross-functional, globally dispersed team, linked by a continuity machine, driven by a common enterprise vision, sharing in the common values of the emerging global culture, and producing out of their cultural, organizational, and technical richness and complexity a constant flow of wisdom. A true global cosmopolis in cyberspace.

O'Hara-Devereaux & Johansen, 1994, p. 420
Globalwork: Bridging Distance, Culture, and Time

Introduction

In today’s world, people spend a considerable amount of time communicating across cultures with other people and organizations around the world. Intercultural communication shapes the way people contend with change, deliver messages across borders and cultures, and revisit the fundamental properties of time and space (Monge, 1998). Effective functioning in an international business environment depends on the ability of employees to adapt to the complexity of other cultures. Employees need to learn how to effectively understand, accept, and respond to cultural differences.

The blend of cultural backgrounds and professional experiences has become a reality in the global business world. To work effectively with diverse people, managers need to know not only about the culture of the person with whom they are interacting, but also about his or her personality, behavior patterns in conflict situations, demographics, and life experiences (Triandis & Singelis, 1998). With the spread of communication technology and the decrease of time spent in face-to-face interaction, obtaining information from a business partner requires a high level of intercultural
communication competence. This critical skill improves the decision-making and problem-solving abilities of those who manage in the global marketplace.

An extensive review of intercultural communication literature provides an understanding of the current research trends in this field. A study of how managers with experience on multicultural teams in multinational organizations in the United States and the Russian Federation perceive intercultural communication competence can lead to an increase in our understanding of how the intercultural communication competence of members of multicultural teams impacts team performance and how different cultural groups of respondents perceive intercultural communication competence. This dissertation contains a description of the research problem, an overview of the literature in intercultural communication, small group communication, and multicultural team performance, the research methodology used for this dissertation, an analysis of the data, research results, and the discussion of research findings. This chapter states the research problem and explains the purpose and importance of this research.
Chapter One: Research Problem

Purpose of the Study

The primary goals of this dissertation are to:

- Examine how different demographic and individual characteristics influence the level of intercultural communication competence.
- Investigate how different cultures perceive intercultural communication competence, high performance teams, and a relationship between intercultural communication competence and the multicultural team performance.
- Describe a relationship between intercultural communication competence of managers and the performance of multicultural teams in American and Russian organizations.

Definition of Terms

Knowing how communication scholars view intercultural communication and define intercultural communication competence and multicultural teams can help the reader to better understand the purpose and the research problem addressed by this study.

*Communication* in organizations can be defined as "an evolutionary, culturally dependent process of sharing information and creating relationships in environments designed for manageable, cooperative, goal oriented behavior" (Wilson, Goodall, & Waagen, 1986, p. 20). Communication is not merely the means of performing in an organizational setting, but also the primary process by which organizations emerge and are imbued with personal, social, and professional meanings. Frederic Jablin (1990) viewed *organizational communication* as a "process of creating, exchanging,
interpreting, and storing of messages within a purposive system" (p. 157).

In multicultural organizations, a large portion of communication occurs between people with different cultural backgrounds. *Culture* can be viewed as a cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, meanings, beliefs, values, and attitudes (Porter, 1972). Culture defines how people express themselves, how problems are solved, the way people think, and the way people interact with each other (Hall, 1959). Gudykunst (1997) argued that communication and culture mutually influence each other. As national cultures strongly influence a population's communication patterns, the way people communicate can change the culture that they live in and share over time (Gudykunst, 1997). Culture teaches one how to think, conditions one how to feel, and instructs one how to act and interact with others, which are the basics elements of communication (Neuliep, in press).

Since culture is largely responsible for the construction of individual social realities, communication repertories vary significantly from culture to culture (Samovar & Porter, 1991). Achieving an understanding of interaction and message production that involves individuals or groups of people from different cultures is the primary interest of *intercultural communication* (Korzenny & Griffis-Korzenny, 1984). While cross-cultural communication focuses on communication patterns in specific cultures and on cross-cultural comparisons of communication-related phenomena, intercultural communication studies "the communication phenomena in which participants, different in cultural backgrounds, come into direct or indirect contact with one another" (Kim, 1984, p. 16). The elements of both cross-cultural and intercultural communication are present in multicultural organizations and are of interest to communication researchers and organizational practitioners.
In the work environment, the *competence* of a person is judged by his or her ability to perform effectively the required task (Klemp, Jr., 1979). It does not matter if the individual is a lawyer, a manager, or a professor; a competent person is one who can meet or surpass performance standards, either implicit or explicit. One way to define the competence of a person is to view it as a combination of a generic knowledge, skills, traits, self-schemas or motives that is causally related to effective behavior, where knowledge is a set of usable information in a specific content area, skills are the ability to demonstrate a set of related behaviors, traits are a characteristic way of responding to an equivalent set of stimuli, self-schemas are a person’s image of himself or herself, and motives are recurrent concerns for a goal state which drives the behavior of the individual (Klemp, Jr., 1979). For the purpose of this research, the *competence* will be viewed as an integrated mix of knowledge, personal characteristics, and skills that together can lead to effective performance.

Most scholars adapt the communication competence paradigm to intercultural communication and interactions (Dinges & Lieberman, 1989). Communication researchers examining *intercultural communication competence* tend to define the interculturally and communicatively competent individual as having a particular set of personal characteristics (McCroskey, 1982; Pavitt & Haight, 1985; Spitzberg, 1983). This person is able to establish an interpersonal relationship with a foreign national through an effective exchange of both verbal and nonverbal levels of behavior (Dinges, 1983).
In modern multinational organizations, work processes are frequently organized around teams. A *team* in an organization is a group of professionals who must coordinate their activities to work jointly toward accomplishing a common task (Shonk, 1982). *Multicultural teams* are work teams that consist of people from different cultures. Increasing reliance on teams in the modern workplace demands an increase of knowledge and understanding of communication processes in teams and the nature of high performance work teams (Wheelan, Buzaglo, & Tsumura, 1998). The studies of intercultural training indicate that, in an era of globalization and continuous organizational change, acquisition of intercultural effectiveness skills is becoming an issue of higher priority for expatriate personnel and business professionals (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996).

**Research Problem: the Perception of Intercultural Communication Competence by American and Russian Managers with Experience on Multicultural Teams**

*Effective intercultural communication* skill is “the ability of an individual or a group to achieve understanding through verbal or non-verbal exchange and interaction between cultures” (Ricard, 1993, p. 7). To achieve the desired intercultural communication competence, people have to possess a well-defined set of skills, including valuing, observing, listening, speaking, and gesturing (Ricard, 1993). These critical skills differ depending on the cultural background and personal characteristics of the people involved in communication.

Communication researchers have numerously attempted to describe intercultural communication competence and its underlying dimensions. Ruben (1976) identified seven dimensions of intercultural communication competence: the capacity to be
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flexible, the capacity to be nonjudgmental, the capacity to tolerate ambiguity, the
capacity to communicate respect, the capacity to personalize one's knowledge and
perceptions, the capacity to display empathy, and the capacity for turn taking. Hammer,
Gudykunst, and Wiseman (1978) distinguished three major factors of intercultural
communication competence: the ability to deal with psychological stress, the ability to
communicate effectively, and the ability to establish interpersonal relationships.
Sarbaugh (1979) identified variables that help determine the success of intercultural
interaction: social organization, roles and role prescriptions, thought patterns,
organization of time and space, and worldview. Other researchers used different
variables to examine intercultural communication competence (McCroskey, 1982;
Pavitt & Haight, 1985; Samovar & Porter, 1991; Spitzberg, 1983, 1989; Wiseman,
Hammer, & Nishida, 1989). Research has not yet indicated, however, which variables
and what theoretical models are more applicable when assessing the communication
processes involved in the performance of multicultural teams. The research described
in this dissertation offers a theoretical model that can be used to investigate this issue.

Communication researchers identified the distinct dimensions of intercultural
communication competence and different variables critical to positive intercultural
encounters (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Samovar & Porter, 1991). Black and
Gregersen (1991) explored the impact of job, personal, and general factors on cross-
cultural adjustments of American managers abroad. However, previous intercultural
communication research is not specific enough about how different situational factors
and individual characteristics of people who work on multicultural teams influence their
level of intercultural communication competence. The first aspect of the research
problem is to better understand the impact of demographic and individual characteristics
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on the level of intercultural communication competence.

People from one culture perceive intercultural communication competence differently from people of another culture. Communication competence of an individual is related to willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and communication assertiveness--characteristics that differ significantly across cultures (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986). Cultural differences such as attitudes toward power distance, individualism or collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity or femininity (Hofstede, 1980) influence people's perceptions about competent behavior. Developing an understanding of how people from different cultures define intercultural communication competence is the second aspect of the research problem of this dissertation.

Managers working on multicultural teams often have to break communication barriers and achieve mutual understanding on a particular business issue. Interaction between two people from different cultures becomes communicative if each of them sees himself/herself through the eyes of the other (McEntee & Thronton, 1996). An effective team member of a multicultural team must operate like a social anthropologist, not only understanding other cultures but also translating and explaining those cultures to others (Goffee & Jones, 1995). Without “cultural translators,” reconciling diversity and achieving cultural synergy is nearly impossible (Hofner Saphiere, 1996). The task of an effective member of a multicultural team is to understand cultural differences and focus on existing commonalities.

High-performance teams are characterized by a high degree of commitment, interpersonal trust and respect, thorough understanding of the team's purpose, and willingness to help other team members (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Developing a
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framework for understanding how different cultures view a high-performing team and an effective team member is another aspect of this dissertation.

Team members with a low commitment, lack of interpersonal skills, inability to work with diverse people, and poor communication skills can quickly ruin a team (Kieffer, 1997). People working on a multicultural team have to be sensitive to the opinions of others, understand the cultural and skills differences among team members, and be united by a common goal. While no set answers or methods are guaranteed to work in every situation, with the help of general guidelines, basic effective communication techniques, and broad cultural models, one can be equipped to function successfully in ambiguous situations (McEntee & Thronton, 1996).

The final aspect of the research problem is to investigate a relationship between intercultural communication competence of American and Russian managers and the performance of multicultural teams.

Significance of the Study

Studies of intercultural communication are central to many theories about globalization. Past research has shown that failures in global ventures most frequently result from a lack of understanding of the nuances of foreign communication and culture rather than professional incompetence (Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992). Fewer than 50% of American overseas managers are successful in completing their assignments; in the early 1980’s, the attendant costs for these failures are estimated between $250,000 and $1,000,000 (Landis & Bhagat, 1983). Managers of multinational corporations need to be aware of the diversity of perspectives, interests, and resources of different cultures. People involved in intercultural communication have little time to
communicate in the “getting to know you” mode. Global teams “often have little time to work face-to-face and in some cases never meet” (O’Hara-Devereaux & Johansen, 1994, p.104).

Corporate employees participate in multicultural teams long before they reach the top of the corporate ladder as CEO or Chair of the Board of Directors (Barnard, 1995). Multicultural teams consist of people from different countries and cultures who have different functional backgrounds. While functional differences are expected in business interactions, differences in working styles, priorities, values, and beliefs are often ignored. Business professionals are usually preoccupied with sharing the common goal of making money and view cultural differences as a minor communication barrier for an intelligent and competent individual (Barnard, 1995). Members of culturally diverse teams need to learn about the cultural differences of their colleagues. This knowledge “improves communication by reducing perceptual distortion and the tendency to rely on stereotypes” (Hofner Saphiere, 1996, p. 227). Team members also need to learn how to focus on their similarities to achieve an understanding of each other’s communication in a short period of time. The task of a member in a high performance multicultural team is to understand cultural differences and focus on existing commonalities. The importance of this research is that its aim is not only to test extant models and theoretical assumptions across cultures, but also to investigate real business issues related to intercultural communication competence and to assist business practitioners in solving a practical problem of improving multicultural team performance. While having a strong practical orientation, this research will draw heavily on the theoretical traditions of intercultural communication and multicultural team scholarship.

An innovative aspect of this dissertation is that it explores a relationship between
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intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance. The researcher drew the participant sample from the United States and the Russian Federation. A number of studies in intercultural communication research (Wheelan et al., 1998) first explored a particular topic in two cultures and later proceeded to replicate similar studies in other cultures. Widely recognized differences in culture, behavior, and communication between Americans and Russians increase the credibility of this research.

Most previous researchers investigated Russian management and communication styles prior to perestroika and the orientation of Russia toward a free market economy (Elenkov & Deletin, 1997; Fey, 1995). Some research on interaction between Russian and American managers indicates that the problems in business ventures result more from years of governmental bureaucracy and an autocratic regime rather than the incompetence of Russian managers (Luthans & Welsh, 1993). The research on intercultural communication competence of Russian managers does not exist and empirical information about Russian-American business interaction is still limited (Luthans & Welsh, 1993). This research examined intercultural communication competence of Russian managers at the beginning of the 21st century.

Another significant aspect of this research lies in examining multicultural team dynamics from a communication perspective. Effective and clear communication of team members is one of the critical factors for achieving high-performing work teams (Shonk, 1982). Therefore, intercultural communication competence research can be considered central to understanding dynamics of multicultural teams. Viewing multicultural team dynamics from a communication perspective can provide valuable insights to intercultural communication research as well as to intercultural management,
international business, multicultural team development, multinational organizations, and other related disciplines.

The final significant factor of this research is the background of the researcher, who is a Russian national and has had over ten years of living and working experience in the U.S. A common reason for the lack of empirical studies of Russian communication and character is that many Russians believe "their national character is too complex, too spiritual, too sensitive, and too instinctive for any empirical investigation to capture and for any non-Russian to understand" (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996, p. 367). Tutchev, the famous Russian poet of the 19th century, said: "With the mind alone Russia cannot be understood, no ordinary yardstick spans her greatness; She stands alone, unique -- in Russia one can only believe" (cited in Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996, p. 367). The background of the researcher together with having a great number of colleagues and friends, both in the U.S. and in Russia, helped in data collection and in developing a deeper understanding of different views of intercultural communication competence.

Summary and Research Questions

This chapter introduced the research problem of this dissertation study: the perception of intercultural communication competence by American and Russian managers with experience on multicultural teams. The key purposes of the study were to examine the influence of demographic and individual characteristics on intercultural communication competence, to investigate how different cultures perceive intercultural communication competence and its impact on multicultural team performance, and to describe a relationship between intercultural communication competence and
This dissertation focuses on the following research questions. First, the researcher investigates whether the mean scores for intercultural communication competence vary for different groups of respondents based on their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on multicultural teams, and international work experience. Second, the researcher will determine if the Russian and the American respondents differ in their mean scores for intercultural communication competence. Finally, the researcher will examine a relationship between the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members and multicultural team performance in American and Russian organizations.

The second chapter will provide a detailed review of the literature with regard to intercultural communication competence, multicultural team performance, and intercultural communication research. The third chapter will describe the research methodology that was employed to perform this study. The fourth chapter will report the results of statistical analyses and qualitative interviews of Russian and American respondents. The fifth chapter will provide insights with respect to the research results, the methodological considerations, and implication for future research. Finally, the appendices contain the research instruments in English and Russian languages, the research consent form, the translation certification for the Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire, the interview guides in English and Russian languages, the list of research participants, the informed consent to participate in research in English and Russian languages, and the Institutional Review Board Approval.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

We have truly become the **global village**, where people cannot avoid one another. No nation, group, or culture is isolated. Contact with people who are different from us is something for which each person must be prepared. A wide variety of careers -- oil workers, business people, professors, politicians, developers, and marketers -- require **intercultural communication skills**.

Pearson & Nelson, 1994, p. 188
*Understanding and Sharing*

The key purposes of this chapter are to:

- Discuss the forces that impact changes in the communication and problem-solving processes in multicultural organizations.
- Review the literature that addresses challenges and advantages of multicultural teams.
- Summarize the literature that investigates a relationship of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team development.
- Address the theoretical foundations and cultural traditions of intercultural communication research.
- Examine different models of intercultural communication competence and present an integrated intercultural communication competence model.
- Provide the research hypotheses.

**Forces Affecting Communication Processes in Organizations**

The first force affecting communication in a multicultural organization is globalization of the world economy. The growth of global interdependence has resulted
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in an expansion of social, political, cultural, and technological networks connecting different countries, people, and cultures. Globalization has made cross-border and cross-cultural communication and international business transactions easier and nearly essential for functioning in the corporate world. The increasing internationalization and globalization of business has made it vital for people from different cultural backgrounds to work together (Thomas & Ely, 1996). Managers of global corporations need to understand the role of intercultural communication competence in achieving cohesiveness in diverse environments of global business teams. Increasing globalization of the world marketplace demands more sophisticated knowledge and training in intercultural communication skills and multicultural team building (Bennett, 1997).

Let us consider ASEA Brown Boveri (ABB), a $20 billion company created by the merger of ASEA (Swedish base), BBC (Swiss base), Combustion Engineering and parts of Westinghouse (U.S. base), and a whole host of other smaller acquisitions around the world. The company operates in 145 countries, is organized into 3,500 profit centers, incorporates 1,150 legal entities, and employs over 190,000 people around the world. The company is involved in so many licensing and co-production agreements that it is hard to keep track. Its portfolio of business consists of a very wide variety of businesses - from a $2 switch to a $1 billion power system for a country (Prahalad, 1992). ABB is, by the very nature of its business, a multicultural corporation and is subject to significant cultural influence and pressures from host governments. Effective intercultural communication and interaction among many business units of ABB is critical to a profitable operation of the company.
The second force that affects communication processes in modern multicultural organizations is continuous change. Today's marketplace requires a corporation to strategically reposition its competitive focus and to restructure its business processes. The fast-paced change in the business world or “permanent whitewater” consists of events that are “surprising, novel, messy, costly, and unpredictable” (Vaill, 1996, p. 14). While reasons for change can differ, every company’s leadership has to communicate changes effectively within an organization for those changes to be successful. Organizational change requires targeted and well-structured communication to be successful and effective. Since communication in an organization is linked to organizational culture and past communication practices, understanding how an organization has communicated changes in the past is important. Winston Churchill once stated, "The longer you look back, the farther you can look forward" (Manchester, 1983, p. 12). Communicating change in multicultural organizations demands intercultural communication competence and cultural sensitivity skills from organizational change leaders.

Finally, the third force affecting communication in a multicultural organization is communication technology. The nature of communication has changed with new technological developments such as teleconferencing, electronic mail, electronic chat room discussions, and group databases. Jaclyn Kostner (cited in Young, 1998), CEO of Bridge the Distance, Inc., a Denver-based consulting and training firm, is convinced that when people communicate by voice alone using virtual communication settings without a face-to-face context, the effectiveness of communication is at about twenty percent. Computer-mediated communication technologies, such as e-mail, voice mail, and electronic meeting systems, interactive cable TV systems, and the information
superhighway permit us instantaneous oral and written information exchange to most locations in the world (Chen, 2000). Porter and Samovar (1994) indicated that the improvement of communication technology has greatly reshaped intercultural communication. Communication technology has created an almost free flow of information throughout the world and reliance on individual communication capabilities. People are forced to use communication technology to interact effectively with others whom they may or may not meet face-to-face at some future date in their lives. Huber (1990) concludes that computer-mediated communication technology involves more people in communication processes. Globalization, continuous organizational change, and communication technology not only intensify the traditional challenges of multicultural teams, but also introduce conceptually new challenges.

For many Russian organizations, communication reflects the transformational process in the Russian society and the orientation of the business world and government toward a market economy. The fall of the Soviet Union left many people in Russia disillusioned and alienated -- stripped of the system of beliefs and norms that had guided their public, and to some extent their private, lives for decades (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996). Russian managers have to try new communication and leadership styles that can ensure a more effective and productive work environment. Teamwork, open communication, and the ability to work in a multicultural setting are among the key skills for a Russian manager.

The following section of this chapter provides an overview of the typical challenges and the key advantages of multicultural teams.
Challenges and Advantages of Multicultural Teams in Organizations

*Developing the capacity to create and sustain *global teams *is the business challenge of the twenty-first century.*

O'Hara-Devereaux & Johansen, 1994, p. 103
Globalwork: Bridging Distance, Culture, and Time

The significance and frequency of multicultural work teams or teams composed of people from different cultures are growing constantly (Moosmüller, Spiess, & Podsiadlowski, 2001). Teams composed of culturally diverse members are encountered at all levels of multinational organizations, from top management to small project groups. The internationalization of business results in the creation of multicultural teams, the "most fundamental reorganization since the multidivisional corporation became the standard in the 1950s" (Dwyer, Engardio, Schiller, & Reed, 1994, p. 81). The differing characteristics named in the literature are race, gender, nationality, ethnicity, culture, occupation, and geographic origin. In this dissertation, the researcher focused on diversity based on the different national origin of the team members and defined multicultural teams as composed of members who are socialized in various national cultures.

Effective multicultural teams are central to future global competitiveness, workforce motivation, and management (Rhinesmith, 1996). Consider the following examples: Whirlpool International's management committee is made up of six people from six nations; IMB has five nationalities represented among its highest ranking officers and three among its outside directors; four nationalities are represented on Unilever's board and three on the board of Shell Oil (Rhinesmith, 1996). Management at Ford and
Citicorp, two large multinational corporations, believes that competing in a global economy requires a company to establish multicultural teams in order to decrease redundant operations across countries. Instead of having Europeans at work in Europe designing a product for the European market and Americans at work in North America designing a product for the North America, Ford uses multinational teams to design products for a global market, taking advantage of economies of scale. A typical new product development team at Ford consists of individuals from the host country, the parent company, and countries where the product will be marketed (Dwyer et al., 1994).

Multicultural teams have increased their presence not only in the corporate world, but also on the geopolitical arena. In the post-Cold War era, multinational teams of United Nations often replace unilateral military actions to address world problems (Ilgen, LePine, & Hollenbeck, 1997). The success of these multinational forces requires people from different nations to cooperate and work together as a team.

Challenges of Multicultural Teams.

For multinational organizations, the effectiveness of intercultural and interpersonal processes in multicultural work teams has become a crucial question (Adler, 1991). Multicultural teams operating across time and distance are destined to have some difficulties. According to Rhinesmith (1993), "figuring out the complexity of global operations is a little like solving a crossword puzzle: you look for clues and sometimes run into blind alleys" (p. 88). Multicultural teams can be both more effective and less effective than monocultural teams depending on the successful implementation of suited team building measures and team leadership development.
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(Moosmüller et al., 2001). The most common challenges of multicultural teams are cultural imperialism, location-centric thinking, cultural, communication, linguistic, and communication competence differences.

Cultural Imperialism.

Cultural imperialism is a common mistake that people make when assuming that everyone thinks in a similar way. In addition to acknowledging differences in cultural norms, one must understand how cultural norms affect a global team's dynamics. The various cultures of team members trigger perceptions, influence interactions, and affect team performance (Young, 1998).

