

# PROMOTING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Fareeda Ibad  
Department of Communication  
College of Business Management, Karachi

## **Abstract**

This paper offers an examination of what constitutes competent intercultural communication for senior managers in multicultural organizations and also attempts to gauge the level of such competence. The dimensions of intercultural communication competence are identified, and a comparison between the findings of this research with previous research has been made.

**Key Words:** intercultural communication competence, culture, interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, cultural empathy

JEL Classification: Z00, Z01,Z19

### **Part I: Introduction**

Employees in managerial capacities, working in multinational organizations need to understand the importance of functioning effectively in their environment which is international, and requires them to adapt to the complexity of other cultures which entails understanding, accepting and responding to the differences that culture produces. The international business world contains a mix of diverse cultural backgrounds and work experiences resulting in the demand on Pakistani managers in such situations to know what the other culture is all about, the personality of the person from that culture, the behavior patterns, as well as the types of conflict producing situations that result thereof. This ability leads to competent communication which aids decision-making and problem-solving in such environments. Keeping this in mind, an attempt will be made to gauge the intercultural communication competence level of Pakistan managers in multicultural organizations since this affects their team performance when in culturally diverse settings.

The Pakistani work environment is becoming increasingly globalized. This globalization is evident in the fact that several local organizations have expanded their operations abroad and many multinationals in Pakistan have expanded within the country setting new benchmarks for skills sets and competencies required for being effective in the workplace. These new benchmarks are especially important when a collaborative management approach is the order of the day, given the fact that tasks are complex and the level of interdependence high. Such is the case for intercultural communication competence which ranks as a 'must have' skill in the above mentioned environments, especially when the globalizing forces of economic integration, tourism, migration etc. are seen as important forces. These forces provide a rationale for an increase in intercultural communication competence.

The first force affecting communication in a multinational organization is globalization where businesses have moved beyond domestic and national markets, thereby increasing interconnectedness. The growth of global interdependence has

resulted in an expansion of social, political, cultural and technological networks connecting different countries, people and cultures (Thomas & Ely, 1996). Managers of global corporations need to understand the role of intercultural communication competence in achieving cohesiveness in the diverse environments of global business teams (Bennet, 1997).

The second force that affects communication processes in modern multicultural organizations is continuous change in the way global business processes are carried out. 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. 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 (Porter & Samovar, 1994). In the literature review presented earlier (PBR, 2009), this writer expressed the need to assess the intercultural competence level of managers in multicultural work environments. The empirical and anecdotal evidence of the study revealed that 'organizations that are open to diversity will achieve a competitive advantage against organizations that are either culturally homogeneous or fail to successfully utilize their diversity.' Thus, there is the challenge for Pakistani multinationals to utilize diversity in all aspects of their workforce.

### **Part II: Objective of the Study**

The objective of the present study is two-fold. The first is to ascertain what constitutes competent intercultural communication, and the second is to derive the level of such competence of senior managers working in multicultural teams existing in a particular region, possessing certain demographics.

### **Part III: An Eclectic Literature Review**

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). Communication and culture mutually influence each other and 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. These are the basic elements of communication (Neuliep, 1999). Intercultural communication studies "the communication phenomena in which participants, different in cultural backgrounds, come into direct contact with one another" (Kim, 1984). The elements of both cross-cultural and intercultural communication are present in multicultural organizations and are of interest to communication researchers and organizational practitioners.

To undertake an explanation of the first objective, that is, what constitutes competent intercultural communication; the definition of Brian Spitzberg which clearly illustrates the key components is used.