The nature of communication and decision making differs depending on cultural characteristics and the value emphasis of a certain culture. In a low-context culture--such as the U.S.--where meaning is expressed explicitly, more clear and factual communication is necessary to arrive at a decision than in a high-context society. While high-context cultures rely heavily on restricted codes, contextual clues, and implicit meaning, the communication in low-context cultures is more elaborate, explicit, demonstrative, and straightforward (Lewis, 1998). In the United States, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and Germany--low-context cultures--most of the information conveyed in communication is embedded in words. In contrast to low-context cultures, communication meaning in Asia, Latin America, and Russia extends far beyond the words (Parker, 1998).
**Location-central Thinking.**

“Location-centric thinking” involves communicating with team members around the world based on the central command view from one corporate office, dictating policy elsewhere in the world. A global team's planning sessions can be scheduled on Friday morning in the United States when it is Saturday morning for team members in Australia (Young, 1998). Problems related to location-centered thinking have escalated in 1990s with a significant increase in the number of mergers, acquisitions, and global joint ventures. Structural rearrangements that cross external boundaries of nations often produce culture clash (Parker, 1998). When Pharmacia, a Sweden based drug company with a significant presence in Italy, and Upjohn, a U.S. based company, merged in 1995, clear communication between employees based in the three national cultures proved difficult. The Pharmacia/Upjohn management had to place corporate headquarters in London and maintain business centers in Michigan, Stockholm, and Milan to reduce location-central thinking and nationalistic tendencies of employees (Parker, 1998).

**Cultural Differences.**

The values, beliefs, and behaviors of each global team member are different. While Americans are used to direct business communication, German counterparts prefer presenting a detailed rationale before talking about specific actions. Members of multicultural teams need to learn about one another's cultural differences because it "improves communication by reducing perceptual distortion and the tendency to rely on stereotypes" (Mitchell, 1986, p. 16). To acknowledge these communication and cultural differences global teams have to establish very clear norms about communication and
business interaction.

Past communication and social science research about Russia shows complex cultural differences within the Russian culture itself (Bollinger, 1994). Afanassiev (1992) used Solzhenitsyn's expression "The House of Russia" describing two subcultures--European and Asian--that co-exist within one Eurasian culture. Within one "House of Russia," each culture retains its own values and ideals, holding on to the past and innovation, Slav and Western, monologue and dialogue, confrontation and compromise, the authoritarian Muscovite method and the consensus method of Kiev and Novgorod (Afanassiev, 1992). These inherent dichotomies within the Russian culture strengthen the cultural differences of multicultural teams that have Russian team members.

Communication Differences.

An analysis of communication differences across cultures determined that "substantial differences in communication orientation exist among the countries of the world" (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990, p. 76). Since "people unavoidably carry several layers of mental programming" (Hofstede, 1991, p. 10), Russian communication patterns differ from those of Americans. The difference reflects the value of group consciousness or collectivism in Russia and individualism in the United States (Hofstede, 1991). While language in the United States is often competitive, confrontational, and aimed at making a point, communication in Russia is usually cooperative and conciliatory (Ferarro, 1998). In a collectivistic culture, such as Russia, communication tends to have a higher degree of emotion and personality as opposed to the climate of an individualistic culture with its high degree of objectivity (Lewis, 1998).
Communication differences are even stronger due to a long rhetorical tradition in the Western world, where a primary function of communication has been to express ideas as "clearly, logically, and persuasively as possible" (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, p. 140). Americans, despite recent controversies from WACO to the Los Angeles Police Department, have never been much for conspiracy theories (Rhinesmith, 1996). Americans value simplicity and straightforwardness, favoring the "tell-it-like-it-is" or "what you see is what you get" approach in communication. Many cultures of Western and Central Europe, like France and Russia, have always "attributed life's events to some dark set of conspiratorial forces that needs to be unraveled from an exceedingly complex explanation of how the world works" (Rhinesmith, 1996, p. 87). Managers in the former Soviet Union, who often faced situations beyond their control, used communication that ensured avoidance of confrontation, risk-taking, and uncovering problems (May, Young, & Ledgerwood, 1998). Americans are action-oriented people and do not enjoy the intrigue of examining complex motives and situations the way Russians do (Rhinesmith, 1996). Therefore, without proper training, American and Russian team members might easily misunderstand each other, even when speaking the same language.

**Linguistic Differences.**

Language is not merely a tool for delivering a message. Language is a reflection of national character, culture, and national philosophy (Lewis, 1998). People from different countries use their language and speech in different ways. Differences in speech and language styles bring misunderstandings and confusion to attempts to interpret
messages (Lewis, 1998). Whereas to the French, their language is a supreme instrument for analytical thought and logical expression, to the Russians their language is a great emotional resonator and repository of everything that can be expressed about the human condition (Holden, Cooper, & Carr, 1998). Among the numerous features of the Russian language are its capacity to express all knowledge accumulated by mankind in every field of endeavor and its semantic universality, and, therefore, its ability to describe human life in its entirety (Filin, 1979). The Russian word for 'dad' is 'papa', but it comes in at least 33 different forms, each of which signify a distinctive level of affection, playfulness, and intimacy (Holden et al., 1998).

On the contrary, people from countries with a more recent history, such as the United States, favor a more direct and understandable way to express themselves in business and in public. Potential problems can occur due to the linguistic differences when translation is needed in a business setting. For example, the Japanese president of Mazda Motors Corporation estimated that 20% of the meaning communicated was lost between him and his interpreter during his meetings with American representatives of Ford Motor Company (Parker, 1998). Another 20% of the meaning was lost between the interpreter and American representatives.

**Communication Competence Differences.**

Research on communication behavior reveals that the communication competence of an individual is related to willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and communication assertiveness (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986). Russian peoples' communication competence, communication apprehension, and willingness to communicate differ significantly from people in the U.S. and other countries. A study of
students at Moscow State University in Russia showed that the overall willingness to communicate score for Russians indicated a lower willingness to engage in communication than the comparative countries, including the U.S. (Christophel, 1996). Russian students are less willing to initiate communication with groups, dyads, strangers, and friends, ranking lowest among comparable countries. The mean communication apprehension score for Russians was identical to Finland; Russians reported the second highest introversion score while U.S. reported the lowest introversion. Russian students perceived themselves as lower on communication competence than most other groups, while indicating they are most competent when communicating with friends. Compared with the U.S., Russians reported lower assertiveness and higher responsiveness (Christophel, 1996).

Advantages of Multicultural Teams.

Cultural diversity not only poses a number of challenges to performance and operational outcomes of multicultural teams, but can also bring a number of advantages and increase team effectiveness. Cultural differences, which are necessary for generating cultural synergy, allow the members of multicultural teams to develop a "global mindset" permitting multiperspective and flexible action--essential factors for intercultural leadership development (Maznevski & Peterson, 1997; Rhinesmith, 1993, 1994). Multicultural teams can be very effective provided that the respective culture-specific strengths are exploited (Adler, 1991; Moran & Harris, 1981).
Multicultural teams can be more productive and can yield a higher level of performance than monocultural teams. Members of multicultural teams can put forward different viewpoints and more creative ideas when solving a problem or developing an organizational strategy. Peter Abersmith, a manager of a global reinsurance company in New York, shared his views on performance of multicultural teams.

[A] diverse team is definitely harder to manage and it does not run as easily as a more homogeneous team; however, in the end, the work product may be a lot better because of creative ideas and dynamism in the communication process. (personal communication, March 5, 2001)

The dynamism of multicultural team processes forces an immediate awareness of different viewpoints. This immediacy of interaction in multicultural teams allows for reconciliation of otherwise latent differences in viewpoints and values that need to be addressed in any multinational organization (Maznevski & Peterson, 1997).

Empirical findings on team diversity argue in favor of a potential cognitive gain through diversity and therefore greater performance and effectiveness. Diverse or heterogeneous teams are able to solve problems more quickly if the members of the team are able to contribute complementary skills relevant to the task (Hoffman & Maier, 1961). Diverse or multicultural teams can reflect a larger number of alternatives, develop better ideas, be more creative, adapt more quickly to changing environmental conditions, render decision making more effectively than homogenous teams (Milikem & Martines, 1996; Podsiadlowski, 1998; Smith & Noakes, 1996). Bantel and Jackson (1989) argued that greater diversity in top management teams causes an
increase in innovation. Janis (1982) determined that diversity reduces the danger of erroneous decisions, conformistic behavior, and group pressure due to groupthink. Diverse teams working on business case studies improved their results continuously over a long period of time and generated more creative alternatives to solve a problem than the homogenous control group (Watson, Kumar, & Michaelson, 1993).

Understanding common challenges of multicultural teams and maximizing on their potential advantages can help multicultural teams to deal productively with cultural diversity and to increase team performance. Managers of multinational organizations use a number of preparatory measures (team composition, clearly defined goals, transparent structures, strong leadership) and accompanied measures (team building, effective communication, team norms and team members' roles) to address common challenges and develop multicultural teams' positive potential (Ilgen, Major, Hollenbeck, & Sego, 1993; Maznevski & Peterson, 1997; Miliken & Martins, 1996; Shoda, Mischel, & Wright, 1993). All of these measures demand high intercultural communication competence: team members must be able to communicate and listen effectively, change perspectives, tolerate ambiguity, and deal with varying action adequately. The following section explains the role that intercultural communication competence plays in development of multicultural teams.

Intercultural Communication Competence and Multicultural Team Development

Functioning in the global business environment is increasingly competitive and interdependent (Hofner Saphiere, 1996). Multinational corporations have to understand their customer base in the countries of their presence. Meeting multicultural customer demands requires accurate, thorough, and quick information sharing and coordination
between people at international locations. Multicultural customer satisfaction also requires decisions that meet or exceed customer requirements and effective functioning of geographically dispersed, culturally mixed work teams (Hofner Saphiere, 1996).

How does a manager develop intercultural communication competence? What does it mean for a multicultural team member to be interculturally and communicatively competent? Past research distinguished different characteristics which describe global leadership or intercultural communication competence (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Moosmüller, 1995; Podsiadlowski & Spiess, 1996), including relationship skills, communication skills, and personal traits such as inquisitiveness (Black & Gregersen, 2000; Black, Morrison, & Gregersen, 1999; Gregersen, Morrison, & Black, 1998; Mendenhall, 2001; Spreitzer, McCall, & Mahoney, 1997).

Intercultural communication competence entails not only knowledge of the culture and language, but also affective and behavioral skills such as empathy, human warmth, charisma, and the ability to manage anxiety and uncertainty (Gudykunst, 1998; Spiess, 1996, 1998).

Historically work teams have received only minimal and intermittent attention from social scientists (e.g., Black, 1979; Simpson & Wood, 1992; Steiner, 1974, 1986). Communication processes and dynamics in teams have remained poorly understood, and efforts to improve their effectiveness have yielded mixed results (Sundstrom, DeMeuse, & Futrell, 1990). Research that addresses issues of intercultural communication in teams containing internationally diverse members has been also limited (Wheelan et al., 1998) and has not been backed empirically (Granrose & Oskamp, 1997; Ilgen, LePine et al., 1997). Most of the studies on diversity and multiculturalism are short-term laboratory studies with groups of students and are
focused on one country, in most cases -- the United States (Moosmüller et al., 2001). Additional research is clearly necessary to understand how multicultural teams function and what type of communication processes can improve their performance.

Past communication research shows that a well-structured team development process can address many of the challenges of multicultural teams. Team development is critical to effective team performance. The process of team development or teambuilding involves unifying a group of people with a common objective into an effectively functioning unit (Shonk, 1982). Teams working in a coherent matter can outperform the brightest and most capable individuals.

According to Shonk (1982), the key factors necessary for a team to be effective are:

- **Clear communication** -- Team members have to be effective listeners and competent communicators. In a multicultural team, team members have to be sensitive to both verbal and nonverbal communication cues, which can mean different things in different cultural contexts.

- **Common direction/goal** -- Team members have to understand the common goal or why the team exists and what is the responsibility of individual team members. The goal of the team must be congruent with the values set by team members and the values of the organization. The goals should be clearly defined, quantified, and specific.

- **Rewards/recognition** -- Team members need to understand the incentives the company provides for working on the team and how the team’s contributions will be recognized. The reward and incentive mechanisms have to be linked with the corporate strategy.
• **Trust** -- For a team to be effective, team members need to trust each other. Mistrust and hidden agendas of team members will hinder the performance of the team. A highly trusting relationship must also be developed between the teams and the management of the company.

• **Decision-making process** -- Team members have to understand how decisions are made and what process is being used to make those decisions. Using one of the group information gathering processes, such as the Nominal Group Technique (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975) or the Delphi Technique (Dalkey, 1969; Linstone & Turoff, 1975), can ensure involvement of each team member in the decision-making process and improve the quality of decisions.

Teams go through different stages of development. During this process, they perform at different levels of effectiveness and make decisions that vary in their quality. Tuckman (1965) outlined four typical stages of team development: forming, storming, norming, and performing. During the forming stage, the team is in an exploration mode. Team members assess each other’s individual qualities and overall culture of the team. The storming stage is characterized by addressing the issues of power distribution and leadership roles among team members. At the norming stage, team members agree on common values, recognize differences and diversity among them, and gradually proceed to problem solving. Finally, during the performing stage, the team begins to work effectively on accomplishing its goal, addressing interpersonal issues, and, if necessary, managing internal conflict.

Wheelan and Hochberger (1996) introduced an integrated model of group
development. Their model included four steps that groups proceed through during their development: dependency and inclusion, counterdependency and fight, trust and structure, and work. While having some similarities to Tuckman's (1965) stages of team development, the Wheelan and Hochberger (1996) model provides a more thorough description of the communication and interaction processes among team members during each stage of team development.

During the first stage, the integrated group development model focuses on issues of inclusion and dependency when team members attempt to identify behavior acceptable to the team leader and other members. Team members attempt to get to know each other and to determine what the rules, roles, and structures of their work team will be. The second stage of counterdependency and fight is characterized by conflict among team members, rooted in the attempts of team members to avoid tension. The third stage is dedicated to the development of trust and more mature and open negotiation regarding goals, roles, group structure, and division of labor. During this stage, communication is more open and task oriented. The final stage is characterized by effective performance of the team, free communication about ideas and information, complete awareness of tasks and time, continuous maintenance, and dealing with interpersonal issues. Level of communication competence of individual team members can significantly influence how well team members work toward accomplishing a common task.
High performance teams have three distinct dimensions that are critical to maintaining a high degree of productivity and effectiveness (Wheelan, 1999). The first dimension of a high performance team is that its members are clear about and agree with team goals, roles, and norms. People on the team must feel that team goals are reasonable and attainable, they have the ability and skills necessary to accomplish the assigned tasks, and team norms encourage members to be creative and innovative. The second dimension of a high performance team is the communication and leadership style, which allows team members to participate in the team processes, to give, receive, and utilize constructive feedback about individual performance and contributions, to define and discuss problems they must solve, to effectively deal with conflict situations, and to change leadership style to meet emerging group needs. Finally, the third dimension is the team structure, which allows team members to spend sufficient time together, to form and work in subteams, and to work effectively and cooperatively together as a unit and on subteams (Wheelan, 1999).

Teams operating in the performing stage of their development can offer many advantages over traditional ways of organizing the work process. Managers of organizations working as a team can distribute skills and tasks widely among all team members, share leadership and management responsibilities, help each other to build on their strengths and minimize their weaknesses, and be more productive in solving business problems than selected individuals. Teams can also promote better performance and changes in the organization because team members are more motivated to contribute to the bottom line of the company than are individual employees. Finally, multicultural teams can provide higher quality creative solutions to current business problems than homogeneous teams or selected individuals.
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Theoretical Foundations and Cultural Traditions of Intercultural Communication Competence

The first theoretical foundation of intercultural communication competence research is based on cross-cultural communication studies. Cross-cultural studies emerged from anthropological concepts developed at the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. Department of State in the late 1940s. Edward Hall (1956) recognized a necessity to narrow the focus of the training of future diplomats from culture as a general concept to microcultural analysis, including paralanguage, gestures, time, and spatial relationships as aspects of communication. Hall (1956) argued that the majority of information available about foreign cultures was not critical to face-to-face interaction with members of these cultures. Following his beliefs that communication, being a counterpart of culture, is equally patterned, learned, and analyzable, Hall (1976) included the study of communication in the concept of culture, emphasizing the value of effective interaction between members of different cultures.

Scholars since Hall have continued to emphasize intercultural communication competence as essential to effective cross-cultural communication. While Brein and David (1971) stressed the communication content of cross-cultural encounters, Ruben (1976) proposed seven categories as critical for effective cross-cultural communication, including display of respect, interaction posture, orientation to knowledge, empathy, role behavior, interaction management, and tolerance for ambiguity. Likewise, Barna (1982) studied obstacles to effective cross-cultural communication: verbal language, nonverbal communication, perceptions and stereotypes, tendency to immediate evaluation, and high anxiety.
By far the most widely referenced dimensions of cultural variability are those derived by Hofstede (1980, 1991). Hofstede (1980), a Dutch social psychologist, surveyed over 100,000 employees in subsidiaries of the multinational IMB Corporation in 40 countries investigating questions about cultural values. Later on, Hofstede (1991) extended his database to include 64 countries, divided into 50 single countries and three multicountry regions. Determined empirically, the four dimensions by which the national cultures differed were power distance, individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity.

Briefly, power distance indicates the extent to which a culture accepts that power within the culture is distributed unequally. The individualism-collectivism dimension refers to a loosely knit social framework in which people place higher values on individual goals than on group goals (individualism) or to a tight social framework in which people place group needs and goals higher than individual ones (collectivism). Uncertainty avoidance indicates the extent to which a culture feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations. Finally, the masculinity-femininity dimension refers to the extent to which the dominant cultural values are masculine—that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things—or feminine focusing more on quality of life and nurturance issues (Hofstede, 1980, 1991).

Hofstede's (1980, 1991) cultural dimensions explain a variety of communication orientations across cultures (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). Hofstede (1980) argued that low power distance cultures prefer consultation, participation, cooperation, and practicality, while high power distance cultures prefer autocratic or majority rule decision making and are reluctant to trust each other. When members of a multicultural team
vary significantly on power distance, difficulties are likely to occur in developing communication and leadership patterns acceptable to the entire multicultural team (Bantz, 1993). For example, among the 50 countries Hofstede (1991) examined, Yugoslavia—a country that is very similar to Russia in its cultural values and ethnic roots-ranked significantly higher on power distance (12th highest, 76 power distance index) than the United States (38th highest, 40 power distance index). Inspection of both the ranks and the scores of Yugoslavia, a country similar to Russia, and the United States reveals sufficient variability to believe that problems might occur when Russians and Americans work together on a multicultural team.

A study of 55 executives and directors in Moscow revealed that 42 percent of participants’ direct supervisors described as autocratic and 22 percent as paternalistic (Bollinger, 1994). High power distance constitutes a permanent part of Russian mentality. Four centuries ago, Baron Herberstein, Emperor Maximillian's ambassador to Russia, wondered about the origin of the Russian monarch’s despotism, debating whether the Russian character formed autocrats in Russia or the autocrats themselves gave this character to the nation (Afanassiev, 1992). The further discussion of Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimensions includes Yugoslavia as an example, realizing strong cultural similarities between Yugoslavia and Russia.

The individualism-collectivism dimension defines how individual team members emphasize their growth and structure their relationship within multicultural teams. Team members from cultures that are low on individualism exhibit more emotional dependence on the team, are more conforming, orderly, traditional, value team decisions, and more particularistic than team members from cultures high on individualism (Hofstede, 1980). The teams varying on individualism, such as with team members from Yugoslavia (35th
highest, 27 individualism index) and the United States (1st highest, 91 individualism index), are likely to have difficulty developing team roles and norms because of different senses of organizational and individual responsibility (Bantz, 1993). In Russia, a country with a collective mentality, employees expect their management to take care of them like family does (Bollinger, 1994).

In the Soviet system, the main role of a factory director consisted of looking after the workers, providing housing, organizing children's playgrounds, and allowing employees to spend their holidays at resorts subsidized by the factory. Managing a business in Russia is based primarily on loyalty and a sense of duty, and decisions are made on the basis of personal relationships with managers. In countries with more of an individualistic mentality, such as the United States, the company does not get involved in the personal lives of its employees and decisions are made on the basis of professional expertise and contribution of an employee to the bottom line results (Bollinger, 1994).

Low uncertainty avoidance cultures are high on achievement motivation, more open to change and risk taking, and less hierarchical than high uncertainty avoidance cultures (Hofstede, 1980). If a multicultural team consists of individuals from cultures that vary widely on uncertainty avoidance, the team might encounter problems in establishing team norms, particular those concerning with conflict and leadership (Bantz, 1993). The team with Yugoslavians (8th highest, 88 uncertainty avoidance index) and the Americans (22nd highest, 76 uncertainty avoidance index) will vary greatly in acceptance of flexibility and change and the role of risk. These disparate expectations might inhibit development of stable team norms about procedures, leadership, communication, and task and social dimension of team activity (Bantz, 1993).

Numerous observers have recorded the Russian need to control uncertainty.
Berdiaev (cited in Afanassiev, 1992) attributed this need to control uncertainty to the geo-politics of Russia's size, arguing that "the Russian soul" is tortured by space, feels no boundaries, and is enslaved by this absence of limits. Russian executives display a high level of anxiety about the future, which forces them to be nervous, emotional, and aggressive (Bollinger, 1994). Seventy eight percent of Russian executives out of 55 surveyed by the Higher Commercial Management School of Moscow said that they feel constantly or often tense or strained at work (Bollinger, 1994). Sixty six percent hoped that they continue to work in their present company for more than five years or up until retirement (Bollinger, 1994).

The masculinity-femininity dimension reflects socialization of individuals in different cultures as being masculine (or instrumental) or feminine (or expressive) (Bantz, 1993; Hofstede, 1980). The masculine cultures value assertiveness, emphasize advancement, and strive for earnings. These cultures define achievement as recognition and believe in independent decision making and the centrality of work in their lives. The feminine cultures value nurturance, are oriented toward providing service, emphasize interpersonal needs, and are concerned with the physical environment. These cultures value achievement through human contacts, value cooperation and a friendly work atmosphere, believe in making group decisions, and find work less central to their lives.

Multicultural teams with Yugoslavians (49th highest, 21 masculinity index) and Americans (3rd highest, 73 masculinity index) might have problems developing team norms because of differences in expectations of cooperation, friendliness, and group versus individual decision making (Bantz, 1993; Hofstede, 1980). In Russia, centuries of serfdom followed by 60 years of dictatorship have prevented men, the majority in
management and government positions, from developing a sense of initiative, feeling
that they are masters of their destiny, and being respected in their work
(Bollinger, 1994). The working climate in Russia is more cooperative, collective,
centered around life, and feminine, and less assertive, goal-oriented, instrumental,
centered around work, and masculine as in the United States.

The second theoretical perspective that explains communication and interaction in
multicultural teams is Uncertainty Reduction Theory developed by Berger and
Calabrese (1975). Uncertainty is present during the initiation phase of every intercultural
interaction - such as a business meeting between people from different cultures - and
might also be present during the later stages of international business relationships.
Reducing uncertainty, defined as “the ability to predict accurately how others will behave
and the ability to explain the behavior of others,” is one of the critical factors for effective
functioning of global teams (Berger & Calabrese, 1975, p. 99). Gudykunst and Nishida
(1986) determined in their studies that people engage in communication with others to
reduce uncertainty. Reducing uncertainty involves gathering information about others’
attitudes, values, beliefs, and behavior, which requires effective communication between
people of different cultures.

The developmental perspective of intercultural communication and multicultural
team research complements both of these theoretical foundations. The development of
a multicultural team follows the four-stage process: dependency and inclusion,
counterdependency and fight, trust and structure, and work (Wheelan &
Hochberger, 1996). Uncertainty is present during all four stages of work team
development, being at its lowest level at the maturity stage. Communication during
earlier stages of multicultural team development will be more sophisticated because of
the higher uncertainty of team members about cultural differences in norms, values, and perspectives of their colleagues. Team members need to be interculturally and communicatively competent to be able to obtain necessary information about their team members, to reduce uncertainty and anxiety, and to start effective working relationship. Communication processes during the last stage of team development is the primary focus of small group communication research (Wheelan, 1994) as well as one of the central points of this study.

**Intercultural Communication Competence Models**

Since team members’ effective and clear communication is one of the critical factors for achieving high performance work teams (Shonk, 1982), intercultural communication competence research can be considered central to understanding dynamics of multicultural teams. Viewing multicultural team dynamics from a communication perspective can provide valuable insights into intercultural communication research as well as into international business and other related disciplines. The overseas performance model, the intercultural adjustment model, and the intercultural communication competence model are the three most commonly mentioned models of intercultural communication competence in the intercultural communication literature. An overview of these models helps in understanding the choice of the integrated intercultural communication competence model for this research.
Cleveland, Mangone, and Adams (1960) performed one of the earliest analyses of intercultural communication competence, identifying the common factors in effective overseas performance of Americans. The researchers focused primarily on high-level administrators in government, business, religion, and industry who were stationed in different parts of the world. The characteristics of effective overseas performance included technical skills, belief in mission, cultural empathy, a sense of politics, and organizational ability. Organizational ability included management and administrative skills and the ability to adjust these skills to cross-cultural settings. Some of these characteristics were found to be more critical depending on the nature of the overseas assignment. For example, the effective performance of embassy personnel was characterized as more salient on sense of politics, but not on cultural empathy or organizational ability. Effective religious workers were characterized by cultural empathy and sense of mission, while effective businesspeople showed more belief in mission and technical skills, but less cultural empathy (Cleveland et al., 1960).

Cleveland et al. (1960) identified several factors that are critical to effective overseas performance, including understanding of the decision-making processes, political symbols, and cultural empathy. Political sensitivity encompassed taking into account indigenous political forces, understanding the power structure, and envisioning political consequences of behavior. Cultural empathy required the skill to understand the logic and coherence of other cultures and the restraint to avoid negative attributions based on perceived differences one's own and others' behavior. These factors served
as a foundation for intercultural communication research in organizational settings (Stein & Kanter, 1980).

In a similar study, Benson (1978) described ten theoretical factors that can be utilized to measure overseas performance. These factors included language skills, communication skills, frequent and pleasant interactions, reinforcing activities, friendliness, socially appropriate behaviors, job performance, attitudes, satisfaction, and mobility. These factors are similar to Porter and Samovar's (1976) classification of effective intercultural communication. Their classification consisted of eight cultural variables that accounted for effective intercultural communication, including attitudes, social organization, patterns of thought, roles and role expectations, language, space, time, and nonverbal expression (Porter & Samovar, 1976).

Hawes and Kealey (1981) examined effectiveness of technical assistance personnel working in six developing countries. The researchers found that that the best predictors of overseas effectiveness were interpersonal skills and orientation, followed by a sense of personal or cultural identity, and a set of realistic pre-departure expectations. Hawes and Kealey (1981) argued that the interpersonal orientation offers a certain curiosity, natural respect toward others, readiness to listen to others, and determination to understand their worldview. A sense of personal identity ensures confidence in interaction with people from other cultures, openness to experiencing other cultures, and an absence of desire to abandon their own cultural identity. A positive and realistic expectation about life in another country, which is the third predictor of overseas effectiveness, allows for overseas employees to acknowledge potential difficulty and inconveniences and to intend to do the best they can in a particular overseas situation (Hawes & Kealey, 1981).
Dinges and Lieberman (1989) assessed intercultural communication competence through situational variables that affected responses to stressful intercultural employment situations. The researchers measured the responses of Japanese American and Caucasian American employees about their stress levels in three employment situations, including job interviews, promotion seeking, and job termination. Sixteen judges evaluated each situation, which was designed to vary the magnitude of stressfulness for each participant. Results of Dinges and Lieberman's (1989) study indicated that the type of situation was a more powerful determining factor in the judges' assessment of intercultural communication competence than were individual competence traits assessed alone. The research subjects, regardless of culture or gender, were rated lower on several competence items (e.g., considered others point of view and respectful of authority), in the job termination situation than in the interview or promotion situations, indicating that their responses in the situation were spontaneous and primarily concerned with the threat to them (Dinges & Lieberman, 1989).

Kealey and Protheroe (1996) analyzed the issue of effectiveness of cross-cultural training for expatriates: specifically, the question of whether cross-cultural training makes a difference to overseas work performance and adaptation of expatriate personnel. The researchers determined that effective cross-cultural training usually had four components: provision of practical information, area studies of a particular country or a region, cultural awareness information, and acquisition of intercultural effectiveness skills (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996). They confirmed earlier findings of Earley (1987) and Bird, Heinbuch, Dunbar, and McNulty (1993) that both area studies and experiential-
based interpersonal skills training correlated with higher evaluations of trainees' overseas effectiveness.

**Intercultural Adjustment Model.**

The second group of intercultural communication theorists favors the intercultural adjustment model when investigating intercultural communication competence. Hammer et al. (1978) analyzed 24 personal abilities considered important in intercultural situations. Fifty-three American students who had lived in a foreign culture for at least three months rated themselves on these personal abilities. The factor analysis showed three basic dimensions: the ability to deal with psychological stress, the ability to communicate effectively, and the ability to establish interpersonal relationships.

The first factor, the ability to deal with psychological stress, included such items as effectively dealing with frustration, effectively dealing with interpersonal conflict, effectively dealing with stress, effectively dealing with pressure to conform, effectively dealing with financial difficulties, effectively dealing with social alienation, effectively dealing with different political systems, and effectively dealing with anxiety. The second factor was the ability to communicate effectively, which included initiation interaction with stranger, entering into meaningful dialogue with other people, effectively dealing with communication misunderstandings between yourself and others, and effectively dealing with different communication styles. Finally, the ability to establish interpersonal relationships included items such as effectively dealing with different social systems, developing satisfying interpersonal relationships with other people, maintaining satisfying interpersonal relationships with other people, accurately understanding the feelings of another person, empathizing with another people, and effectively dealing with different
Brislin (1981) analyzed attitudes, traits, and skills involved in effective intercultural interactions and embedded in performance situations. While the essential attitudes included non-ethnocentrism and non-prejudicial judgments, the key personality traits consisted of tolerance, strength, social relations, intelligence, task orientation, and motivation. The skills that were identified as necessary for effective intercultural communication included knowledge of subject matter, language, communication skills, positive orientation to opportunities, the ability to use traits in a given culture, and the ability to complete tasks (Brislin, 1981). The importance of Brislin's (1981) research is that he provided a beginning list of situational factors that influence the outcomes of intercultural interactions. The researcher distinguished between the key traits and skills, which are crucial for purposes on selection and training for intercultural competence.

Kealey (1989) performed a longitudinal study of the overall adjustment and effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors living in developing countries. The researcher determined that personal traits of technical advisors were more relevant in explaining and predicting overseas adjustment outcomes than situational variables and interpersonal skills. Three of the interpersonal skills—self-rater caring, peer-rated caring, and self-rated self-centered—were found to associate with greater difficulty in intercultural adjusting (Kealey, 1989). Knowledge of the local culture and participation were found to associate with effectiveness in working with foreign nationals and transferring of skills and knowledge to peers. The results of this study suggested that previous overseas experience moderated adjustment stress for over 50 percent of Canadian technical advisors (Kealey, 1989).

Black and Gregersen (1991) explored cross-cultural adjustment of American
expatriate managers registered with the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Hong-Kong. They examined relationships among individual, organizational, job, and non-work antecedents and three facets of cross-cultural adjustment. The researcher distinguished between anticipatory adjustment, including previous international experience and organization, in-country adjustment, both individual and job related, and non-work adjustment, including association with home and host nationals, cultural novelty, spouse interaction, and general adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991). Previous international work experience was not related to any of the three factors of adjustment. Self-initiated pre-departure culture training was significantly related to interaction adjustment, while company-provided cross-cultural pre-departure training was not related to either job or general adjustment. Interaction with home nationals was significantly related to work adjustment, and interaction with host nationals was related to interaction adjustment. Spouse interaction adjustment was strongly related to expatriate interaction adjustment, and spouse general adjustment was strongly related to expatriate general adjustment (Black & Gregersen, 1991).

Redmond and Bunyi (1991) examined the relationship between intercultural communication competence and stress during intercultural adjustment of 644 international students attending a university in the United States. They defined intercultural communication competence as consisting of communication effectiveness, adaptation, social integration, language competence, knowledge of the host culture, and social decentering (Redmond & Bunyi, 1991). Two facets of intercultural communication competence -- adaptation and social decentering -- accounted for 16 percent of the variance in amount of stress reported and communication effectiveness,
adaptation, social integration were related to the amount of stress (Redmond & Bunyi, 1991). Communication effectiveness, adaptation, and social integration accounted for 46 percent of the variance in reported effectiveness in handling stress.

Several studies of intercultural adjustment have focused on differentiating sociocultural and psychological forms of adjustment (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1992, 1993). Ward and Kennedy (1993) investigated cross-cultural transitions and adjustment of Malaysian and Singaporean students in New Zealand and Malaysian students in Singapore. The researchers assessed each group on cross-cultural experience, cultural knowledge, personality, life changes, cultural distance, acculturation, attitudes toward host country, and quality and quantity of interpersonal relations. For the first group of research participants, psychological adjustment was predicted by a low incidence in life changes, an internal locus of control, satisfying co-national relations, and social adaptation. For the Malaysian students in Singapore, an internal locus of control, a low incidence of life changes, sociocultural adaptation, and increased interaction with hosts were the most significant predictors of psychological adjustment. Cultural identity, cultural distance, length of residence in the host culture, quantity of interaction with hosts, and psychological adjustment predicted sociocultural adjustment of the research subjects.

**Intercultural Communication Competence Model.**

The third model of intercultural communication competence views effective intercultural interactions as a function of the success of the communication process between culturally different persons. An interculturally competent person is able to establish an interpersonal relationship with a foreign national through effective exchange
of both verbal and nonverbal levels of behavior (Dinges, 1983).

Abe and Wiseman (1983), in their study of 57 students from various Japanese universities, reported five dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: the ability to communicate interpersonally (50 percent of the variance in the abilities items), the ability to adjust to different cultures (18 percent of the variance), the ability to adjust to different social systems (15 percent of the variance), the ability to establish interpersonal relationships (10 percent of the variance), and the ability to understand others (7 percent of the variance). This study compared the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness found in Hammer et al. (1978) using American sojourners with the dimensions found with Japanese sojourners. Using larger samples of American students who have sojourned abroad, Hammer (1987) confirmed the existence of these dimensions. The dimension of the ability to adjust to different societal systems of the Abe and Wiseman (1983) study was most similar to the ability to deal with psychological stress of the Hammer et al. (1978) study; the ability to communicate interpersonally corresponded with the ability to communicate effectively of the Hammer et al. (1978) study; and the ability to establish interpersonal relationships was similar to the ability to develop interpersonal relationships of the Hammer et al. (1978) study.

Martin and Hammer (1989) attempted to identify behaviors associated with the impression of communication competence in intracultural and intercultural interaction contexts. Each of 602 subjects were asked to describe (a) what he or she would do to create a favorable impression and be seen as a competent communicator and (b) what he or she would expect the other person to do to create a favorable impression and be viewed by the respondent as a competent communicator. The respondents in the study identified three specific categories of behaviors: nonverbal behaviors, verbal
behaviors (topic/content), and conversational management behavior. The behaviors most frequently identified as important to communication competence for self were similar to those identified for other: show of interest, friendliness, politeness, make the other person comfortable, and act natural. Behaviors identified as important to communication competence for others included do the same as I do, show interest, honesty, and politeness. Nonverbal behaviors associated with communication competence included direct eye contact, listening carefully, smiling, paying attention, and using gestures. Common conversational management behavior included seeking common ground, seeking topics of shared interest, sharing information about self, talking about own country, and comparing countries and cultures.

Wiseman et al. (1989) examined the relationship between intercultural communication competence and knowledge of the host culture and cross-cultural attitudes surveying 887 subjects from Japan and the United States. The researchers conceptualized intercultural communication competence as a multidimensional construct which included culture specific understanding of other, culture-general understanding, and positive regard for other. Using Gudykunst, Wiseman, and Hammer’s (1977) three-factor model of cross-cultural attitudes as the predictor variables--cognitive (stereotypes of the other culture), affective (ethnocentrism), and conative (behavioral intentions)--Wiseman et al. (1989) found ethnocentrism to be the strongest predictor of the culture-specific understanding dimension of communication competence, while perceived social distance followed as the next strongest predictor. High levels of ethnocentrism were related to less culture-general understanding; greater degrees of perceived knowledge of specific culture were associated with greater culture-general understanding. Finally, the culture-general dimension was positively correlated with perceived social distance.
Increased positive regard was modestly related to less ethnocentrism, greater knowledge of the other culture, and greater perceived social distance.

Dean and Popp (1990) examined the agreement between American managers in Saudi Arabia and French managers in the United States on culture-general and culture-specific interpretations of five personal abilities perceived as being important for intercultural communication competence. The researchers asked respondents to select the five abilities from 16 personal abilities for intercultural communication effectiveness (Hammer et al., 1978) that greatly facilitate intercultural functioning. The results of the study determined the abilities to communicate interpersonally and to adjust to different cultures to be culture specific, while the abilities to deal with unfamiliar situations, to work with other people, to deal with changes in lifestyles, and to deal with communication misunderstandings to be culture general (Dean & Popp, 1990).

Cui and Awa (1992) examined the concept of intercultural effectiveness by surveying American business people in China. Their model of intercultural effectiveness was based on the five underlying dimensions: interpersonal skills, social interaction, cultural empathy, personality traits, and managerial ability. Cui and Awa (1992) studied the five underlying factors of the intercultural communication competence model in relation to cross-cultural adjustment and job performance. The researchers found effective cross-cultural adjustment and job performance to be moderately correlated and to differ in their factorial structures. In terms of cross-cultural adjustment, personality traits accounted for 24.4 percent of the variance, interpersonal skills accounted for 11.7 percent of the variance, and social interaction accounted for 8.7 percent of the variance. For the job performance factor analysis, interpersonal skills, cultural empathy, managerial ability, and personality traits
accounted for 24.9 percent, 11.5 percent, 7.9 percent, and 7.3 percent of the variance respectively (Cui & Awa, 1992). The researchers concluded that, to be interculturally effective, a person should be effective in both cross-cultural adjustment and job performance; however, cross-cultural adjustment and effective job performance have different requirements and priorities.

**The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model**

The researcher determined that the integrated intercultural communication competence model to be the most appropriate when examining the impact of intercultural communication competence on performance of multicultural teams. The proposed integrated intercultural communication competence model is based on the research of Abe and Wiseman (1983) and Cui and Awa (1992). The review of the overseas performance model, the intercultural adjustment model, and the intercultural communication competence model shows several advantages of the integrated intercultural communication competence model over other models.

While each study produces an extensive list of skills, abilities, and attitudes, the literature does not lead to the transparent integration of these variables across these studies. Researchers operating in the overseas performance framework investigated factors of effective overseas performance of American government workers and administrators (Cleveland et al., 1960), theoretical factors to measure overseas performance (Benson, 1978), effectiveness of technical assistance personnel (Hawes & Kealey, 1981), situational variables that affected responses to stressful situations (Dinges & Lieberman, 1989), and effectiveness of cross-cultural training for expatriates (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996). The overseas performance model focuses on a
very specific context of overseas performance or an overseas assignment of a temporary nature.

The researchers in favor of the intercultural adjustment framework examined different abilities considered important in intercultural situations (Hammer et al., 1978), attitudes, traits, and skills involved in effective intercultural interactions (Brislin, 1981), adjustment and effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors (Kealey, 1989), cross-cultural adjustment of American expatriate managers (Black & Gregersen, 1991), the relationship between intercultural communication competence and stress during intercultural adjustment of international students (Redmond & Bunyi, 1991), and sociocultural and psychological forms of adjustment (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1992, 1993). The intercultural adjustment model investigates the abilities, skills, and traits of international sojourners during their adjustment to another culture.

The researchers in favor of the intercultural communication competence framework examined the relationship between intercultural communication competence and knowledge of the host culture of Japanese sojourners (Wiseman et al., 1989), the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness reported by Japanese students (Abe & Wiseman, 1983), behaviors associated with the impression of communication competence in intracultural and intercultural interaction contexts (Martin & Hammer, 1989), culture-general and culture-specific interpretations of intercultural communication competence of American and French managers (Dean & Popp, 1990), and the concept of intercultural effectiveness by surveying American business people (Cui & Awa, 1992).

While these researchers attempted to move from more narrow contexts of overseas performance and intercultural adjustment, the results of their studies do not
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unify under one conceptual framework of intercultural communication competence. Some researchers viewed intercultural communication competence as a set of abilities (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Dean & Popp, 1990), a list of behaviors (Martin & Hammer, 1989), and a set of dimensions of intercultural effectiveness (Cui & Awa, 1992). Current intercultural communication research can benefit from a universal conceptual model and analytical instrument, integrating different models and approaches in examining intercultural communication competence. The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model used in this dissertation was developed to overcome the conceptual limitations of the overseas performance, the intercultural adjustment, and the intercultural communication competence frameworks.

The proposed integrated intercultural communication competence model is based on the research of Abe and Wiseman (1983) and Cui and Awa (1992). Abe and Wiseman (1983) reported five dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: the ability to communicate interpersonally, the ability to adjust to different cultures, the ability to adjust to different social systems, the ability to establish interpersonal relationships, and the ability to understand others. Cui and Awa (1992) examined the concept of intercultural effectiveness based on the five underlying dimensions: interpersonal skills, social interaction, cultural empathy, personality traits, and managerial ability. The researcher developed the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model by combining the dimensions of Abe and Wiseman's (1983) and Cui and Awa's (1992) models and applying them to the context of multicultural teams (Matveev, Rao, & Milter, 2001).

The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model has a number of conceptual and operational advantages. First, the Integrated Intercultural
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Communication Competence model is more universal in nature: it can be applied to a much wider range of situations and interactions of people from different cultures, including overseas performance and intercultural adjustment. Second, the theoretical foundation of the Integrated Model is consistent throughout different intercultural communication and cultural studies (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Cui & Awa, 1992; Dean & Popp, 1990; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hammer, 1987; Hofstede, 1980, 1991; Samovar & Porter, 1991; Shonk, 1982; Wheelan, 1994; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996). Finally, earlier studies using the foundational intercultural communication competence model yielded significant findings. Abe and Wiseman’s (1983) five dimensions of intercultural effectiveness accounted for 50 percent of the variance (the ability to communicate interpersonally), 18 percent of the variance (the ability to adjust to different cultures), 15 percent of the variance (the ability to adjust to different social systems), 10 percent of the variance (the ability to establish interpersonal relationships), and 7 percent of the variance (the ability to understand others) in the abilities items. Cui and Awa’s (1992) dimensions of intercultural effectiveness accounted for 25 percent (interpersonal skills), 12 percent (cultural empathy), 8 percent (managerial ability), and 7 percent (personality traits) of the variance in the abilities items.

The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model views a multicultural team in an organization as a basic unit of analysis. Each member of the multicultural team comes from a different culture and possesses different characteristics contributing to the communication process. The Model examines intercultural communication competence of a team member as being based on four underlying dimensions: the interpersonal skills dimension, the team effectiveness dimension, the
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The four dimensions of intercultural communication competence consist of different specific elements.

**Dimension One: Interpersonal Skills.**

In the *interpersonal skills dimension* a member of a multicultural team has to acknowledge differences in communication and interaction styles of people from different cultures, to be flexible in dealing with communication misunderstandings, and to feel comfortable when communicating with foreign nationals. To effectively communicate interpersonally in a multicultural environment team members have to be aware of their own cultural conditioning, which influences decision-making processes, and have to acquire basic knowledge and information about the country, the culture, and the language of another team member. Cultural awareness allows team members to work more effectively on a multicultural team, as they are able to view different approaches towards work and decision making of people from other cultures not as bad but as different. Cultural awareness provides an important kind of information upon
Figure 1. The Dimensions of the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model

**Interpersonal Skills**
- Acknowledging differences in communication and interaction styles
- Being flexible in dealing with communication misunderstandings
- Feeling comfortable when communicating with foreign nationals
- Being aware of your own cultural conditioning
- Having a basic knowledge and information about the country, the culture, and the language of another team member

**Team Effectiveness**
- Understanding team goals, roles, and norms
- Using participatory communication and leadership style, involving everyone in decision making, giving, receiving, and utilizing constructive feedback, dealing with conflict situations, displaying respect to other team members
- Working cooperatively, sharing information, practicing intercultural interaction management

**Cultural Uncertainty**
- Being able to deal with cultural uncertainty
- Displaying patience
- Being tolerant of ambiguity and uncertainty due to cultural differences
- Being open to cultural differences and willing to accept change and risks
- Exercising flexibility

**Cultural Empathy**
- Understand the world from others’ cultural perspectives
- Having spirit of inquiry about other cultures, values, beliefs, and their communication patterns
- Having an appreciation for different working styles
- Viewing the ways things are done in other cultures not as bad, but as different
which the behavior of team members from the other cultures can be better understood and accurately interpreted and predicted (Wiseman et al., 1989).

Dimension Two: Team Effectiveness.

The team effectiveness dimension includes such critical skills as the ability of a team member to understand and communicate clearly team goals, roles, and norms to other members of a multicultural team. Effective team members support and engage in the communication and leadership style, which allows team members to participate in the team processes, to give, receive, and utilize constructive feedback about individual performance and contributions, to define and discuss problems they must solve, to effectively deal with conflict situations, to change leadership style to meet emerging group needs, and to display respect and courtesy to other team members. Finally, the team effectiveness dimension of intercultural communication competence includes an ability to develop and support the team structure, which allows team members to spend sufficient time together, to form and work in subteams, and to work effectively and cooperatively together as a unit and on subteams, and to practice intercultural interaction management (Wheelan, 1999).

Dimension Three: Cultural Uncertainty.

The cultural uncertainty dimension of intercultural communication competence reflects primarily an ability of a team member to deal with cultural uncertainty and display patience, to be tolerant of ambiguity and uncertainty due to cultural differences, and to work in a flexible manner with other members on a multicultural team.
Multicultural team members with a high level of cultural uncertainty tend to be worried about the future of communication and team dynamics and tend to have high levels of anxiety associated with communicating with people from different cultures (Hofstede, 1980). Team members with a low level of cultural uncertainty are more open to cultural differences and more willing to accept change and risks (Hofstede, 1980).

**Dimension Four: Cultural Empathy.**

Finally, in the *cultural empathy dimension*, a member of a multicultural team has to develop the capacity to behave as though they understand the world as do team members from other cultures do (Koester & Olebe, 1988), a spirit of inquiry about other cultures and the communication patterns in these cultures, an appreciation for different working styles (Cui & Awa, 1992), and an ability to view the ways things are done in other cultures not as bad but simply as different (Meggison, 1967). Communication researchers found cultural empathy to be the most important psychological predisposition for effective intercultural communication (Kim, 1986).