'Competent communication is interaction that is perceived as effective in fulfilling certain rewarding, objectives in a way that is also appropriate to the context in which the interaction occurs, (Spitzberg, 1998). Upon examination of the definition, 'perceived' as a key word reflects that competence is determined by those who are a part of the interaction. In other words, communicative competence is a social judgment about how well a person interacts with others. That competence involves a social perception suggests that it will always be specific to the context and interpersonal relationship within which it occurs. Therefore, whereas judgments of competence are influenced by an assessment of an individual's personal characteristics, they cannot be wholly determined by them, because competence involves an interaction between people. Competent interpersonal communication results in a set of behaviors that are regarded as 'appropriate'. That is, the actions of the communications fit the expectations and demands of the situation. Appropriate

communication means that people use the symbols they are expected to use in a given context.

Competent interpersonal communication also results in a set of behaviors that are effective in achieving desired personal outcomes. Satisfaction in a relationship or the accomplishment of a specific task-related goal is an example of an outcome people might want to achieve through their communication with others. Thus communication competence is a social judgment that people make about others. The judgment depends on the context, the relationships between the interactants; the goals or objectives that the interactants want to achieve, and the specific verbal and non-verbal messages that are used to accomplish those goals (Lustig & Koester, 2006).

Having defined competent interpersonal communication, it becomes necessary to conceptualize intercultural communication competence. Intercultural communication competence involves the knowledge, motivation, and skills to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures (Wiseman, 2001). Intercultural communication competence is considered, very broadly as an impression that behavior is appropriate and effective in a given context.

To discuss the aspect that intercultural competence is contextual, it is necessary to establish what 'contextual' implies. According to Lustig & Koester (2006), an impression or judgment that a person is intercultural competent is made with respect to both a specific relational context and a particular situational context. Competence is not independent of the relationships and situations within which communication occurs. Thus, competence is not an individual attribute; rather, it is a characteristic of the association between individuals. It is possible, therefore, for someone to be perceived as highly competent in one set of intercultural interactions and only moderately competent in another. Judgments of intercultural competence also depend on cultural expectations about the permitted behaviors that characterize the settings or situations within which people communicate. The settings help to define and limit the range of behaviors that are regarded as acceptable. Consequently, the

same set of behaviors may be perceived as very competent in one cultural setting and much less competent in another (Lustig & Koester, 2006).

Another aspect that requires explanation is the fact of appropriateness and effectiveness. Both interpersonal competence and intercultural competence require a set of behaviors that are appropriate and effective. By 'appropriate' we mean those behaviors regarded as proper, and suitable given the expectations generated by a given culture, the constraints of the specific situation, and the nature of the relationship between the interactants. By 'effective' we mean a set of behaviors that lead to the achievement of desired outcomes (Lustig & Koester, 2006).

Turning to other requirements of competent intercultural communication, that is, sufficient knowledge, suitable motivations, and skilled actions, it can be said that each of these alone is insufficient to achieve competence. 'Knowledge' refers to the cognitive information you need to have about people, the context, and the norms of appropriateness that operate in a specific culture. Without such knowledge it is unlikely that you will interpret correctly the meanings of other people's messages, nor will you be able to identify a set of behaviors that are appropriate and that allow you to achieve your objectives. Consequently, you will not be able to determine what the appropriate and effective set of behaviors is, in a particular context. The kinds of knowledge that are important include culture-general and culture-specific information. The former provides insights into the intercultural communication process abstractly and can, therefore, be a very powerful tool in making sense of cultural practices, regardless of the cultures involved.

Intercultural competence also depends on culture-specific information, which is used to understand a particular culture. Such knowledge should include information about the forces that maintain the cultures uniqueness and facts about the cultural patterns that predominate. The type of intercultural encounter will also suggest other kinds of culture-specific information that might be useful. Business people may need essential information about the cultural dynamics of doing

business in a specific country or with people from their own country who are members of different cultural groups. Other crucial form of culture-specific knowledge involves information about the specific customs that govern interpersonal communication in a specific culture. Often overlooked is knowledge of one's own cultural system. Yet the ability to attain intercultural competence may be very closely linked to this kind of knowledge. Knowledge about your own culture will help you to understand another culture (Lustig & Koester, 2006).