**Summary and Research Hypotheses**

The literature review presented in this chapter has led to the following conclusions. First, since most of the work processes are organized around teams and a large portion of communication in multicultural organizations occurs between people with different cultural backgrounds, intercultural communication competence of individual members of multicultural teams has risen to a higher level of importance. With team members
communicating more effectively among each other, organizational tasks can be accomplished in a more efficient manner. Second, the integrated intercultural communication competence model, based on research of Abe and Wiseman (1983) and Cui and Awa (1992) and strongly rooted in the traditions of cross-cultural communication research (Hall, 1956, 1976; Hofstede, 1980, 1991), clearly specifies a set of characteristics of an intercuturally competent person. This model can be used as a conceptual tool to examine intercultural communication competence of managers working on multicultural teams. Third, the integrated team development model (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) can be used to assess the level of multicultural team performance.

**Research Hypothesis One:** The mean score for intercultural communication competence vary for different groups of respondents based on their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on multicultural teams, and international work experience.

Past research has demonstrated the significance of understanding intercultural communication competence and team development to effective functioning of multicultural teams in modern organizations. Communication researchers have identified the distinct dimensions of intercultural communication competence and different variables critical to positive intercultural encounters (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Samovar & Porter, 1991). Some researchers have explored the impact of job, personal, and general factors on cross-cultural adjustments of American managers abroad (Black & Gregersen, 1991). However, previous intercultural communication research is not specific enough about how different demographic and individual
characteristics of people who are involved in intercultural interactions influence the level of intercultural communication competence. Therefore, the first research hypothesis will investigate the influence of demographic and individual characteristics on the level of intercultural communication competence.

The second group of research hypotheses will specifically address the difference in self-perceived intercultural communication competence and different dimensions of intercultural communication competence by the Russian and the American managers.

**Research Hypothesis Two (a):** The Russian and the American managers in multinational organizations differ in their mean scores for intercultural communication competence.

Communication competence of an individual is related to willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and communication assertiveness (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986). Russian peoples' communication competence and willingness to communicate differ significantly from people in the United States. Russian people are less willing to initiate communication with groups, dyads, strangers, and friends, ranking lowest among comparable countries (Christophel, 1996). However, no communication research examined differences in intercultural communication competence between the Russians and the Americans.

Sub-hypotheses (b) and (c) will investigate differences in the mean scores for the individual dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the Russian and the American managers.
Research Hypothesis Two (b): The American managers have higher mean scores on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the Russian managers.

The Russian team members might exhibit lower scores on the interpersonal skills dimension than the American team members as they are less able to acknowledge differences in communication and interaction styles of people from different cultures, less flexible in dealing with communication misunderstandings, and feel less comfortable when communicating with foreign nationals because of the fact that Russia was a closed society for most of the last century (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996).

Previous research shows that Russians value people for what they are rather than because of what they have done (Kluckhohn, 1961). Russians are less persistent than Americans and more acceptant of the passive sides of their nature. They display little concern with achievement, are intensely personal in relationships, and are more oriented toward the group than the individual (Peabody, 1985). The collective orientation of Russian people allowed the researcher to believe that the Russian team members might exhibit lower scores on the team effectiveness dimension than the American team members.

Research Hypothesis Two (c): The Russian managers have higher mean scores on the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the American managers.

Cultural uncertainty and cultural empathy of an individual are related to how open a person is to people from other cultures. People from collectivistic cultures make greater
distinctions between the in-group (the family, people from their own culture) and the out-group (neighbors, people from other cities and cultures) than people from individualistic cultures (Triandis, 1990). Russians, coming from a highly collectivistic culture, might express higher level of cultural uncertainty toward other cultures—the out-group—and might be more curious and empathetic about other cultures.

Research Hypothesis Three: A relationship exists between the mean scores for intercultural communication competence of managers and the mean scores for the multicultural team performance.

Team development research has described four typical stages of team development and characteristics of teams during each stage (Tuckman, 1965; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996). However, the research has not yet described the impact of intercultural communication competence of individual team members on multicultural team performance. Wiseman and Shuter (1994) noted the limited research on interpersonal and small group factors in multinational organizations, and the lack of focus on communication issues. Rhinesmith (1993) argued that "there has been remarkably little systematic work in defining the specific characteristics of a well-functioning multicultural team" (p. 178). Previous research on intercultural effectiveness and multicultural teams focused on individual and interpersonal findings and not on team-oriented findings and assessment of team performance (Hofner Saphiere, 1996; Reagan & Rohrbaugh, 1990). Therefore, the third research hypothesis will examine a relationship between intercultural communication competence and the performance of multicultural teams.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology used to investigate the perceptions of intercultural communication competence and its impact on performance of multicultural teams by American and Russian managers. The nature and the desired results of the proposed study guided the choice of research methodology. The desired results of this study were to understand how different demographic and individual characteristics influence the level of intercultural communication competence, to investigate how selected members of American and Russian cultures perceive intercultural communication competence and its impact on multicultural team performance, and to describe a relationship between intercultural communication competence of managers and the performance of multicultural teams.

The researcher used the survey method to solicit information from the respondents on intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance (Richards, 1998). The researcher employed the survey method -- a commonly used methodology in intercultural communication research -- to learn about characteristics of a large population and to ask questions of respondents representing a specific population about their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors (Frey, Botan, Friedman, & Kreps, 1991). The methodology of survey research typically includes identifying a population or interest group, selecting the research participants, determining a method for collecting information, constructing survey questions, and collecting and analyzing the gathered information (Rubin, Rubin, & Piele, 1996). Each of these steps will be described in the next sections of this chapter. The pilot study of intercultural communication competence and its findings are also presented in this chapter.
Selection of Participants

The participants in this study were upper and middle managers of medium and large multinational companies in the United States and the Russian Federation. The researcher selected the companies and the actual research participants based on the scale of their international operations, their history of working in intercultural teams, and their willingness to participate in this research study. The majority of the respondents worked in the consulting (58%), manufacturing (31%), and insurance (11%) industries, while holding managerial and administrative positions (55%). Targeting of the participants for the study was based on the networking method described by Burgess (1984), where the initial participants bring in people with similar experiences through their professional networks. The researcher surveyed a total of 61 Russian and 56 American managers.

The unit of analysis in this study was a manager who is a member of a multicultural team. The minimal sample size for this dissertation was to survey 60 managers in the United States and in Russia. The researcher estimated the sample size based on the recommendations of Stevens (1986), who suggests having 15 research subjects per variable, and Cohen (1988), who recommends a minimum of 50 participants per group to achieve an approximate power of .80 with a medium effect size.

Investigating how different cultures perceive intercultural communication competence and its impact on multicultural team performance included field research in Russia and data collection in the United States. In the Russian Federation, the researcher collected data primarily in two locations: Moscow, a large metropolitan area of the Russian capital with a high concentration of international business and
multinational corporations, and Chelyabinsk, a large city in the Urals region of Russia. In
the United States, the researcher focused on surveying multinational organizations with
the headquarters located in Washington, D.C., New York, Cleveland, Ohio, and Fargo,
North Dakota. This sampling procedure ensured a more diverse pool of respondents,
including people from a highly developed metropolitan area and cities in the regions of
the United States and Russia.

Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure varied depending on the type, location, and
accessibility factors of the respondent's group. In general, the researcher used a
multistep process to collect data from managers of international companies to ensure
an unobtrusive nature of the data collection procedure and an adequate response rate
(Frey et al., 1991). The researcher contacted the participating companies in advance to
inform them about this study and to inquire about their interest in taking part in this
research. In some cases, an interview or a meeting to discuss the details followed the
initial contact. When companies agreed to participate, the questionnaires, research
forms, and other supporting research tools were sent to them via mail, fax, or e-mail.

In addition to the questionnaires, a number of semi-structured interviews as well as
formal discussion and feedback sessions took place with the American and Russian
respondents. The goal of this qualitative part of the research was to obtain more in-
depth information about how the respondents perceive intercultural communication
competence and its relationship with the performance of multicultural teams
(Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992). The researcher secured a permission to study
managers of companies in the United States and in Russia from the Institutional Review
Research Instruments

This study of intercultural communication competence employed a survey method to collect data from managers with different communication styles and to achieve a high level of validity and reliability of data. The researcher used two research questionnaires to solicit information about each manager's perceptions of intercultural communication competence and performance of multicultural teams. Using questionnaires increased the reliability of this study because of the uniformity of the questions being asked across different research participants. Other advantages of using a questionnaire included low cost, high penetration rate, high accessibility, high consistency, and low biasing error (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992).

**Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire (ICCQ):** This questionnaire was designed to develop an understanding of how different groups of respondents perceive different dimensions of intercultural communication competence and to provide preliminary guidelines for describing the relationship between intercultural communication competence and team effectiveness of multicultural work teams. The ICCQ's theoretical framework is based on the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model, which is rooted in Abe and Wiseman's (1983) abilities model and Cui and Awa's (1992) concept of intercultural effectiveness. The model is based on four underlying dimensions that describe a level of intercultural communication competence of a team member: interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy. The researcher constructed 23 questions of the ICCQ around these dimensions of intercultural communication competence. The questions, each of which
prompts the respondents about one dimension, were randomly distributed in the questionnaire to ensure unbiased answers. The researcher performed a pilot study to test the scale for reliability by surveying 380 participants. The researcher found the reliability of the scale to be $\alpha = 0.88$, a relatively high value of Cronbach's alpha for a self-designed scale (Tabachnik & Fidel, 1996). The Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire is shown in Appendix A.

**High Performance Team Questionnaire** (HPTQ): This questionnaire is a part of a set of questionnaires that were designed to assess team performance during different stages of team development. The HPTQ is based on the integrated model of group development designed and tested by Wheelan (1990, 1994). The HPTQ contains 42 questions that assess and characterize team performance during the high-performance stage (fourth stage) of its development. The HPTQ has a test-retest reliability of .82 and an internal consistency alpha of .88 (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996). The HPTQ was tested and validated in Mexico and Japan by the original authors; it maintained its high reliability values of .78 for Mexico and .82 for Japan and internal consistency values of .89 for Mexico and .86 for Japan (Wheelan et al., 1998). The High Performance Team Questionnaire is shown in Appendix B.

The researcher translated the ICC and HPT questionnaires from the English language into the Russian language. Dr. Evans-Romaine -- Assistant Professor of Russian at Ohio University and a certified translator with over 20 years of experience with the Russian language and 4 years residence in Russia -- back-translated both questionnaires. The researcher then compared the back-translated questionnaires with the original questionnaires and made appropriate modifications to minimize the losses in
meaning due to language nuances and translation.

Pilot Study

The researcher performed a pilot study of corporate managers and students of management to test the Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire (ICCQ) for consistency and internal reliability and to make preliminary generalizations about how different groups of respondents defined intercultural communication competence. The researcher created and administered the ICCQ to 380 participants from three groups: employees of multinational companies, employees of international organizations, MBA students, and undergraduate students at a midwestern university. A survey method was used to solicit information from the respondents on intercultural communication competence (Richards, 1998).

The researcher subjected the 23-item ICCQ to a principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation. Items with a minimum factor loading of .40 and with no cross-loadings over .20 were included (Nunnally, 1978). The reliability analysis determined a relatively high reliability of the scale of .88 (Tabachnik & Fidel, 1996). The exploratory factor analysis (Kim & Mueller, 1985; Lawley & Maxwell, 1971) revealed the underlying dimensions of intercultural communication competence among the questions composing the ICCQ. The factor analysis identified four factors, which clearly corresponded with the dimensions of the integrated intercultural communication competence model.
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The first factor included five items and focused on the interpersonal skills needed in an intercultural context. The eigenvalue was 7.61, and 33% of the variance was explained by this factor. The second factor included five items that focused primarily on the attitude and skills needed to be an effective team member. The eigenvalue for the second factor was 2.83 and explained about 12% of the variance. The third factor had four items and dealt with issues related to cultural uncertainty. The eigenvalue for the third factor was 1.28 and explained 6% of the variance. The fourth factor, which had four items and focused on cultural empathy, had an eigenvalue of 1.09 and explained 5% of the variance. The reliability of each subscale in the ICCQ was found to be .87 for the first factor, .80 for the second factor, .73 for the third factor, and .66 for the fourth factor.

The four factors, with significantly high factor loadings, combined items from the ICCQ to create an integrated meaning of intercultural communication competence. Each of these dimensions is multifaceted consisting of items related to intercultural communication knowledge, attitude, motivation, and skills (Matveev, Rao, & Milter, 2001). The researcher labeled these four dimensions interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy.

Data Analysis Procedure

A descriptive statistical analysis yielded generalizations about how groups of managers with different demographic and individual characteristics define intercultural communication competence (Rubin et al., 1996). The study compared data on the type of gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience. The mix of demographic and individual factors was
consistent with earlier research on intercultural communication competence (Black & Gregersen, 1991; Kealey, 1989). One t test and four one-way analyses of variance determined any statistically significant differences in mean intercultural communication competence scores between the groups of respondents, depending on gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on multicultural teams, and length of international work experience (Maxwell & Delaney, 2000; Stevens, 1996). These analyses answered the first research question: do the mean intercultural communication competence scores vary for different groups of managers based on their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on multicultural teams, and length of international work experience?

The t tests determined any statistically significant differences in mean scores for intercultural communication competence and the mean scores of the interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the American and the Russian managers (Maxwell & Delaney, 2000; Stevens, 1996). The nationality of the group was the independent variable and the mean score of the respondents on interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy were the dependent variables. The t tests answered the second trio of research questions: (a) do the Russian and the American managers differ in their mean intercultural communication competence scores, (b) do the American managers score higher on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the Russian managers, and (c) do the Russian managers score higher on the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the American managers?
Finally, the researcher used correlation analysis to investigate the relationship between intercultural communication competence and performance of multicultural teams (Kenny, 1987). The squared correlation coefficient ($r^2$) was determined for the simple regression equation. The correlation analysis answered the third research question: does a relationship exist between a level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members and multicultural team performance as measured by team members' perceptions of intercultural communication competence and team performance? The researcher used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to perform the descriptive statistical analyses, the $t$ tests, the analyses of variance, and the correlation analysis (Norusis, 1999). The alpha level of statistical significance (Cronbach, 1951) was set at .05 for all types of statistical analyses (Stevens, 1996).

Summary

This chapter outlined the research methodology used in the study. Specifically, this chapter included a description of the participants, the data collection procedure, and the research instruments, including the Intercultural Communication Competence and the High Performance Team questionnaires, and the data analysis procedure. The researcher described the findings of the pilot study of intercultural communication competence which tested the Intercultural Communication Competence questionnaire and statistically confirmed four dimensions of intercultural communication competence. Finally, this chapter outlined the $t$ tests, the analyses of variance, and the correlation analysis performed to answer three primary research questions of this dissertation. The following chapter will introduce the results of these statistical analyses and the
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interviews performed by the researcher in Russia and in the United States.
Chapter Four: Results

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses and the interviews performed by the researcher in Russia and in the United States. The researcher employed the Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire with reliability $\alpha = 0.88$ (Matveev, Rao, & Milter, 2001) and the High Performance Team Questionnaire with reliability $\alpha = 0.82$ (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) to survey managers in Russia and in the United States. The collected data was examined for statistical outliers to avoid the instances of incorrect data entry and extreme non-representative cases (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). The researcher addressed the issue of meeting data assumptions criteria for each statistical analysis performed to test the research hypotheses.

The data collected from 124 managers of Russian and American multinational organizations showed no significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for male and female respondents, across different age groups, educational levels, length of international work experience, and frequency of work on multicultural teams.

The American and Russian respondents did not differ significantly on their mean scores for intercultural communication competence. The American respondents reported higher mean scores on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence. The researcher observed no significant differences between American and Russian respondents on the cultural uncertainty dimension or on the cultural empathy dimension of intercultural communication competence. Finally, the researcher found a significant relationship between the mean scores for intercultural communication competence and the mean
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scores for multicultural team performance.

The researcher conducted a total of 40 interviews with Russian and American managers with experience on multicultural teams. The interview guide in English and Russian languages ensured consistency of questions asked of the interviewees in these two countries. The Russian and American managers agreed about relevance and importance of intercultural communication competence for performance of multicultural teams, viewing intercultural communication competence as a key factor in today's job market. However, Russians and Americans differed in their ranking of relative importance of different dimensions of intercultural communication competence, both as the stand-alone theoretical constructs and in the multicultural team context. This chapter provides specific details about these research findings, starting with the results of the descriptive analysis of the research participants.

Descriptive Analysis of the Research Participants

The researcher collected data from a total of one hundred and twenty four respondents (N = 124) in Russia and in the United States. Across both groups, the sample of the respondents was predominately white. The majority of the respondents worked in the consulting (58%), manufacturing (31%), and insurance (11%) industries, while holding managerial and administrative positions (55%). Fifty eight percent of the 124 respondents had international work experience, with 27% having more than five years of international work experience.
Among the Russian respondents, 35 (57%) were male and 22 (36%) were female (4 did not complete this information on the questionnaire) (Table 1). The participants’ ages ranged from 21 to 64, with an average age of 34 years. A majority of the participants (39%) completed their Master’s degree, whereas, others had earned Bachelor degrees (16%), and Doctoral degrees or other types of advanced diplomas (38%) (Table 1). The participants had significant experience working on multicultural teams. Their work on multicultural teams varied from weekly (34%) to once a year (21%) (Table 1). International work experience of the Russian respondents averaged 11 years with a maximum of 33 years. A majority of the Russian respondents held managerial and administrative positions in consulting (53%) followed by the manufacturing industry (34%).

Among the American respondents, 32 (57%) were male and 22 (39%) were female (2 did not complete this information in the questionnaire) (Table 1). A majority of the participants (36%) were older than 40 years of age, while the second largest age group was 31-40 years old (30%). An equal number of American respondents held a Bachelor degree (36%) or a Master degree (36%) degree, while only 11% held a Doctorate and other type of degree (Table 1). Most of the respondents reported that they work on multicultural teams on a weekly basis (57%). A majority of American respondents had under 5 years (34%) of international work experience, followed by a group (18%) who had 11 or more years of international work experience (Table 1). A majority of the American respondents worked in consulting (64%), while the second largest occupational group was manufacturing (25%).
Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Russian and the American Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th></th>
<th>American</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>P\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>n\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>P\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 30 yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 40 yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral and other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Russian and the American Respondents (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>P&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>n = 61 for the Russian respondents and n = 56 for the American respondents. <sup>b</sup>P = 100 percent for each subgroup of the respondents based on gender, age, education, frequency of work on multicultural teams, and international work experience.

Seven research participants were nationals of countries other than the United States and Russia, including three Germans, two Italians, one from the United Kingdom, and one from Kenya. A majority of the this group (86%) worked in consulting, had less than five years of international work experience (57%), and worked on multicultural teams weekly and daily (71%). The researcher did not include this group of participants in analyses comparing Russian and American managers’ perception about intercultural communication competence and importance of different dimensions of intercultural communication competence.

The analysis identifying statistical outliers minimized the instances of incorrect data entry and extreme non-representative cases. The outlier analysis was performed for each variable used in the statistical analyses. The researcher found 5 statistical outliers...
for the intercultural communication competence score and 3 statistical outliers for the multicultural team performance score. These subjects were not included in the statistical test, which involved one or both of these variables.

**Research Hypothesis One:** The mean intercultural communication competence scores vary for different groups of respondents based on their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on multicultural teams, and length of international work experience.

The researcher compared the intercultural communication competence score for different groups of respondents based upon their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience. The gender, the age and the level of education of the respondents are the typical demographic characteristics used to analyze a sample and make inferences about a larger population (Bryman & Cramer, 1994). The frequency of work on multicultural teams and the length of international experience of the respondents were additional characteristics of the respondents that could influence a level of intercultural communication competence and performance of multicultural teams (Black & Gregersen, 1991). As shown in Tables 2 through 6, the sample of respondents is very homogeneous on all five demographic variables.

The $t$ test determined any statistically significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores for male and female respondents. The gender of the respondents was the independent variable and the score for intercultural communication competence was the dependent variable. No significant differences in the means of intercultural communication competence scores were observed for male
and female respondents, \( t(101) = .113, p > .05 \) (Table 2). The \( t \) test met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The mean intercultural communication competence scores were normally distributed. The population variances for the male and the female groups of respondents were assumed to be equal: Levene's test for equality of variance was not significant. Each respondent in Russia and in the United States completed the questionnaires only once, independently from other respondents, and did not influence other respondents to any degree (Kenny, 1987; Stevens, 1996). The sample size for the \( t \) test \( (N = 103) \) met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 50 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .50 with a small effect size.

Table 2: \( t \) test for the Intercultural Communication Competence Score Based on Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( N^a )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>( T )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64(^b)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39(^c)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^aN = 103.\(^b\)Male respondents in the sample. \(^c\)Female respondents in the sample.

The analysis of variance determined any statistically significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores of the respondents of different age. The researcher identified three age segments of the respondents: under or equal to 30 years old, 31-40 years old, and older than 40 years old. The age group was the
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independent variable and the mean score for intercultural communication competence was the dependent variable. The study revealed no significant differences in the means of the intercultural communication competence scores across different age groups $F(2, 97) = .97, p > .05$. The mean scores for intercultural communication competence for respondents younger or equal to than 30 years old ($n = 38, M = 72, SD = 9.0$), for 31-40 years old respondents ($n = 27, M = 74, SD = 7.1$), and for respondents older than 40 years of age ($n = 35, M = 74, SD = 6.4$) were relatively similar (Table 3).

The analysis of variance met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size for the $F$ test met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 30 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .55 with a medium effect size.

Table 3: ANOVA for the Intercultural Communication Competence Score Based on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5674</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 100$.

The analysis of variance determined any statistically significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores of the respondents with different
educational levels. The researcher identified three different groups of respondents by educational attainment. The levels were Bachelor, Master, and Doctorate and other type of degree or diploma earned either in the United States or in Russia. The educational attainment group was the independent variable and the mean score for intercultural communication competence was the dependent variable. Respondents with different educational levels exhibited no significant difference in mean intercultural communication competence scores, $F(3,101) = .37, p > .05$. The mean intercultural communication competence score for respondents with Bachelor degree ($n = 29, M = 76, SD = 7.1$), Master degree ($n = 42, M = 73, SD = 8.0$), Doctorate degree and other types of diplomas ($n = 26, M = 73, SD = 8.0$) were very similar to each other (Table 4).

The analysis of variance of the mean intercultural communication competence score for different groups of respondents based on educational attainment met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size for the $F$ test met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 30 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .55 with a medium effect size.
The analysis of variance determined any statistically significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores of the respondents with different length of international work experience. Three different groups of respondents were identified based on their length of international work experience: respondents with less than or equal to 5 years ($n = 38$), 6-10 years ($n = 12$), and 11 or above years ($n = 21$). The group identifying the length of international work experience of the respondents was the independent variable and the mean score for intercultural communication competence was the dependent variable. No significant differences in means of the ICC scores were observed among respondents with different lengths of international work experience, $F (3, 68) = .82$, $p > .05$ (Table 5).

The analysis of variance of the mean intercultural communication competence score for different groups of respondents based on their length of international work experience met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size for the $F$ test met Cohen's (1988) requirement of...
approximately 25 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .55 with a medium effect size.

Table 5: ANOVA for the Intercultural Communication Competence Score Based on International Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICC Score</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 71\).

The analysis of variance determined any statistically significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores of the respondents who worked more or less often on multicultural teams. The researcher examined three different groups of respondents based on how frequently they worked on multicultural teams: respondents working on multicultural teams daily (\(n = 35\)), monthly (\(n = 32\)), and less frequent than once per month (\(n = 23\)). The group identifying how frequently the respondents worked on multicultural teams was the independent variable and the mean score for intercultural communication competence was the dependent variable. Respondents who worked less or more often on multicultural teams exhibited no significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores, \(F (2, 87) = 1.04, p > .05\) (Table 6).
The analysis of variance of the mean intercultural communication competence scores for different groups of respondents based on the frequency of work on multicultural teams met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size for the F test met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 25 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .55 with a medium effect size.

Table 6: ANOVA for the Intercultural Communication Competence Score Based on the Frequency of Work on Multicultural Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5508</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 90.

Comparison of the Mean Intercultural Communication Competence Scores between the Russian and the American Respondents

Five t tests determined any statistically significant differences in the mean scores of intercultural communication competence and the mean scores of different dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the American and the Russian respondents. The pilot study identified these four dimensions of intercultural communication competence, including interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural
uncertainty, and cultural empathy (Matveev, Rao, & Milter, 2001).

The $t$ tests provided insights on the second research question, answering if the American respondents perceived intercultural communication competence differently and placed different values on the four dimensions of intercultural communication competence compared with the Russian respondents. The review of intercultural communication literature predicted that a) the Russian and the American respondents will differ in their mean scores for intercultural communication competence, b) the American respondents will score higher on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence than would the Russian respondents, and c) the Russian respondents will score higher on the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the American respondents.

Research Hypothesis Two (a): The Russian and the American respondents differ in their overall intercultural communication competence score.

The $t$ test determined any statistically significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence between the American and the Russian respondents. The independent variable was the nationality of the respondents; the dependent variable was the score for intercultural communication competence of the respondents. The American and the Russian respondents did not differ significantly on their mean scores for intercultural communication competence, $t(103) = -1.54$, $p > .05$ (Table 7). The mean scores for intercultural communication competence were slightly higher for Americans ($M = 75, SD = 6.3$) than for Russians ($M = 73, SD = 8.7$).

The $t$ test of the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for
Americans and Russians met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size for the $t$ test met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 50 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .60 with a medium effect size.

**Research Hypothesis Two (b):** The American respondents score higher on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the Russian respondents.

Two $t$ tests determined any statistically significant differences in the mean scores on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the American and the Russian respondents. The independent variable was the nationality of the respondents; the dependent variable was the score on the interpersonal skills dimension and on the team effectiveness dimension, respectively, for each $t$ test. The American and the Russian respondents had significantly different mean scores on the interpersonal skills dimension, $t(107) = -2.90, p < .05$ (Table 7). Further examination of mean scores indicates that the American respondents report higher mean scores on the interpersonal skills dimension ($M = 18, SD = 1.9$) than did the Russian respondents ($M = 16, SD = 2.4$). Likewise, a significant difference between the American and the Russian participants was found for the team effectiveness dimension, $t(106) = -2.24, p < .05$ (Table 7). The team effectiveness score for the American respondents ($M = 22, SD = 3.0$) was higher than for the Russian respondents ($M = 21, SD = 3.5$).
These \( t \) tests of the mean scores on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimension of intercultural communication competence for Americans and Russians met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size for the \( t \) tests for the mean scores on the interpersonal skills dimension met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 50 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .95 with a large effect size. The sample size for the \( t \) tests for the mean scores on the team effectiveness dimension met Cohen's (1988) requirement of approximately 50 participants per group, achieving an approximate power of .60 with a medium effect size.

**Research Question Two (c): The Russian respondents score higher on the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the American respondents.**

Two \( t \) tests determined any statistically significant differences in the mean scores on the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the American and the Russian respondents. The independent variable was the nationality of the respondents; the dependent variable was the score on the cultural uncertainty dimension and on the cultural empathy dimension, respectively, for each \( t \) test. No significant differences between American and Russian respondents were observed on the cultural uncertainty dimension (\( t(108) = .72, p > .05 \)) or on the cultural empathy dimension (\( t(105) = .04, p > .05 \)) (Table 7). However, the researcher observed a slightly higher cultural uncertainty score for the Russian respondents (\( M = 20, SD = 4.3 \)) than for the American respondents (\( M = 19, SD = 3.8 \)). The cultural empathy score is similarly slightly higher for the
Russian respondents ($M = 15.82, SD = 2.8$) than for the American respondents ($M = 15.80, SD = 2.1$).

These $t$ tests of the mean scores on the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimension of intercultural communication competence for Americans and Russians met the data assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and independence of observations. The sample size of approximately 55 participants per group for the $t$ tests for the mean scores on the cultural uncertainty dimension achieved an approximate power of .20 with a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). With the sample size of approximately 55 participants per group, the $t$ tests for the mean scores on the cultural empathy dimension was not statistically powerful due to a very small effect size (Cohen, 1988).

### Table 7: The $t$ tests of Intercultural Communication Competence Scores and Intercultural Communication Competence Dimensions Scores for the American and the Russian Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n$^a$</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICC Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: The $t$ tests of Intercultural Communication Competence Scores and Intercultural Communication Competence Dimensions Scores for American and Russian Respondents (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n^a$</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural uncertainty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural empathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $^a n$ is the number of the Russian and the American respondents for each $t$ test.

**Correlation Analysis of Intercultural Communication Competence and Multicultural Team Performance**

A correlation analysis investigated the relationship between intercultural communication competence and performance of multicultural teams. The Pearson correlation coefficient $r$ was estimated between the score for intercultural communication competence and the score for multicultural team performance. The researcher also
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reported the estimates of the Pearson correlation coefficient \( r \) between the scores on each dimension of intercultural communication competence and the score for multicultural team performance.

**Research Hypothesis Three:** A relationship exists between the level of intercultural communication competence of team members and multicultural team performance.

The correlation analysis suggests a significant relationship between the score for intercultural communication competence and the score for multicultural team performance \((r = .45, p < .05)\) and that intercultural communication competence accounts for a moderate amount of the variance (20%) in multicultural team performance (Table 8). This finding provides a positive answer to the third research question that intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance are correlated to a significant degree. However, the correlation between these variables is not sufficiently high to suggest that a higher level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members would result in higher performance of a multicultural team.

The researcher performed correlation analyses for the interpersonal skills, the team effectiveness, the cultural uncertainty, and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance. Significant relationships with multicultural team performance were observed for the interpersonal skills dimension \((r = .33, p < .05)\), the team effectiveness dimension \((r = .45, p < .05)\), and the cultural uncertainty dimension \((r = .29, p < .05)\). No significant relationship with multicultural team performance was found for the cultural empathy dimension \((r = .08, p > .05)\) (Table 8).
The correlation analysis of the scores for intercultural communication competence, the scores for different dimensions of intercultural communication competence, and the scores for multicultural team performance met the requirements of the data assumptions of linearity, reliability, non-aggregation, and outlier analysis (Kenny, 1987). The researcher found a linear relationship between the scores for intercultural communication competence and the scores for multicultural team performance, employed the highly reliable instruments to collect the data, used the individual scores rather than averaged or aggregate scores across the sample, and performed the outlier analysis before executing the statistical tests. The correlation analysis worked with the sample of 105 respondents included two variables: the score for intercultural communication competence and the score for multicultural team performance. The correlation analysis exceeded Stevens' (1986) recommendations of having 15 research subjects per variable.

The researcher performed the correlation analyses of the mean scores for intercultural communication competence and the mean scores for multicultural team performance separately for the Russian and the American managers. The results of these analyses were similar to the correlation analysis of the mean scores for intercultural communication competence and the mean scores for multicultural team performance for all respondents. The correlation analyses confirmed a significant relationship between the mean scores for intercultural communication competence and the mean scores for multicultural team performance as perceived by the Russian managers ($r = .41, p < .05$) and by the American managers ($r = .45, p < .05$). The Russian and the American managers view intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance being correlated to a significant degree.
Table 8: Pearson Correlations between the Intercultural Communication Competence Scores, the Intercultural Communication Competence Dimensions Scores and the Multicultural Team Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication competence</td>
<td>.45^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>.33^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team effectiveness</td>
<td>.47^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural uncertainty</td>
<td>.29^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural empathy</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural team performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** r is the Pearson correlation coefficient. These values represent significant correlations at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Qualitative Interviews with the Russian and the American Respondents

_I really wish for people to be more patient with each other, in life and at work. I would spend my wish for asking to eliminate impatience from the personality traits spectrum of humans._

German Sukonnikov, a global management consulting company (personal communication, December 3, 2000)

The researcher conducted interviews with a selected group of both the Russian (n = 21) and the American (n = 19) respondents (see Appendix H). The researcher randomly selected the interviewers from the respondents who completed both the...
Intercultural Communication Competence and the High Performance Team questionnaires. The interviewers represented consulting (60%), manufacturing (28%), and insurance (12%) industries. The interviews enriched the results of the quantitative analyses by securing more in-depth information about how the Russian and the American respondents perceive intercultural communication competence and the performance of multicultural teams. The interviews demonstrated the importance of different dimensions of intercultural communication competence in American and Russian cultures and its relationship with multicultural team performance. The researcher applied a semi-structured approach to perform the interviews as the Russian and the American respondents were asked a number of similar questions in their native language. The interview guides in English and in Russian languages are shown in Appendix F and Appendix G, respectively. A summary of the interview responses of the Russian and the American managers is provided in the next section of this chapter. Each of the sub-headings corresponds to a separate question that the researcher posed to the interviewees.

**Relevance of intercultural communication competence and performance of multicultural teams.**

The researcher asked the Russian and the American managers about how relevant they thought were the topics of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance to their companies. All of the Russian respondents emphasized the importance and relevance of the topics of intercultural communication competence and team performance to their workplace.
George Grishin, a native-born Russian entrepreneur and the owner of an insurance brokerage firm, explained how relevant the topic of intercultural communication competence is to his company.

It [this topic] is very important. We [our company] work primarily in the European market. Approaches toward communication within the countries of European community vary greatly among each other. Employees who have come to work for us from other companies realize that it is impossible to work without being competent in [intercultural] communication. One of our newly hired employees acquired his communication skills in about 6 months, improving on his abilities to listen to the clients and to explain to them cultural differences of the insurance industry. (personal communication, December 19, 2000)

Two primary reasons for why the topics of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance were relevant and important were that the managers worked in a multinational corporation and that their work team usually had several foreign nationals.

Irina Knyazevskaya, a human resource manager in an international insurance corporation in Russia, replied to this question:

We work with people from different cultures on a daily basis. Our multicultural company [international insurance corporation] provides services for the Russian market while receiving technical support and expertise from offices all over the word. For me, a human resources manager, this topic [intercultural communication competence and
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performance in multicultural teams] is even more important because I work with people and I have to understand different cultures and human personalities within these cultures. (personal communication, December 27, 2000)

The American respondents agreed with the Russian respondents, stating that issues of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance were relevant for their companies. Some of the key reasons for this opinion include: having international staff members at their company, constant contact and communication with foreigners, frequent work on multicultural teams, a variety of international work assignments, and a necessity to communicate with employees from around the globe and in different time zones.

The president of a global oil lubricants manufacturing company explained:

Yes, they [issues of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance] are very important. Our company does business all around the world and only half of our sales come from North America. We rely heavily on cooperation with individuals in Europe and in the Pacific Rim locations in order to satisfy our global customers. We have to communicate very carefully and thoroughly from one location [of the world] to another so we have an overall view of our [global] customer.

We are also entering many new business areas. People coming into our organization have to be trained in technical skills. However, we rely on their local knowledge and cultural background to help us to do business in an appropriate way in a particular geographic region. I think
these topics [intercultural communication competence and performance in multicultural teams] are very relevant and very important to us.

(personal communication, April 10, 2001)

Company as a multicultural workplace.

All of twelve (100%) Russian respondents viewed their company as a multicultural workplace. The key reasons named were globalization of the business world, constant communication between the Russian corporate office and offices in other locations of the world, and work being organized around multicultural teams. An information technology manager in an international insurance company explained why he thought about his work environment as multicultural: "My team consists from people all over the world. We communicate primarily via electronic mail. I work with people from Germany, France, England, the Ukraine, and the United States" (personal communication, December 26, 2000).

Eleven out of twelve (92%) American respondents agreed that their workforce, including their clients, was multicultural. While many American respondents confirmed that they work in a multicultural environment, several stated that they did not necessarily mean that people with different cultural backgrounds worked at their office locations.

Dana Nelson, a manager of the E-commerce department in a North Dakota-based software development and consulting company told the researcher:

Yes, we work with [people from] United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Canada. I would not say that there is a lot of daily person-to-person type intercultural interaction at this location [in North Dakota]. We interact with a lot with people from across the world by the
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means of different communication technologies, including phone
conversations, email interaction, and network and video communication.
(personal communication, February 27, 2001)

Intercultural communication competence as a key success factor.
The third question was about intercultural communication competence being a key success factor in today's work environment. Nine out of twelve (75%) Russian respondents answered strongly positively to this question, supporting the fact that intercultural communication competence is a key factor in today's job market. One respondent agreed that intercultural communication competence is an important variable when examining performance at the workplace.

Anton Bakeev, a respondent from a growing consulting company in Chelyabinsk, a large city in the Urals region of Russia, expressed his opinion about importance of intercultural communication competence:

It [intercultural communication competence] has become more important and will be [important] in the future with more investment and businesses coming into the regions of Russia. Presently, our city [Chelyabinsk] is moderately attractive to foreign investments--the main reason why foreigners come to visit. Intercultural communication competence is a matter of professionalism at work. One has to have basic knowledge about countries and holidays there to understand how to communicate with people from different countries and to establish a better interpersonal contact. (personal communication, November 25, 2000)
Three American respondents answered "definitely agree" to this question.

David Hoover, an analyst from a Washington, D.C.-based public relations and consulting company, supported his answer by saying:

Companies that we work with have mergers and acquisitions going on a global scale, major corporate consolidations. Our world is becoming more of a neighborhood. An ability to communicate and work effectively with people from different cultures is definitely an advantage as far as a skill set to have. (personal communication, January 29, 2001)

An interculturally and communicatively competent employee.

The researcher asked the interviewees to describe an interculturally and communicatively competent employee in their company. The Russian managers named vast cultural knowledge as a major quality of a person who is highly interculturally and communicatively competent. Cultural knowledge was followed by communication and foreign language skills and openness to cultural differences and adaptability. Other qualities of an interculturally and communicatively competent employee as named by the Russian interviewees were understanding of nonverbal communication, understanding of different worldviews, motivation to achieve goals, emotionally reserved, acknowledging different cultural attitudes toward time and space, readiness to help, professional competence, patience, international work experience, intercultural communication skills, industrious, the ability to distinguish between cultural and individual characteristics, cultural empathy, cultural awareness, and the ability to compromise.
Ruslan Korzh, managing director of a global management consulting company in Moscow, shared his views about an interculturally and communicatively competent employee:

[This employee] should have a mix of formal and informal qualities and a mix of subjective and objective experiences. By objective experiences I mean experience of working in different countries, cultures, environments, ideally in different continents, and in different social systems as well as experience working in different positions and roles. This experience helps a person to understand the existence of different cultures and the need to understand them. Working abroad helps an individual to decode different cultural signals, understand different cultural and regulatory procedures, understand cultural diversity; all this prepares this person to work in a multicultural environment.

By subjective experiences I mean personal qualities, such as respectful attitude toward different team members in general and toward different cultures, high educational level, the ability to interact with people from different cultures, and different colors, and people speaking with an accent. (personal communication, December 17, 2000)

A majority of the American managers viewed open-mindedness and openness to new ideas as key qualities of a person who is highly interculturally and communicatively competent. Open-mindedness was followed by cultural empathy, the ability to interpret others from their perspectives, respect for other cultures, patience, listening, cultural sensitivity, and preparing for differences. Other qualities of an interculturally and
communicatively competent person named by the American interviewees include cultural awareness, recognizing different cultural traditions and values, willingness to learn, taking time to learn about different culture, being an effective communicator, the ability to understand communication of others, talking to people, asking questions, and clear written and verbal communication skills.

The American managers also named not assuming that the other person is exactly as you are and his culture is like yours, not jumping to conclusions too fast, not worrying about expressing their own culture, not being afraid to explain why certain things are part of your culture, understanding non-verbal communication and cultural clues, observant, self awareness, knowing how you come across, not making an issue out of working with other cultures, not having biases working in a multicultural team, knowing your job topic well, good understanding of project objectives, previous experience, honesty, flexibility, and good interpersonal skills.

The president of an oil lubricants manufacturing company named a number of critical qualities of an interculturally and communicatively competent employee.

Some of very important aspects are that they [employees] are very good listeners and have a very open mind. These qualities allow them to hear what customers' needs are, to interpret them in a proper way for a specific region. The first skill [listening] gives them [employees] some advantage when they are talking to people here in North America or their colleagues from another part of the world. If they [employees] listened carefully enough, they can repeat a message from the customer almost with the same feeling and the same intent…
Open mindedness is the second quality. Many times the way we would do business, the terms, the conditions, the demand that we would like to have from our customers, can't be met in the normal way. The person who has great success in working in different regions of the world, reaching business deals, being able to pursue new business opportunities, is able to translate some of these customer issues back into acceptable way of doing business, but not necessarily into specific initial way that we might have in mind. Flexibility, open mindedness, almost an interpretive approach in conducting business, and being able to communicate very carefully customer expectations are critical.

Finally, people who have lived in other parts of the world, perhaps, have different ethnic background in their upbringing, or certain cultural aspects of their background has been maintained, can better understand other cultures. People who have traveled enough--and I don't mean just a business trip here and there--, who have met a large number of people in different parts of the world, have a better understanding of other cultures. This [understanding] allows them to communicate better because of their background and experience. (personal communication, April 10, 2001)

A project associate from a development consulting company in Washington, D.C., emphasized flexibility, patience, and understanding as key qualities of an interculturally and communicatively competent employee.
Flexibility is the first [quality]. When you are working with people from different cultures and countries, especially when, as in my situation, you have to rely heavily on electronic and telephone communication and not on face-to-face communication or body language, you have to be flexible. If you are not [flexible], you are going to have problems just out of miscommunication and not because of the type of work you are doing. Understanding and patience are also critical to be successful and to build relationships in multicultural work environment as ours.

(personal communication, March 6, 2001)

**Critical dimensions of intercultural communication competence.**

The researcher asked the interviewees to rank three dimensions of intercultural communication competence based on the interviewees' views and ideas about this construct. The researcher assigned three points to the dimension of intercultural communication competence with the highest ranking, two points to the dimension with the second highest ranking, and one point to the dimension with the third highest ranking. The total number of points $\Sigma$ for each dimension for the Russian and American managers is shown in Table 9. The Russian managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the personality traits dimension as the second most important, and the cultural knowledge as the third most important. The American managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the cultural knowledge dimension as the second most important, and the personality traits dimension as the third most important (Table 9).
Table 9: Relative Importance of the Intercultural Communication Competence Dimensions as Named by the Russian and the American Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality traits</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Σ is the total number of points for each dimension assigned by the Russian and the American managers.

A manager in an international insurance company in Russia explained why he believed that the interpersonal skills dimension is the most important.

First come the interpersonal skills. We are in a business environment, where the main task is to make money. Communication must be understandable to another person; for this, the interpersonal and communication skills are critical. Second, the personality traits dimension. It is also important that business relationships do not become routine and that at least a bleak spark of interpersonal relationships flash on occasion. One must ask business partners how things are and remember how delicious were oysters in Brussels. Third comes cultural knowledge. Knowing foreign culture and the nuances of business environment is also critical in avoiding confusing
situations such as not to congratulate an Indian with Hanukah.

(personal communication, December 26, 2000)

A managing director of an oil lubricant manufacturing company in the United States, currently working in South Africa, believes that interpersonal skills are the most important dimension of intercultural communication competence.

I will rank them as interpersonal skills, cultural knowledge, and personality traits. Interpersonal and communication skills are critical to avoiding misunderstandings and such. Knowledge and understanding of other cultures help you to understand how others do business, structure their business tactics, and the reasons why they would do business in a certain way (personal communication, May 4, 2001).

Another American respondent, a president of an oil lubricants manufacturing company, however, placed more value on the personality traits dimension:

Personality would be the first [dimension]. Pure knowledge on products, businesses, and different cultures does not necessarily allow you to use it in the right way. Personality characteristics such as motivation, eagerness to understand and learn about different cultures, acceptance of individuals of different cultures [are very important]. I believe it really starts with a person, if he/she has motivation, has a desire to succeed in an international role, or has been exposed to different cultures. The second dimension would be interpersonal skills and the third would be cultural knowledge. There are certain things, of course, you need to
know to avoid making disastrous mistakes. (personal communication, April 10, 2001)

**Views about high performance team.**

The researcher addressed the high performance team topic by asking the interviewees to name the critical dimensions of high performance teams. The Russian managers named professional competence, adequacy, and clear match between individual and professional competence and the team roles as the most important for effective performance of multicultural teams. They also mentioned bonding by team goal and mission, good understanding of problems needed to be solved, different types of team members, including leaders, shapers, task masters, performers, effective sharing of duties, roles, and responsibilities, the ability to replace another team member, to help out, and to be responsible. Finally, the Russian managers stated such critical dimensions of high performance teams as the similarity of team members in personality and psychological features, attitude toward work, educational levels, and communication skills, readiness to work hard at achieving team goals, adaptability to team needs, the ability to place individual interests and goals second to the team goals, mutually complimenting professional skills, listening to individual opinions, understanding team goals and tasks, following a common goal, experience working on multicultural team, punctuality, reliability, mutual support, effective team leader that is respected by team members, and constant communication about team directions and future perspectives.

German Sukonnikov, a senior consultant with a global management consulting corporation in Russia, believes that the most critical dimension of high performance
team is readiness of every team member to work for the benefits of the team.

   Every team member must realize that sometimes team goals can take a higher priority than individual ambitions, habits, views, opinions, and traditions, and must be ready to adjust his/her personal 'I' accordingly. A huge barrier can rise between a member of a multicultural team and other team members if he or she joins a team with a belief that they belong to the richest nation in terms of its history and culture.

   (personal communication, December 3, 2000)

   The American managers emphasized focusing on a common course of action, clear understanding of team goals, and agreeing on how to accomplish them as the most important dimensions of high performance teams. The next critical dimensions of high performance teams were accepting and incorporating new ideas, hearing and respecting everyone's opinion, team members frequently communicating with each other, having a clear sense and role definition, and dividing responsibilities among team members.

   The American managers found important to respect authority and each other, to allocate time for reflection and an opportunity to learn from mistakes, to be open-minded, to exercise empowerment, to take responsibility for the roles, to have high expectations and encouragement to perform well, to execute team role to the best of ability, to give 110%, to account for the individual strengths, and to include and equally respect each of the cultures involved.

   The final list of dimensions of high performance teams named by the American managers included strong educational background in the area of expertise of team
members, necessary skills to do the job, diversity of experiences, the ability to create high quality products and services, satisfy customers on a timely fashion, regular feedback and debate about work, revision of each other work, provision of input and suggestions, and improving the final product, good leadership, people awarded individually and as a group, people being comfortable and enjoying the project, ability to learn from each other, cooperation, small size of team (4-6 members), and an adequate knowledge of main communication language (English).

President of an oil lubricants manufacturing company elaborated about his views on the critical dimensions of high performance teams.

[It is critical for a high performance team to have] highly motivated team members and individuals who can drive the team. Right now I am working on a project with my colleagues from the United Kingdom and Sweden. I am so excited about this so when I get to my office, I do not want to do anything else until after lunchtime. I do not what to miss an opportunity to speak to my colleagues overseas and to work with them when we are in the same working hours. It is incredible how really motivation can move a team forward!

It is also critical to have people on teams who complement each other in their skills sets. We have rarely a duplication of skills; teams usually are very small. Another important thing is early success. In the past, we had a lot of teams that had gone on for a long period of time before they reached their goals. It does help a lot when you
identify an early success. I think this goes along with motivation.

(personal communication, April 10, 2001)

A global business manager of the same company expressed his ideas about high performance teams.

A high performance team is able to accomplish more efficiently and more quickly its goal than a team that is not performing well. It comes down to dollars and sense. A high performance team can accomplish more than simply multiplying the number of people times the number of hours worked. In this team, members find ways to cover for each other, and to fulfill each other's tasks when people are either out, traveling, or ill. If one plots a Gann chart, saying the time and the costs of the project, a high performing team will take less time and less money to accomplish the same task. (personal communication, April 20, 2001)

Common challenges of multicultural teams.

The Russian managers named a number of common challenges that their multicultural team faced. These examples included: difficulties in the initial stages of team development, when team members adjust to values, beliefs, and behavioral norms of other team members, difference in this adjustment time depending on the culture; difference in attitudes toward professional duties in different cultures, differences in educational level and the structure of educational systems, and differences in attitudes toward conflict situations and conflict management strategies. These common difficulties occur because team members view people from different cultures as their
backyard neighbors and because of a lack of knowledge about the value system and cultural norms of others.

The Russian managers expressed some criticism of their own culture by saying that Russian team members can be late, excessively discuss family and personal problems at work, and tend to discuss work related issues at the dinner table. Americans do not necessarily welcome such non-work related communication and activities in the workplace. Russians often do a job in a manner that does not display attention to quality and established procedures. They make decisions based on their feelings and how they view the situation, which might not be in the best interest of the company. However, they view themselves as being knowledgeable about geography, as valuing holidays, and as appreciating life more than their American counterparts.

Elena Varvariv, a human resource manager of a technical service company in Russia, believes that cultural differences between Russians and Americans can cause problems and construct challenges to performance of multicultural teams.

Russian or even Soviet people are accustomed to do things unofficially, "to the left" or for personal financial gains. They often have a desire to do something without thinking of the process and the outcomes. Americans and Europeans follow pre-defined rules and procedures. They would choose a subcontractor based on costs, efficiency, and reliability of service, while Russians would choose a subcontractor that they like and enjoy working with, as in the case with selecting the Russian staff. Russians usually do not like to follow the pre-defined rules and procedures. They try to do the best according to their views, which might not be the most beneficial way for
the company. These cultural differences toward working approaches can cause major problems for multicultural teams. (personal communication, December 22, 2000)

The Russian managers believe that Americans value individual achievement and accomplishing results more than the personal qualities of their colleagues. They noticed that Americans are more likely to follow the established business guidelines and principles, while sometimes lacking a basic knowledge of geographical and political issues.

Ruslan Korzh, a managing director of the Moscow practice of a global management consulting company seemed to be very surprised by the geographical illiteracy of people from some advanced countries.

I came across some completely unacceptable and impossible scenarios while working on a consulting project with a high technology corporation in the United Kingdom. My team members from the client side have never visited London that is located within a two hours ride from their city. Their knowledge about how many countries were in the world and what were the countries of Eastern Europe could not be tested. One would question the rationale for working on solving multifaceted complex business problems with team members who could not even visually locate this or that country on a world map. What can one expect about their knowledge about judicial, legal, economic, political, and cultural characteristics of these countries?

(personal communication, December 17, 2000)
The Russian managers also expressed their opinion on how they see an effective multicultural team. Ruslan Korzh, a manager in Russia, said, "Successful intercultural interactions must be based on equal understanding, by using the same language of meaning creation, having an adequate understanding of the purpose of one's communication efforts, principles of work organization, and expectations of team members" (personal communication, December 17, 2000).

The American managers named a number of examples of common challenges that their multicultural teams faced. These examples included: communication problems, linguistic differences, language barriers, inability to establish good rapport with people from other cultures, inability to find a common ground, not understanding business protocol in another culture, absence or lack of face-to-face communication, difficulties in communication across different time zones, and reliance on electronic communication.

Colleen Green, a senior development specialist in a development consulting firm, continues the list of examples of cultural differences addressing the differences in logic and problem-solving techniques among people from different cultures.

People solve problems and come to a set of answers that is consistent with their past experience. When people from two different cultures work together and their experience, logic, and way of thinking are different, they tend to arrive at a completely different set of answers. This [different answers] creates problems for teamwork. (personal communication, February 1, 2001)
The American managers also identified the issues of transparency and different attitudes toward transparency and information as the key challenges for a multicultural team.

Americans, when working with people from other cultures, tend to presume issues to be transparent when they are not. They [Americans] tend to have a certain level of transparency, availability of information, and accuracy of information. In some cultures, as in countries of the former Soviet Union, because of the legacy and history of these countries, information might not be transparent. Different ideas about transparency increase the challenge of communicating and working on multicultural teams. (personal communication, February 1, 2001)

The American managers expressed some criticism of their own culture by saying that American managers tend to have an indirect management style and listen more to employees' ideas. This participatory approach sometimes does not work well with employees from other cultures, including the Russian staff. Americans are not as skilled in foreign languages as people from other cultures and tend to use colloquial phrases excessively when communicating with foreign nationals.

The American managers believe that other cultures have different opinions about a place of women in the workplace. When working on a number of international assignments, American women felt a certain tension between them and the male half of the workforce. Some interviewees mentioned that a certain gender bias; women had more difficulty gaining respect and understanding of their ideas.
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A female business analyst of a Washington, D.C.-based consulting company shared her experiences working with people from Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Asia, Pakistan, and India.

I did not have a good working relationship with my team members. I felt that I was less competent just because I was a woman. This [feeling of incompetence] was, probably, attributable to their culture, where women are considered to be lower in status in a business setting than men.

(personal communication, February 12, 2001)

The impact of intercultural communication competence on team performance.

The researcher asked managers about their views on the relationship of intercultural communication competence and performance in multicultural teams. All of the Russian managers answered positively to this question supporting their beliefs that the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members affects the performance of multicultural teams. They thought that the low levels of intercultural communication competence and the inability to listen and to understand others impaired interaction and understanding among team members.

German Sukonnikov, a senior consultant in the Moscow office of a management consulting company, believes that intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance are closely related.

The probability of ineffective and unsuccessful performance is very high if cultural differences exist in a multicultural team and no mechanisms or skills are present to eliminate or level down these differences.

I would not like to be part of a team where people do not account for
cultural differences by knowing the distinct characteristics and cultural differences of team members. This team will be unsuccessful.

(personal communication, December 3, 2000)

All of the American managers answered positively to this question confirming their beliefs that the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members affects the performance of multicultural teams. They based their views on their past experience, saying that, for multicultural team members to work well together, they need to understand each other. Americans agreed that cultural differences abound in the workplace. Being aware about and being able to decode different nuances of communication is important. They emphasized that poor communication or a lack of understanding between and empathy for team members of different cultures would seriously impair the effectiveness of the team.

Chris Nelson, an international sales manager in a North Dakota-based software development company, sees a definite link between intercultural communication competence and the performance in multicultural teams.

Many roadblocks and problems can occur in a team if members of this team do not communicate well with people from different cultures. Effective communication with people from different cultures is a very important aspect of a high performance team. Team members must be able to communicate and understand clearly what they are trying to accomplish and what the goal is. Across cultures this is a more challenging, difficult, and critical task. (personal communication, February 22, 2001)
Dana Nelson, a manager of E-commerce department in the same company, shares his colleagues’ opinion.

Very much so [in regards to the impact of intercultural communication competence on performance of multicultural team]. You can have individuals who become champions of multicultural teams because of their communication abilities. If you are working on a team where one part of a team is in one country and another part of a team is in a different country, team champions emerge on both ends. They [team champions] take leadership of a more challenging task of working with people from different cultures and taking over the communication between the two cultures. (personal communication, February 27, 2001)

**Dimensions of intercultural communication competence critical to achieving high performance of multicultural teams.**

The researcher asked interviewees to rank three dimensions of intercultural communication competence based on their perceptions of relative importance of each dimension for multicultural team performance. The researcher assigned three points to the dimension of intercultural communication competence with the highest ranking, two points to the dimension with the second highest ranking, and one point to the dimension with the third highest ranking. The total number of points $\Sigma$ for each dimension for the Russian and American managers is shown in Table 10.

The Russian respondents identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the personality traits
dimension as the second most important, and the cultural knowledge dimension as the third most important (Table 10). The results of this ranking are different from the answers when the researcher asked to rank the intercultural communication competence dimensions without providing the interviewees with the multicultural team context.

George Grishin, a Russian-born Director of a London-based insurance company, ranked highest the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence, the second highest the personality traits dimension, and the third highest the cultural knowledge dimension.

For our company, the interpersonal and communication skills are most important. The second would be inherited personality traits, such as openness and willingness to communicate. Cultural knowledge I would place third, however, a high performance team should ideally have people strong in all three dimensions. (personal communication, December 19, 2001)

The American managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the cultural knowledge dimension as the second most important, and the personality traits dimension as the third most important (Table 10). This result of this ranking is different from the answers when the researcher asked to rank the intercultural communication competence dimensions without mentioning the multicultural team context.
An international sales manager of a software development company explained his ranking of three dimensions of intercultural communication competence within the multicultural team context.

In the team context, there is less time to sit down and talk about different cultures and different personalities. The interpersonal skills dimension becomes more important because in a team there is not much time for one-on-one relationships. The interpersonal skills dimension becomes critical for existence of a high performance team. The second dimension is cultural knowledge and the third dimension is personality traits. Multicultural teams always have many personalities present and differences in personalities become less significant in a team than in one-on-one relationships. (personal communication, February 22, 2001)

Table 10: Relative Importance of the Intercultural Communication Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions in the Multicultural Team Context</th>
<th>Σ&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality traits</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Σ<sup>a</sup> is the total number of points for each dimension assigned by the Russian and the American managers.
What to improve in performance of multicultural teams?

The Russian managers’ first wish was for people to exhibit more patience at work, especially when working on multicultural teams. Russians also wanted team members to develop a more tolerant attitude toward people from different cultures. German Sukonnikov, a senior consultant in the Moscow office of a global consulting company, replied: "I really wish for people to be more patient with each other, in life and at work. I would spend my wish for asking to eliminate impatience from the personality traits spectrum of humans” (personal communication, December 3, 2000).

Second, the Russian managers wished for more opportunities to work in different cultures and countries and on different multicultural teams. Ruslan Korzh, managing director of a global consulting company in Moscow explained his wish.

[I would ask for] more opportunities for consultants to work on a project abroad. This can broaden their horizons and worldview and allow them to acquire new skills as they are placed into unfamiliar working conditions and are faced with new type of difficulties. This [working on projects abroad] builds the character, increases professionalism, and enriches intercultural communication experience. (personal communication, December 17, 2000)

Third, the Russian managers mentioned the need for training sessions on cultural issues and intercultural communication competence. Finally, the Russian managers asked for an intelligent and educated team leader who is able to create and lead a challenging and high performance team and to match individual team members with their ideal team roles.
The top items on the wish list of Americans include: having more challenging assignments and interesting project tasks, everyone working on one major goal as a team, better communication among all members, a higher level of communication skills, an ability to clearly communicate with others, more sensitive communication, better understanding of other people's intentions, and better understanding of everyone's objectives. The Americans wished for a more frequent acknowledgment of proper English language being more appropriate when communicating with foreign employees, everyone speaking the same language, everyone living in several parts of the world and experiencing different cultures, less ethnic and nationality issues surfacing in the workplace, and people putting their prejudice aside.

John Jepsen, an associate in a development consulting company, commented on his wishes to solve common problems in multicultural teams.

Sometimes I become more interested in the way people describe certain things and by their accent, sort of fall into their caricatures, and can get lost in the actual meaning of the message and not take this person as seriously as I should. I would wish for people to focus more on tasks and less on cultural differences. (personal communication, January 21, 2001)

The American managers also wished for better leadership from the top, more respect among team members, more interest in the culture of their international colleagues, an increased patience level, better language skills, having interpreters for everyone on a team, healthy and friendly work environment, an ability to communicate better their own goals to ensure a better mutual understanding, better understanding of
different cultures in other office locations (people in German office would understand how it is to be in Fargo, North Dakota, USA), getting to know people from different offices, and people turning off their pagers and cellular phones during meetings.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the statistical analyses and the interviews performed by the researcher in Russia and in the United States. The statistical analyses showed no significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for male and female respondents, across different age groups, educational levels, length of international work experience, and frequency of work on multicultural teams.

The American and the Russian managers did not differ significantly on their mean scores for intercultural communication competence. Similarly, no significant differences between the American and the Russian managers were observed on the cultural uncertainty dimension or on the cultural empathy dimension of intercultural communication competence. However, the American managers reported higher mean scores on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence than the Russian managers. The researcher also found that intercultural communication competence accounted for 20% of the variance in the mean scores for multicultural team performance.

Russians and Americans differed in their ranking of relative importance of the dimensions of intercultural communication competence, both as a stand-alone theoretical construct and within the multicultural team context. The Russian managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence
as the most important, the personality traits dimension as the second most important, and the cultural knowledge as the third most important. The American managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the cultural knowledge dimension as the second most important, and the personality traits dimension as the third most important.

In the multicultural team context, the Russian managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the personality traits dimension as the second most important, and the cultural knowledge dimension as the third most important. Americans identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the cultural knowledge dimension as the second most important, and the personality traits dimension as the third most important.

The following chapter will present interpretation of the results of the data analysis and will address the methodology and implications for future research.
Companies that we work with have mergers and acquisitions going on a global scale, major corporate consolidations. Our world is becoming more of a neighborhood. An ability to communicate and work effectively with people from different cultures is definitely an advantage as far as a skill set to have.

David Hoover, an analyst from a public relations consulting company (personal communication, January 29, 2001)

The purpose of this chapter is to offer a closer examination of the results of the intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance study and provide insights with respect to the statistical analyses and qualitative interviews presented in chapter four. Providing an overview of this study and its main goals, reviewing the research methodology, and highlighting the key conclusions of this research achieves this objective. The chapter continues with a detailed examination the methodology and concludes with the implications for future research.

Overview of the Study and the Key Findings

The goal of this dissertation was to determine how American and Russian managers with experience on multicultural teams perceive intercultural communication competence and its relationship with multicultural team performance. Past communication research has emphasized the importance of intercultural communication competence in the interactions of business professionals from different cultures. To work effectively with diverse people, managers need to know not only about the culture of the person with whom they are interacting, but also about his/her personality, behavior patterns in conflict situations, demographics, and life experiences. In this dissertation,
the researcher set forth to describe the relationship between intercultural communication competence and the performance of multicultural teams in American and Russian multinational organizations.

Effective functioning in an international business environment depends on the ability of employees to adapt to the complexity of other cultures. The blend of cultural backgrounds and professional experiences has become a reality in the global business world. This critical skill improves the decision-making and problem-solving abilities of managers in the global marketplace. This dissertation investigated how different demographic and individual characteristics influence intercultural communication competence, how Americans and Russians perceive intercultural communication competence and different dimensions of intercultural communication competence, and a relationship between intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance.

The researcher employed a survey method to solicit information about intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance from the respondents. The participants in this study were upper and middle managers of medium and large multinational companies in the United States and the Russian Federation. The companies and the actual research participants were selected based on the scale of their international operations, their history of working in intercultural teams, and their willingness to participate in this research study.

The researcher used two questionnaires—the Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire and the High Performance Team Questionnaire—to solicit information about each respondent's perceptions of intercultural communication competence and performance in multicultural teams. The researcher conducted 40
semi-structured interviews to obtain more in-depth insights about how the respondents perceive intercultural communication competence and its relationship with multicultural team performance. A number of statistical tests yielded generalizations about how different groups of respondents defined intercultural communication competence, determined if the American and the Russian respondents express similar or different values for the importance of different dimensions of intercultural communication competence, including interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy. The researcher described a relationship between the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members and the performance of multicultural teams.

This dissertation yielded a number of conclusions about intercultural communication competence and the performance of multicultural teams. The key conclusions of this research are:

- (1) different groups of managers based upon their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience did not differ significantly in their mean scores for intercultural communication competence;
- (2a) the Russian and the American respondents did not differ significantly in their mean scores for intercultural communication competence;
- (2b) the Russian and the American respondents differed significantly on their mean scores of the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence;
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- (2c) the Russian and the American respondents did not differ significantly on their mean scores of the cultural uncertainty or the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence;
- (3) a moderate relationship exists between the level of intercultural communication competence of an individual team member and the overall performance of a multicultural team; intercultural communication competence accounts for 20% of the variance in the performance in multicultural teams.

The following section of this chapter provides a detailed examination of each of these conclusions.

**Key Finding 1: different groups of respondents did not differ significantly in their intercultural communication competence scores.**

The researcher compared the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for different groups of respondents based upon their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience. One t test and four one-way analyses of variance were performed to determine any statistically significant differences in the mean intercultural communication competence scores. No significant differences were observed in the mean intercultural communication competence scores for different groups of respondents based upon their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience.

An absence of gender differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence supports a conclusion that gender is unrelated to intercultural communication competence. Similarly, neither age nor educational level
appears to be related to intercultural communication competence. The non-significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for different respondents with respect to age, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience can be explained by a statistically acceptable but relatively small sample size used for these analyses. For example, the mean scores for intercultural communication competence were higher for older respondents and lower for younger respondents. A similar study with a larger sample size might result in finding a significant difference on the mean scores for intercultural communication competence between the younger and the older research participants.

The managers who worked on a multicultural team on a daily or a weekly basis reported a lower mean score for intercultural communication competence than the managers who worked on a multicultural team less frequently, ranging from once per month to once every three months. Similarly, the managers with less than five years of international work experience reported lower mean scores for intercultural communication competence than the managers with more than five years of international work experience.

A larger sample size might lead to a determination of a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence among the managers with respect to their frequency of work on a multicultural team and their length of international experience. A more frequent work schedule on a multicultural team as well as working for more years with people from different cultures could lead to an increase in team members' knowledge of culture specific and culture general information, their ability to communicate and interact effectively with people from different cultures, and their open-mindedness and cultural empathy. These personality
traits and ability items are the integral characteristics of an interculturally and communicatively competent individual.

**Key Finding 2a:** the Russian and the American managers did not differ significantly in their mean scores of intercultural communication competence.

Mean scores for intercultural communication competence did not differ significantly between the American and the Russian managers. This finding contradicts with earlier intercultural communication research (Christophel, 1996; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986) concerning the perceptions of communication competence of Russian students who viewed themselves as being lower in communication competence than most other groups of respondents from different countries, including the United States, Sweden, Finland, Australia and Micronesia.

This difference in the findings of this dissertation versus earlier research can be explained because the respondents in this study were managers of multinational companies who had much more exposure to and experience working with people from different cultures than the respondents in the earlier research (Christophel, 1996). Another possible explanation for this difference in findings is that previous communication research focused on investigating more traditional aspects of human communication, such as willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, communication competence, communication assertiveness, and communication responsiveness across cultures. This dissertation investigated a more integrated concept of intercultural communication competence as perceived by managers in the United States and Russia.
Key Finding 2b: the Russian and the American managers differed significantly in their mean scores of the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of the intercultural communication competence.

The American managers reported higher mean scores on the interpersonal skills and team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence. The significant differences in the mean scores of the interpersonal skills dimension can lead to a conclusion that the American managers are able better to acknowledge differences in communication and interaction styles of people from different cultures, are more flexible in dealing with communication misunderstandings, and are more comfortable when communicating with foreign nationals than are the Russian managers.

The American managers are found to be more effective on the interpersonal skills dimension as they are aware of their own cultural conditioning and possess basic knowledge and information about the country and the culture of their team members. Higher interpersonal skills in the multicultural team context allows team members to be more competent communicators and to work more effectively on a multicultural team, as they are able to view different approaches toward work and decision making of people from other cultures and to align their communication based on their knowledge of other cultures (Wiseman et al., 1989).

A lower mean score on the interpersonal skills dimension of the Russian respondents can be explained by the fact that Russia was a closed society for most of the last century (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996). Until recently, only a few Russians were exposed to and, therefore, familiar with Western people and culture. With the removal of an iron curtain in the late 1980s, Russia became a more open society, and a much greater number of people have traveled to different countries. A higher mean
score on the interpersonal skills dimensions of the American respondents can be explained by Americans' opportunity to travel, learn, and experience different cultures for many years. These historic differences in the social development of Russia and the United States can explain a difference in the mean scores on the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence between the Russian and the American managers of multinational organizations.

The significant differences in the mean scores on the team effectiveness dimension of intercultural communication competence can lead to a conclusion that the American managers are more effective than the Russian managers when working on a multicultural team as the American managers are able to better understand and communicate team goals, roles, and norms. Team effectiveness requires team members to be skilled communicators, be able to give and receive constructive feedback, openly discuss problems, and communicate a desire for a trusting relationship with team members.

The significant difference in the mean scores on the team effectiveness dimension can be explained by earlier research findings and the interview data. The researcher found that the Russian managers viewed the personality of a team member as more important than his or her skills and knowledge. A number of empirical studies of the Russian character have concluded that Russians are less concerned with individual achievement than Americans (Inkeles, 1968), are more collectivistic and concerned about retaining communal feelings for the group rather than about the group outcomes (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996), and are used to more cooperative and conciliatory communication than their American counterparts. The history of Russia and Russian personality characteristics largely explain this difference in the views about personality of
a team member (Ferarro, 1998).

German Sukonnikov, an interviewee from Russia and a manager in a multinational consulting company, supported this statement by saying that "team members must realize that team goals can take a higher priority than individual ambitions and views" (personal communication, December 3, 2000). A higher mean score for the American mangers on the team effectiveness dimension can be also explained by their international experience. The American managers have, on average, more years of international experience and work on multicultural teams more frequently than the Russian managers.

Key Finding 2c: the Russian and the American managers did not differ significantly in the mean scores of the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of the intercultural communication competence.

The researcher observed no differences between the Russian and the American managers in the mean scores of the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence. A possible reason for this finding is that the Russian and the American managers are similar with respect to the cultural uncertainty and the cultural empathy dimensions when working on a multicultural team. However, past communication research involving the American and Russian cultures (Christophel, 1996; Gannon, 1994; Holden et al., 1998; Lewis, 1998; Melnikova, 1990; Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996) can lead to different conclusions.
A closer examination of the mean scores for the cultural uncertainty dimension of intercultural communication competence shows that the Russian managers exhibited higher mean scores on this dimension than did the American managers. This finding supports some earlier conclusions about communication in these cultures and differences in levels of uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1991). The cultures that have relatively high desire for uncertainty avoidance or even demand consensus on societal goals do not tolerate dissent or allow deviation in the behaviors of cultural members. Historically, high uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to have an extensive system of legislative rules and laws and to experience a high rate of social change. Members of high uncertainty avoidance cultures have high levels of anxiety and tend to be worried about their future.

Although Hofstede's study (1980, 1991) did not include a sample from Russia or other countries of the former Soviet Union, the cultural characteristics of the Russians (Gannon, 1994; Lewis, 1998; Melnikova, 1990) and the fast pace transformational processes in Russia at the end of the 20th century (Christophel, 1996; Holden et al., 1998; Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996) allow for a view of Russia as a high uncertainty avoidance country and a view of the Russian people as high on uncertainty avoidance.

The relatively higher mean scores of the Russian managers on the cultural uncertainty dimension of intercultural communication competence suggest that the Russians are less tolerant of ambiguity and uncertainty, display patience less frequently in conflict situations, and are less flexible than are the Americans when working on a multicultural team. Russians are less open to cultural differences, are less willing to accept change and risks, tend to worry about the outcomes of communication processes
and team dynamics, and tend to have high levels of anxiety associated with communicating with people from different cultures (Hofstede, 1991).

A closer examination of the mean scores for the cultural empathy dimension of intercultural communication competence revealed that the Russian managers exhibited higher mean scores on the cultural empathy dimension than did the American managers. This difference in the mean scores suggests that the Russians are better able to communicate an understanding of another person's thoughts, feelings, and experiences, and include in their communication repertoires both verbal statements that identify the experience of others and nonverbal codes that are complementary to the moods and thoughts of others (Koester & Olebe, 1988; Olebe & Koester, 1989).

Russians historically had to rely on a close network of interpersonal relationships to accomplish life goals through interpersonal contacts rather than through individual skills (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996). The Russian people had to distinguish between public and private communication (Mikheyev, 1987; Smith, 1976, 1990). An old Russian proverb that is still being used today states: "It is more important to have 100 friends, than 100 roubles" (cited in Bollinger, 1994, p. 52). Therefore, Russians have a higher capacity "to behave as if one understands the world as others do" and "to appear to put themselves in others' shoes" (Lustig & Koester, 1999, p. 332). These characteristics of Russians, paired with their natural passion for social interaction (Kluckhohn, 1961), enable Russian managers to develop a spirit of inquiry about other cultures and the communication patterns in these cultures, an appreciation for different working styles, and an ability to view the ways things are done in other cultures better and more effectively than their American counterparts.
Key Finding 3: a relationship exists between the level of intercultural communication competence of an individual team member and the overall performance of a multicultural team.

The final and the most valuable finding of this dissertation is that a moderate relationship exists between the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members and the overall performance of a multicultural team. The researcher determined that intercultural communication competence accounts for 20% of the variance in the mean scores of multicultural team performance. Intercultural communication competence has been recognized as a key management skill for employees of multicultural organizations (O'Hara-Devereaux & Johansen, 1994; Hofner Saphiere, 1996). As the workforce in these organizations becomes more multicultural, leaders in global corporations and international organizations have to be effective intercultural communicators to function effectively on multicultural teams.

The researcher applied the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model to examine the intercultural communication competence of managers in multinational companies who work on multicultural project teams. This Model is based on four underlying dimensions: the interpersonal skills dimension, the team effectiveness dimension, the cultural uncertainty dimension, and the cultural empathy dimension. These four dimensions of intercultural communication competence consist of critical characteristics for effective multicultural teams. The theoretical foundation of the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model is consistent throughout different intercultural communication studies, such as those of Abe and Wiseman (1983), Hammer (1987), Dean and Popp (1990), Samovar and Porter (1991),
A number of researchers have viewed intercultural communication competence as central to understanding the dynamics of multicultural teams. Shonk (1982) cited team members’ effective and clear communication as a critical factor for building high performance teams. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) characterized high-performance teams as having a high degree of commitment, interpersonal trust and respect, understanding of the team’s purpose, and willingness to help other team members. Wheelan and Hochberger (1996) and Wheelan (1999) reported that communication and leadership style are critical for a high performance team. Kieffer (1997) concluded that poor communication skills could quickly ruin a team.

However, the previous research on intercultural communication competence and multicultural teams focused on individual and interpersonal findings and not on team-oriented findings and assessments of team performance (Hofner Saphiere, 1996; Reagan & Rohrbaugh, 1990). The researcher, by focusing his dissertation on investigating intercultural communication competence in the multicultural team context, arrived at the conclusion that the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members is related to the overall performance of a multicultural team. The mean scores for intercultural communication competence account for 20% of the variance in the mean scores of performance of a multicultural team.

A number of managers in Russia and in the United States expressed the belief that a team members’ level of intercultural communication competence is related to multicultural team performance. For example, Elena Yanbukhtina, a consultant working on a US AID-funded Small Business Development Project in Moscow, Russia, is convinced that the ability of a person to communicate well with people from different
cultures is critical to effective teamwork. Mrs. Yanbukhtina said: "It is very difficult to work and discuss business problems if a person cannot listen well, when he (she) interrupts a conversation frequently; these things get in the way of understanding the individual opinions of team members" (personal communication, December 8, 2000).

Natalya Nedueva, her Russian colleague and team member, supported Mrs. Yanbukhtina's statements by describing the communication skills of their American team leader.

Our team leader has a very high level of qualifications, including communication skills. He talks to us in a very nice and straightforward way. This is why people want to communicate with him, try to fulfill the assigned tasks, and not to undermine their own and his reputation.

Occasionally, we had to work with people who were boring communicators. This caused us to not have a desire to work and perform well as a team. (personal communication, December 8, 2000)

When asked if the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members influences multicultural team performance, Zachary Morford, an associate from a Washington, D.C.-based global consulting firm, replied:

Yes, definitely! They [intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance] are very closely related. If there were a poor communication or a lack of understanding between and empathy for team members from different cultures, it would seriously drag on the effectiveness of the team. (personal communication, January 30, 2001)
Chris Nelson, an international sales manager from a Minnesota-based software development and consulting firm, confirmed the importance of intercultural communication competence for multicultural team performance.

Many roadblocks and problems can occur if people who do not communicate well with people from different cultures are a part of the team. Effective communication is a very important aspect of a high performance team. Team members must be able to communicate and understand clearly what they are trying to accomplish and what their goal is. Across cultures, this is a more challenging and difficult task. (personal communication, February 22, 2001)

The results of the correlation analysis of the mean scores of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance and the content analysis of the interviews' recordings in the United States and in Russia both support the fact that intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance are indeed the related concepts.

The researcher conducted 40 interviews to obtain more in-depth insights about how the respondents perceive intercultural communication competence and its relationship with multicultural team performance. This qualitative part of the research determined that different cultures place different values on the dimensions of intercultural communication competence. The researcher asked the American and the Russian managers to rank three dimensions of intercultural communication competence as an isolated conceptual construct and in the multicultural team context.

The Russian managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural
communication competence as the most important, the personality traits dimension as the second most important, and the cultural knowledge dimension as the third most important. The American managers identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important, the cultural knowledge dimension as the second most important, and the personality traits dimension and the third most important.

This difference in the perception of relative importance of the dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the American and the Russian managers suggests that people from different cultures see different communication and behavior of multicultural team members as more or less competent. A Russian manager might perceive a competent communicator with high interpersonal and communication skills and exhibiting high level of motivation, cultural empathy, and eagerness to understand and learn about different cultures. An American manager might look for high interpersonal skills and extensive knowledge of culture in an interculturally competent team member. This difference in the perception of intercultural communication competence might lead to an increase in problems and challenges and a decrease in performance of multicultural teams. The researcher will address the practical values of these findings for academia and for practitioners in the last section of this dissertation chapter.
Methodological Considerations of the Study

This section of the dissertation will address the methodological considerations of this study, including the sample size and homogeneity of the research participants, using self-report research instruments to assess intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance, and drawing the participant sample from the United States and Russia.

The sample size and homogeneity of the participants.

The first methodological consideration is that of the sample size and homogeneity of respondents both in the United States and in Russia. The minimal sample size established for this dissertation was 60 managers in the United States and in Russia, respectively. The researcher estimated the sample size based on the recommendations by Stevens (1986), who suggested having 15 research subjects per variable, and Cohen (1988), who argued for a minimum of 50 participants per group to achieve an approximate power of .80 with a medium effect size.

The researcher performed a number of statistical analyses depending on the research question under investigation. One t test and four one-way analyses of variance were performed to determine any statistically significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence based on gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international work experience of the respondents. The number of groups for these analyses varied. The respondents were divided into two groups (male and female) and a t test was used to examine the mean scores for intercultural communication competence with an approximate power of .70 and a medium effect size. Three groups and the analysis of variance were used to
examine the impact of the respondent's age. In this case, an approximate power of .70 and a medium effect size were achieved. With educational level, again, three groups and the analysis of variance were used and an approximate power of .70 and a medium effect size were achieved. The same was true for the analysis of variance for different groups of managers based on frequency of work on multicultural teams (power of .60 and a medium effect size) and length of international work experience (power of .55 and a medium effect size).

The power of each statistical test varied depending on the number of groups and the number of participants in each group. While the \( t \)-test had a power of .70, the analyses of variance had powers of .70, .60, and .55 (Cohen, 1988). A larger sample size for the analyses of variance could have produced a higher power with respect to the statistical tests that involved the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for different groups of the respondents based on the level of education, the frequency of work on a multicultural team, and the length of international work experience. The number of respondents in different groupings fluctuated for the analyses of variance of the mean scores for intercultural communication competence based on the respondent's age (\( n_1 = 38, n_2 = 27, n_3 = 35 \)), the level of education (\( n_1 = 29, n_2 = 42, n_3 = 26 \)), the frequency of work on a multicultural team (\( n_1 = 38, n_2 = 27, n_3 = 35 \)), and the length of international work experience (\( n_1 = 35, n_2 = 32, n_3 = 23 \)). The statistical power would have been greater if each group in the analyses of variance had the same or similar number of respondents.

A \( t \) test determined any statistically significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence and the mean scores of the different dimensions of intercultural communication competence between the American and the
Russian respondents. The researcher surveyed approximately the same number of respondents in the United States (n = 50) and in Russia (n = 55), achieving an approximate power of .60 with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988).

The researcher conducted a correlation analysis to investigate the relationship between the level of the intercultural communication competence of individual team members and the performance of multicultural teams. The correlation analysis suggested that a significant relationship exists between the score for intercultural communication competence and the score for multicultural team performance (r = .45, p < .05) and that the level of the intercultural communication competence of individual team members accounts for a moderate degree of the variance (20%) in multicultural team performance (Cohen & Holiday, 1982). The researcher used the data from 105 respondents and significantly exceeded the recommendations to have a minimum of 15 research subjects per variable (Stevens, 1986) and 10 research subjects for every variable with an average data reliability of .80 (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996).

The first methodological consideration of this dissertation is that future research can benefit from a larger sample size and more homogeneous groupings of the respondents. A majority of the statistical tests administered during this study had acceptable statistical power of approximately .80 and a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). However, a larger sample size and an equal number of participants in each groups of respondents for the analyses of variance would increase the statistical power of the analysis and might lead to different conclusions.
The use of self-report research instruments.

The second methodological consideration of this dissertation focuses on the use of self-report research instruments for data collection. The researcher employed a survey method for data collection to ensure reliability, validity, and uniformity of data across the samples (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992). The Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire with an internal reliability of $\alpha = 0.88$ (Matveev, Rao, & Milter, 2001) and the High Performance Team Questionnaire with a test-retest reliability of .82 and an internal consistency of $\alpha = .88$ (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) were used to collect data about the perceptions of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance. These questionnaires enabled the researcher to survey a sufficient sample of 124 respondents in two different cultures (Cohen, 1988; Stevens, 1986).

However, use of the questionnaires meant the researcher had to rely on self-assessments and self-reports of individual perceptions of intercultural communication competence and team performance. A number of communication researchers have based their conclusions on respondents' perceptions of a certain phenomenon or a concept: the perceptions of intercultural communication problems by Saudi Arabian and North American managers (Adelman & Lustig, 1981), the perceptions about cultural viability (Gudykunst, Nishida, & Chua, 1986; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Gudykunst, Yoon, & Nishida, 1987), the impressions of communication competence of self and other (Martin & Hammer, 1989), and the subjective evaluations of the abilities for intercultural communication effectiveness (Dean & Popp, 1990).

In addition to the questionnaires, the researcher conducted a total of
40 interviews with both American and Russian managers to obtain more in-depth information about how the respondents view intercultural communication competence and to understand the relationship between intercultural communication competence and the performance of multicultural teams. The interview sessions yielded valuable examples of what the interviewees perceived to be effective intercultural communication in the workplace, their opinions about the importance of intercultural communication, the common challenges present on multicultural teams, and the critical characteristics of high performance multicultural teams. However, as in the case of using self-report questionnaires, the interview findings were based on the perceptions of the respondents as well as the interpretation ability of the researcher to understand the information collected during these interviews. Several interviewees attempted to please the interviewer by giving socially acceptable but potentially misleading answers. One example of this bias is that almost all interviewees answered positively to the question "Does the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members impact multicultural team performance?"

A possible solution to the problem of self-perception bias and interviewer bias in future research would be to use outcome-based types of instruments to assess intercultural communication competence in addition to the self-report and self-interpreted assessment instruments. Communication researchers have attempted to move toward behavioral assessment methods (Ruben, 1976) that measure communicative performance and behaviors as opposed to attitudes, values, motives, or personality characteristics. For example, Ruben and Kealey (1979) performed a study of the behavioral assessment of communication competence and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. Koester and Olebe (1988) developed the behavioral assessment
scale for intercultural communication effectiveness, focusing on actual behaviors of individuals rather than on internalized attitudes, perceptions, or projections of these behaviors. However, these studies focused on communicative behaviors only and did not account for a particular context, such as the context of the multicultural team environment.

An outcome-based instrument to assess intercultural communication competence in the multicultural team context should include items to evaluate specific, observable behaviors and specific, measurable performance outcomes of a multicultural team. The specific and measurable performance outcomes can include assessment of how effective a team is in achieving the team's goals and tasks, following established team norms, utilizing effective decision-making and problem-solving processes, and forming an appropriate team structure.

Drawing the participants from the United States and Russia.

The third methodological consideration of this dissertation involves the fact that the research was conducted in the United States and in Russia. The comparative nature of this dissertation is one of the innovative aspects of the research design. Among the key findings of the study are the differences in the perceptions of the American and the Russian managers with respect to the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence, the difference in the participants' views of the relative importance of cultural knowledge, interpersonal skills, and personality traits, and the relationship between the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members and the performance of a multicultural team.
The data collected for this dissertation is one of the most recent and representative among a number of similar studies. The researcher collected the data at the turn of the 21st century and included samples from central, metropolitan and regional locations, both in the United States and in Russia, including Moscow and Chelyabinsk in Russia and Washington, D.C., New York, Cleveland, Ohio, and Fargo, North Dakota, in the United States. However, given the specific research agenda, the motivational interests of the researcher, and time and budget constraints, the study could not be extended to explore the intercultural communication competence phenomenon and multicultural team performance in other countries. The research community can benefit if the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model used in this two-country comparative research is applied in a number of other cultures and similar studies of the intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance are conducted in different countries across the world.

Implications for Future Research

The study of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance in American and Russian organizations yielded significant conclusions about the multidimensionality of the intercultural communication competence concept, the difference in the perceptions about the characteristics of an interculturally and communicatively competent individual between the American and the Russian managers, and the impact of the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members on performance of a multicultural team. The methodological considerations of this dissertation included the sample size for some of the statistical tests administered by the researcher, the self-report instruments used to assess the
perceptions of the intercultural communication competence and performance in multicultural teams, and the comparative research in the United States and in Russia. A number of remarkable implications both for the academia and for the business world and a number of specific questions to pursue in future studies will now be addressed.

The implications for the academia.

(1) This dissertation contributes to knowledge and theory in several disciplines, including intercultural communication, small group communication, multicultural team development, interpersonal communication, intercultural management, and international business. The study not only examined multicultural team dynamics from a communication perspective, but also investigated the relationship between the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members and the performance of multicultural teams.

The researcher collected data on intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance from managers who work in real business teams in multinational organizations in the United States and Russia and tested the past intercultural communication research and theoretical assumptions by applying the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model. The researcher utilized a new instrument—the Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire (Matveev, Rao, & Milter, 2001)—and applied a highly reliable cross-cultural instrument—the High Performance Team Questionnaire (Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) —in Russia, a different culture.
This dissertation offered evidence that the concept of the intercultural communication competence is multidimensional in nature; intercultural communication competence emerged as an integrated and context-based notion, rather than an easily separable and compartmentalized construct. The researcher used the four dimensions of intercultural communication competence, i.e., interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy, as the foundations of a supportive framework for the research rather than as set-in-stone theoretical assumptions. The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model and the research results allow intercultural communication researchers to go beyond the traditional culture specific or cross-cultural approaches in intercultural communication studies. The foundations of the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model can be used as a universal framework for investigating the topics of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance in a variety of cultures.

Self-report instruments were used to collect the data on perceptions of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance. The researcher had to rely on correctness of understanding and interpretation of these issues by each participant in the research. Researchers who investigate concepts of intercultural communication in the future should use a combination of self-report and outcome-based research instruments. These instruments will include items that evaluate both the specific, observable behaviors of research participants and specific, measurable performance outcomes of a multicultural team. This combination
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of self-report and outcome-based research instruments will strengthen the research methodology by reducing the researcher's and the participants' biases and increasing the reliability of the findings.

• (4) This dissertation investigated the perception of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance by American and Russian managers with experience on multicultural teams. The study can be considered heuristic and exploratory because the researcher chose an innovative approach in analyzing intercultural communication competence in multicultural team context. Significant differences between the American and the Russian managers were found only for their perceptions of the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence. Many researchers have noted large cultural and communication differences between the American and the Russian people (Christophel, 1996; Holden et al., 1998; Hofstede, 1991; Stephan, & Abalakina-Paap, 1996; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Peabody, 1985; Triandis, 1990). Extending this study to a more in-depth investigation of the factors that influence perceptions of intercultural communication competence and the relative importance of its different dimensions with a large participant sample can lead to some important findings about cultural differences in perceptions of intercultural communication competence.

• (5) The last implication of this dissertation for future research is the need to examine the impact of communication technology on intercultural communication competence. The nature of communication has changed with
new technological developments such as teleconferencing, electronic mail, electronic chat room discussions, and group databases. Members of multicultural teams have to communicate across distance with a very limited opportunity to meet and communicate face-to-face with each other.

Will reliance on electronic communication technology and limited face-to-face communication change the definition and perceptions of the intercultural communication competence? If written communication facilitates accuracy and telephone communication allows for better emotional understanding (Hofner Saphiere, 1996), will Russians—a members of collectivistic and high-context society—continue to favor face-to-face and telephone communication over electronic communication as they tend to place personal characteristics and emotions higher than direct task-oriented communication? Will Americans continue to favor low-context communication and be very comfortable with relying on electronic technology when doing business with their counterparts in another country? How can a team member establish a high level of trust and achieve effective performance of a multicultural team in the absence of regular face-to-face communication? Future research about the intercultural communication competence and communication technology can answer some of these research questions.

The implications for the business professionals and trainers.

• (1) The first practical implication of this dissertation is that it confirmed that the issues and topics of the intercultural communication competence and
multicultural team performance are both relevant and important in the workplace, especially for people who work in multinational organizations. Ninety six percent of interviewees believe that being interculturally and communicatively competent is critical when working on a multicultural team. According to a consultant from Great Plains Software (a Microsoft company) in North Dakota, "The topic of intercultural communication competence is very relevant as working on international teams with people all over the world requires an extra effort in understanding both communication and cultures" (personal communication, February 22, 2001).

The interviews with managers of multicultural organizations in the United States and in Russia revealed that the Americans value interpersonal skills and cultural knowledge more than personality traits, while the Russians place a higher value on personality traits and interpersonal skills than cultural knowledge. An inability to understand communication differences due to the specific culture of person can lead to business failures and lost opportunities (Barnard, 1995; Black et al., 1992; Landis & Bhagat, 1983; O'Hara-Devereaux & Johansen, 1994).

Knowing how much value people from different cultures place on the various dimensions of intercultural communication competence is critical to effective performance and successful international business outcomes. The importance of understanding communication differences between Americans and Russians extends beyond the pure desire for a healthy business relationship between American and Russian businessmen: this
understanding is also critical for the development of mutual dialogue between these two countries and the directions of communication research in Russia and in the United States.

- **(2)** The second practical implication of this study is that it determined the existence of a relationship between the intercultural communication competence and performance of a multicultural team. While many researchers investigated the intercultural communication competence and intercultural effectiveness (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Brislin, 1981; Cui & Awa, 1992; Dean & Popp, 1990; Dinges & Lieberman, 1989; Hammer, 1987; Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Redmond & Bunyi, 1991; Samovar & Porter, 1991), the research on intercultural communication in multicultural organizations and in multicultural teams is not sufficiently developed (Hofner Saphiere, 1996; Reagan & Rohrbaugh, 1990; Rhinesmith, 1993; Wiseman & Shuter, 1994).

  Each and every company's management is searching for possible ways to improve productivity and enhance performance. In multicultural organizations, where people often operate at a distance, the performance of multicultural teams is critical to operational outcomes and a productive working environment. As the workforce in these organizations becomes more multicultural, leaders and managers in multinational corporations and international organizations have to be effective intercultural communicators to function effectively and achieve high levels of performance.

- **(3)** The third practical implication of this dissertation is its value for trainers and organizational development practitioners. The first remark for
intercultural communication trainers is that the dimensions of intercultural communication competence--interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy--consist of the cognitive elements, abilities, skills, and personal characteristics. These are learned phenomena and can be enhanced through training. Managers of multinational organizations who work on multicultural teams can be trained to become better intercultural communicators. As the workforce in various countries becomes increasingly diverse, the need to train individuals to become more effective in dealing with such new complexities increases (Landis & Bhagat, 1983). The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model can be used as a conceptual foundation for developing training programs for managers of multinational organizations.

This study determined that different cultures place different values on the dimensions of intercultural communication competence. Training programs must take this into an account and have a stronger emphasis on a specific dimension based on the need of managers in a particular country. For example, a training program for Russian managers working with American managers must have stronger interpersonal skills and cultural knowledge component, which are the dimensions of intercultural communication competence valued more by Americans.

The second recommendation for trainers concerns the nature of training. Intercultural communication competence is a contextual phenomenon and is defined by a situation where an interaction occurs. People behave differently in multicultural situations than in monocultural
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situations, especially when they are in their home cultures (Fontaine, 1987). Trainers must apply interactive approaches to specific intercultural contexts to enable team members to understand a specific intercultural situation, recognize cultural and communication differences of team members, and utilize these differences to both professional and personal advantage.

Summary

This chapter offered a closer examination of the results of the study of the perception of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance by American and Russian managers with experience on multicultural teams. The study is the first investigation of multicultural team performance from a communication perspective since the beginning of the 21st century. The researcher determined the importance of intercultural communication competence on the performance of multicultural teams, described cultural differences in the perceptions of intercultural communication competence between Americans and Russians, and explained differences in the scores on the dimensions of intercultural communication competence between managers from these two cultures with experience on multicultural teams.
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The researcher employed the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model that describes intercultural communication competence consisting of interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy dimensions. American and Russian managers both identified the interpersonal skills dimension of intercultural communication competence as the most important and critical in achieving high performance of a multicultural team. The researcher determined that American managers score higher on the interpersonal skills and team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence than Russian managers.

This chapter provided insights with respect to the statistical analyses and qualitative interviews presented in the earlier chapter, examined the methodology, and concluded with the implications for future research. The researcher collected data from 124 American and Russian managers with experience in multicultural teams and an average of 11 years of international work experience. The Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire and the High Performance Team Questionnaire, both instruments high in reliability, were used to survey managers in the consulting, manufacturing, and insurance industries in the United States and in Russia. The researcher performed six $t$ tests, four one-way analyses of variance, and one correlation analysis to investigate each research question using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

The researcher conducted 40 interviews with American and Russian managers in the United States and in Russia to develop an in-depth understanding of difference in the perception of different dimensions of intercultural communication competence between American and Russian managers. The Russian managers perceived the interpersonal skills (ranked $1^{st}$), the personality traits (ranked $2^{nd}$), and the cultural
knowledge (ranked 3rd) dimensions as most important, while the American managers perceived the interpersonal skills (ranked 1st), the cultural knowledge (ranked 2nd), and the personality traits (ranked 3rd) dimensions as most important. These differences in the perception of intercultural communication competence, if not acknowledged, might lead to an increase in problems and challenges and a decrease in performance of multicultural teams.

The methodological considerations of this research included addressing the sample size and homogeneity of the research participants, using self-report research instruments to investigate the perceptions of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance, and drawing the participant sample from the United States and Russia. Future research of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance can benefit from a large sample size, a more homogeneous grouping of the respondents, outcome-based research instruments to evaluate observable behavior in multicultural contexts, and an inclusion of other countries into the analysis of intercultural communication competence.

The implication for future research addressed the value of the study for academia, including multicultural team context and the effects of communication technology on intercultural communication competence research, and for business professionals and trainers, such as using various training approaches and different focus of training programs depending on the cultural characteristics of the trainees. The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model can be used as a universal framework for investigating the topics of intercultural communication competence and multicultural team performance in a variety of cultures. Leaders and managers of multicultural organizations can reduce costs of international operations and global venture failures.
and can increase performance of multicultural teams by training their employees to become more competent intercultural communicators. Finally, this dissertation not only yielded a number of valuable practical conclusions for the academic and business worlds, but also helped to satisfy the inquisitive mind of the researcher for over one and a half years of his life. Designing this study, developing the research instrument, interviewing more than three and a half dozen professionals working in different locations in multinational organizations in the United States and Russia, making sense of and compiling the data into this dissertation, and reflecting on personal experiences working as a management consultant will remain forever in the mind of the author and will provide an irreplaceable foundation and a continuous stimulus for future research of this nature.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire (English)

Instructions: Please take a few moments to think about what it means to be competent in intercultural communication. Listed below are a few items that may or may not reflect your personal notions of an interculturally competent person. Please read each of the following statements carefully. Then rate each of them in terms of the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement using the following scale. Please do not put your name on this questionnaire so that your answers remain anonymous.

Sex: ___  Age: ____  Occupation: _____  Position: _____  Nationality: ______
Ethnicity: _______  Place of birth: ___________  Native language: __________
Education: Bachelor’s ___  Master’s ___  Doctoral ___  Other _________
Work on a multicultural team: once a week ___  once a month ___  every three months ___
international work experience: 0 y ___  < than 3 y ___  3-5 y ___  > than 5 y ___  Other ___
Length of stay/work in this country: ____________________________
Frequency of travel abroad: _________________________________
Countries you lived/worked in: _____________________________
Participation in multicultural team training: Yes ___  Number of times ___  No ___
Nationality of team members: ______________________________
Number of people in team: usual average ___  occasional ___
maximum ever worked _____
Number of foreigners in team: usual average ___  occasional ___
mixed ever worked ___
Foreign language(s): (1) _____________  (2) _____________  (3) ____________
Past work experience: (1) _____________  (2) _____________  (3) ____________
1. Establishing a good working relationship with people from other countries is difficult. ___

2. I listen actively to other people in my team. _____

3. Dealing with and managing cultural uncertainties is troublesome. _____

4. I feel uncomfortable working with people from different countries. _____

5. My team involves every member in the decision-making process without any relevance to the national origin of a team member. _____

6. I work with nationals from other countries differently from the way I work with people from my home country. _____

7. I engage in a meaningful dialogue with people from other countries in the same way as with people from my own country. _____

8. I acknowledge differences in communication and interaction styles when working with people from different countries. _____

9. Working with people from different cultures is exciting. _____

10. Information sharing in my team decreases if people from different cultures are present. ___

11. Dealing with cultural differences is a frustrating process. _____

12. Working effectively with other people involves understanding other peoples' beliefs. _____
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13. Hearing people speaking with an accent makes me believe that they are less capable. ____

14. I am inattentive to cultural and behavioral norms of others. _____

15. Effectiveness of communication on the team falls when people from different countries are working on the team. _____

16. When in another country, I try to learn as much about the culture of this country as possible. _____

17. I am flexible when working with people from different cultures as I acknowledge differences in values and beliefs among cultures. _____

18. Setting priorities for a multicultural team requires different communication processes than for a homogeneous team. _____

19. I am comfortable when communicating with foreign nationals. _____

20. Viewing people from their cultural perspectives is helpful when working on a multicultural team. _____

21. Decision making depends on the social system of where the person is from. _____

22. I tend to develop closer relationships with team members from my own country than with team members from other countries. _____

23. Creativity of the team increases if people from different cultures are present. _____
Appendix B: High Performance Team Questionnaire (English)

Instructions: Please take a few moments to think about what it means to work in a high performing team. Listed below are a few items that may or may not reflect your personal notions of high team performance. Please read each of the following statements carefully. Then rate each of them in terms of the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement using the following scale. Please do not put your name on this questionnaire so that your answers remain anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Members of my team are clear about team goals. ____
2. Members of my team agree with the team goals. ____
3. In my team, tasks are appropriate to team versus individual solutions. _____
4. Members of my team are clear about their roles. ____
5. Members of my team accept their roles and status. ____
6. Role assignments match abilities of team members. ____
7. The team leader's style changes when necessary to meet emerging group needs. ____
8. Delegation or "unleadership" is the prevailing leadership style in my team. ____
9. My team has an open communication structure that allows all members to participate. ____
10. My team gets regular feedback about its productivity. ____
11. Team members give each other constructive feedback. ____
12. My team utilizes feedback about its effectiveness to make improvements in how it is functioning. ____
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. My team spends time defining problems it must solve or decisions it must make. ____

14. My team spends time planning how it will solve problems and make decisions. ____

15. My team spends enough time discussing problems and decisions it faces. ____

16. My team chooses decision-making methods that are participatory. ____

17. My team implements and evaluates its solutions and decisions. ____

18. Voluntary conformity is high among team members. ____

19. My team accepts members who behave differently as long as their behavior is perceived as helpful to task accomplishment. ____

20. My team's norms encourage high performance and quality. ____

21. My team expects to be successful. ____

22. My team's norms encourage innovative solutions. ____

23. My team pays attention to the details of its work. ____

24. My team accepts coalition and subteam formation. ____

25. Subteams are integrated into the team as a whole. ____

26. Subteams work on important tasks. ____

27. Tasks contain variety and challenge. ____

28. Subteams work on a total product or project. ____
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Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Modestly Disagree | Neither agree | Modestly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

29. My team contains the smallest number of members necessary to accomplish its goals. ____

30. My team has access to the technical resources necessary for task accomplishment. ____

31. My team has access to the human resources necessary for task accomplishment. ____

32. My team has access to technical consultations as needed. ____

33. My team has access to interpersonal consultations as needed. ____

34. My team has access to technical and human relations training as needed. ____

35. My team has a defined work territory. ____

36. My team has sufficient time together to develop a mature working unit and to accomplish its goals. ____

37. Subteams are recognized and rewarded by my team. ____

38. My team is highly cohesive. ____

39. Interpersonal attraction among team members is high. ____

40. Team members are cooperative. ____

41. Periods of conflict are frequent but brief. ____

42. My team uses effective conflict management strategies. ____
АНКЕТА
«Компетентность в межкультурных коммуникациях»

Вашему вниманию предлагается ряд утверждений, которые в той или иной мере совпадут или нет с Вашиими представлениями о компетентности в межкультурных коммуникациях (КМК).

Пожалуйста, прочитайте эти утверждения и ответьте, насколько Вы согласны или нет с каждым из них, используя приведенную ниже шкалу ответов. Вся информация этой анкеты останется анонимной.

Пол _____ Возраст ___ Сфера деятельности __________ Должность __________
Образование: Бакалавр _____ Магистр _____ к.н. ________ другое _________
Работа в мультикультурных командах: ежедневно ______ раз в неделю ______
раз в месяц ______ каждый 3 мес ______ каждый 6 мес ______ раз в год ______
Опыт работы в других странах: 0 лет ______ менее 3 х лет ______
от 3-х до - 5-ти лет ______ более 5-ти лет ______ другое ________
Национальность __________ Место рождения __________ Родной язык __________
Страны проживания: (1) ______________ (2) ______________ (3) ______________
Сфера деятельности в прошлом: (1) ______________ (2) ______________ (3) ______________
Частота поездок в другие страны __________
Срок работы в данной стране __________________
Участие в тренинге по мультикультурным командам: Да _____ Кол-во раз _____
Нет _____
Национальность членов команды: ______________________________
Кол-во членов команды: среднее _________ иногда ______
максимальное ________
Кол-во иностранцев в команде: среднее _________ иногда ______
максимальное ________
Иностранные языки: (1) _______________ (2) ____________ (3) _______________
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1. Мне трудно налаживать хорошие деловые отношения с людьми из других стран. ____

2. Я внимательно слушаю то, что говорят другие члены команды. ____

3. Трудно иметь дело и реагировать на неоднозначные ситуации, связанные с культурными различиями людей. ____

4. Я чувствую себя некомфортно, работая вместе с иностранцами. ____

5. Все члены моей команды, независимо от национальной принадлежности, принимают активное участие в принятии решений. ____

6. Стиль моей работы с иностранцами отличается от стиля работы с людьми из моей страны. ____

7. Я вступаю в содержательный диалог с людьми из других стран и с людьми из моей страны одинаковым образом. ____

8. В работе с представителями других стран я учитывая то, что стиль их общения и взаимодействия отличается от принятых у нас. ____

9. Я нахожу работу с людьми других культур увлекательной. ____
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Категорически против</th>
<th>Не согласен</th>
<th>Скорее не согласен</th>
<th>Затрудняюсь ответить</th>
<th>Скорее согласен</th>
<th>Согласен</th>
<th>Полностью согласен</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Обмен информацией ухудшается, если в команде присутствуют люди разных культур. ____

11. Меня раздражают проблемы, возникающие из-за культурных различий. ____

12. Для эффективной работы с другими людьми необходимо понимать их убеждения. ____

13. Речь людей, говорящих с акцентом, вынуждает меня предположить, что они менее компетентны. ____

14. Я невнимательно отношусь к культурным и поведенческим нормам других. ____

15. Общение в команде становится менее эффективным, когда в ней работают люди из разных стран. ____

16. Находясь в другой стране, я стараюсь как можно глубже познать ее культуру. ____

17. Я стараюсь проявлять гибкость в работе с людьми других культур, так как я учитывая различия в их жизненных ценностях и мировоззрении. ____
18. Расстановка приоритетов в мультикультурных командах требует других коммуникационных процессов, чем в монокультурных. ____

19. Я чувствую себя комфортно при общении с иностранцами. ____

20. Рассмотрение людей с точки зрения их культуры способствует работе в мультикультурной команде. ____

21. Социальная среда человека влияет на то, как он принимает решения. ____

22. Я склонен налаживать более тесные отношения с членами команды из моей страны, чем из других стран. ____

23. Творческий потенциал команды повышается, если в ней участвуют люди разных культур. ____
АНКЕТА
«Эффективность деятельности команды»

Вашему вниманию предлагается ряд утверждений, которые в той или иной мере совпадут или нет с Вашиими представлениями об эффективности деятельности команды.

Пожалуйста, прочитайте эти утверждения и ответьте, насколько Вы согласны или нет с каждым из них, используя приведенную ниже шкалу ответов. Вся информация этой анкеты останется анонимной.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Категорически против</th>
<th>Не согласен</th>
<th>Скорее не согласен</th>
<th>Затрудняюсь ответить</th>
<th>Скорее согласен</th>
<th>Согласен</th>
<th>Полностью согласен</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Все члены моей команды четко представляют себе цели ее работы. ____

2. Все члены моей команды согласны с поставленными целями. ____

3. Поставленные перед моей командой задачи требуют коллективных, а не индивидуальных решений. ____

4. Каждый член команды четко представляет свою роль. ____

5. Все члены моей команды согласны со своей ролью и статусом в команде. ____

6. Роль каждого члена команды соответствует его способностям. ____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Категорически против</th>
<th>Не согласен</th>
<th>Скорее не согласен</th>
<th>Затрудняюсь ответить</th>
<th>Скорее согласен</th>
<th>Согласен</th>
<th>Полностью согласен</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Стиль работы лидера изменяется для удовлетворения новых потребностей команды. ___

8. Делегирование полномочий или «нелидерство» является преобладающим стилем лидерства в моей команде. ___

9. Открытая система общения в моей команде позволяет всем членам команды участвовать в работе. ___

10. Моя команда получает регулярную «обратную связь» по оценке своей деятельности. ___

11. Члены команды делают друг другу конструктивные замечания. ___

12. Команда использует «обратную связь» оценки своей деятельности с целью совершенствования функционирования. ___

13. Моя команда выделяет время для определения решаемых проблем и принимаемых решений. ___

14. Моя команда выделяет время для планирования решаемых проблем и принимаемых решений. ___
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Категорически против</th>
<th>Не согласен</th>
<th>Скорее не согласен</th>
<th>Затрудняюсь ответить</th>
<th>Скорее согласен</th>
<th>Согласен</th>
<th>Полностью согласен</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. В команде выделяется достаточное время для обсуждения стоящих перед ней проблем. ____

16. Команда использует такие методы принятия решений, которые предполагают участие всех ее членов. ____

17. Команда выполняет и оценивает решаемые проблемы и принимаемые решения. ____

18. Естественная согласованность действий высока среди членов команды. ____

19. Моя команда допускает поведение, отличающееся от принятого, если оно воспринимается как способствующее выполнению задач. ____

20. Нормы команды поощряют высокую эффективность и качество деятельности. ____

21. Моя команда рассчитывает на успех. ____

22. Нормы команды поощряют инновационные методы решения проблем. ____

23. Моя команда уделяет внимание деталям своей работы. ____

24. Моя команда допускает формирование коалиций и подгрупп. ____
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Категорически против Не согласен Скорее не согласен Затрудняюсь ответить Скорее согласен Согласен Полностью согласен

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. В моей команде существует интеграция подгрупп и команды в целом. ____

26. Подгруппы работают над выполнением значимых заданий. ____

27. Стоящие перед командой задачи разнообразны и сложны. ____

28. Подгруппы работают над продуктом или проектом в целом. ____

29. Число членов моей команды является минимальным и достаточным для достижения ее целей. ____

30. Команда располагает техническими ресурсами, необходимыми для выполнения задания. ____

31. Команда располагает человеческими ресурсами, необходимыми для выполнения задания. ____

32. При необходимости команда может получить техническую консультацию. ____

33. При необходимости команда имеет возможность получить межличностную консультацию. ____
34. В случае необходимости команда имеет доступ к тренингу по вопросам персонала и техническим аспектам. _____

35. Моя команда имеет определенную территорию для работы. _____

36. Команда проводит достаточное время вместе, чтобы сформировать коллектив и достичь своих целей. _____

37. Подгруппы признаются и вознаграждаются моей командой. _____

38. Моя команда работает очень слаженно. _____

39. Тяготение членов моей команды друг к другу очень высоко. _____

40. Члены команды сотрудничают друг с другом. _____

41. Конфликты в команде возникают часто, но быстро разрешаются. _____

42. В моей команде используются эффективные способы разрешения конфликтных ситуаций. _____
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Appendix F: Interview Guide (English)

Introduction of the research topic.

1. How relevant are the topics of intercultural communication competence and team performance to your organization?

2. Do you view your company as a multicultural workplace?

Intercultural Communication Competence.

3. Do you view intercultural communication competence as a key success factor in today's job market and, specifically, at your company? If yes, what makes you think this way? If no, please explain.

4. How would you view an interculturally and communicatively competent individual in your organization? Please name several qualities, characteristics, and skills and provide some examples of why you think they are critical.

5. One way to examine intercultural communication competence of a member of multicultural organization is to look at this phenomenon as being based on three underlying dimensions: the cultural knowledge and empathy dimension, the personality dimension, and the skills dimension. Would you say that one or several of these dimensions has(ve) more value in defining intercultural communication competence and, therefore, is more critical for employees of your organization?
6. What are the critical dimensions of a high performing team? Why did you name these dimensions? Do you view your team as high performing? Why or why not?

7. What are the common challenges that your team faces? Please provide examples of challenging scenarios.

Relationship between intercultural communication competence and team performance.

8. Do you think that the level of intercultural communication competence of individual team members influence team performance?

9. What dimension(s) of intercultural communication competence is(are) critical for achieving high performing multicultural team? Please provide example(s) if you experienced the positive impact of intercultural communication competence on performance of your work team(s).

Improving performance of a multicultural team.

10. If you had a magic wand, which one or two specific things would you ask for to make your multicultural team(s) function more effectively?
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План интервью
"Влияние компетентности менеджеров в межкультурных коммуникациях на эффективность деятельности команды."

Введение в тему исследования

1. Насколько актуальны вопросы компетентности в МК и эффективности работы в командах для вашей организации?
2. Считаете ли Вы свою организацию как мультикультурную рабочую среду?

Компетентность в межкультурных организациях

3. Считаете ли Вы, что КМК является одним из ключевых факторов успешной работы в условиях современного рынка и, в частности, в Вашей фирме? Пожалуйста, поясните свой ответ.
4. Каким Вы представляете сотрудника, компетентного в МК? Пожалуйста, назовите несколько качеств, характеристику или навыков и приведите несколько примеров, объясняющих их важность.
5. В основу изучения КМК в межкультурных организациях могут быть положены 3 элемента: (1) знание культуры и взаимодействия людей из разных стран, (2) личностные качества и (3) навыки членов команды. Можете ли Вы отметить какие-то элементы? Думаете ли что, отдельные элементы имеют большую значимость для определения КМК и, следовательно, являются более важными для сотрудников Вашей организации.
Эффективность деятельности команды

6. Каковы основные характеристики высокоэффективной команды? Поясните, почему Вы назвали именно их? Считаете ли Вы свою команду высокоэффективной?
Объясните Ваш ответ.

7. Каковы наиболее типичные трудности возникают перед Вашей командой?
Пожалуйста, приведите примеры.

Взаимосвязь КМК и ЭДК

8. Думаете ли Вы, что уровень КМК члена группы влияет на ЭДК.

9. Какие элементы КМК наиболее значимы для максимального уровня эффективности деятельности команды? Приведите конкретные примеры положительного влияния КМК на ЭДК.

Повышение эффективности деятельности мультикультурных групп

10. Если бы Вам предложили исполнить одно или два желания по повышению ЭДК, какие бы Вы выбрали.
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Participants in the United States.
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6. UD consultant, management consulting
7. TS senior consultant, client services, management consulting
8. EY senior manager, small and medium enterprise, development consulting
9. NN manager, grant office, development consulting
10. UB manager, market risk assessment, global banking and consulting
11. EV manager, logistics support, manufacturing and service
12. EG manager, human resources, manufacturing and service
13. NO manager, international relations, manufacturing and service
14. OP manager, regional development, manufacturing and service
15. EY senior manager, regional development, manufacturing and service
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Appendix I: Informed Consent to Participate in Research (English)

Dear Research Participant,

You are invited to take part in the research study "The Impact of Intercultural Communication Competence on Multicultural Team Performance in American and Russian organizations". The primary goals of this research are to

- describe the relationship between intercultural communication competence of managers and performance of multicultural teams,
- investigate how different cultures perceive intercultural communication competence, and
- provide researchers and practitioners with recommendations regarding the value of developing intercultural communication skills of employees in modern organizations.

Please be advised that participation in this research is entirely voluntary and you have a right to agree with or decline your participation in this research. The researcher anticipates no risks to the research subjects and to the participating organizations. This research study will comply with the general guidelines of confidentiality and nondisclosure of distribution of information obtained during the data collection sessions. The collected information will be used for the sole academic purposes of the research. All responses provided in the questionnaires or during the interviews will be anonymous and non-identifiable. The Office of Research Compliance at Ohio University reviewed the procedures for this research.
You as a research participant of this study have a right not to answer to any of the questions asked to you during the course of this research. You are invited to address your questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant directly to the researcher or to the Office of the Associate Vice President for Research, Ohio University, 740-593-0370.

Thank you for your attention. Do you have any questions about the information presented to you?
Согласие на участие в исследовании

Уважаемый участник опроса!

Вам предлагается принять участие в исследовании на тему «Влияние 
компетентности в межкультурных коммуникациях на эффективность деятельности 
мультикультурной команды в Американских и Российских организациях».

Главными целями исследования являются:

• выявление взаимосвязи компетентности менеджеров в 
межкультурных коммуникациях и эффективности деятельности 
мультикультурной команды,

• рассмотрение различия в определении компетентности в 
межкультурных коммуникациях у людей из разных культур,

• предоставление другим исследователям и практикам 
рекомендаций относительно необходимости развития навыков 
mежкультурных коммуникаций у сотрудников современных 
организаций.

Примите к сведению, что участие в данном исследовании является Вашим 
добровольным решением и у Вас есть право отказаться. Это исследование не 
подвергает риску опрашиваемого и организацию-участника и отвечает 
требованиям конфиденциальности и нераспространения полученной информации.
Сведения будут использованы исключительно в научных целях. Метод исследования согласован с Департаментом Исследований Университета Огайо, США.

Вы имеете право не отвечать на задаваемые вопросы, а также можете обратиться с пожеланиями и вопросами о Ваших правах, как участника опроса, непосредственно к исследователю, проводимому интервью, или в офис Вице-президента по Исследовательским Программам в Университете Огайо по телефону 740-593-0370.

Благодарим Вас за внимание. Будем рады ответить на Ваши вопросы.
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