**Motivations** include the overall set of emotional associations that people have as they anticipate and communicate interculturally. As with knowledge, different aspects of the emotional terrain contribute to the achievement of intercultural competence. Human emotional reactions include both feelings and intentions. Finally, 'actions' refer to the actual performance of a set of behaviors that are regarded as appropriate and effective. Thus, you may have the necessary information, be motivated by the appropriate feelings and intentions, and still lack the behavioral skills necessary to achieve competence (Lustig & Koester, 2006).

**Competent communicators** are able to identify their goals, assess the resources necessary to obtain those goals, accurately predict the other communicator's responses, choose workable communication strategies, enact those communication strategies, and accurately assess the results of the interaction (Parks, 1976). In the light of this, Wiseman states, that the two criteria of 'effectiveness' and 'appropriateness' combine to influence the quality of the interaction (Wiseman, 2001). And, Spitzberg in his formulation of intercultural communication competence suggested four possible communication styles that may result from the combinations of the extremes of the two criteria: (1) "Minimizing communication" is both inappropriate and ineffective, and would obviously be of a low communicative quality. (2) "Sufficing communication" is appropriate but ineffective, that is, it is highly accommodating and does nothing objectionable, but also accomplishes no personal objectives. It is suggested that the sufficing style is sufficient to meet the basic demands of the context, but accomplishes nothing more. (3) "Maximizing communication" occurs when an individual is

effective in achieving personal goals, but at the cost of being highly inappropriate contextually. This style may include verbal aggression, Machiavellian behavior, deception, the infringement of others' rights, or the degradation of others. (4) "Optimizing communication" occurs when interactants simultaneously achieve their personal goals and fulfill the normative expectations of the context. While this two-by-two analysis of discrete, binary combinations of the two criteria may be a bit simplistic, it helps to provide insight into the dialectics of the competence criteria in social episodes (Spitzberg, 2000, Wiseman, 2001).

**H**ow 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 relationships; or intercultural communication competence (Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Moosmuller, 1995; Podsiadlowski & Spiess, 1996), including relationship skills, communication skills, and personal traits such as inquisitiveness (Black & Gregersen, 2000; Black, Morrison & Gregerson, 1999; Gregerson, Morrison & Black 1998; Mendenhall, 2001; Spreitzer, McCall & Mahoney, 1997) have continued to emphasize intercultural communication competence as essential to effective cross-cultural communication (Matveev, 2002).

**T**he Overseas Performance model, the Intercultural Adjustment model and the Intercultural Communication Competence model are the three most commonly used models for studying 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 used in this study.

**C**leveland, 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. According to the researchers several factors are critical to effective overseas performance, including understanding of the decision-making processes, political symbols and cultural empathy. Political sensitivity included taking into account indigenous political forces, understanding the power structure, and being able to imagine the 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 in one's own and others' behavior. (Cleveland et al.,1960; Matveev, 2002).

Another group of intercultural communication researchers used the Intercultural Adjustment model to determine intercultural communication competence. Hammer et al. (1978) analyzed 24 personal abilities considered important in intercultural situations. Respondents in the study who were American students and had lived in a foreign culture for at least three months rated themselves on these personal abilities. The factor analysis yielded three basic dimensions: the ability to deal with psychological stress, the ability to communicate effectively, and the ability to establish interpersonal relationships (Matveev, 2002). Brislin (1981) analyzed attitudes traits and skills involved in effective intercultural interactions and embedded in performance situations. 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). Brislin provided a beginning list of situational factors that influence the outcomes of intercultural interactions. He distinguished between the key traits and skills, which are crucial for purposes on selection and

training for intercultural competence (Matveev, 2002). Kealey's (1989) study of overall adjustment and effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors living in developing countries determined that personal traits were more relevant in explaining and predicting overseas adjustment outcomes than situational variables and interpersonal skills. Three of the interpersonal skills—self-rated 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 skills and knowledge to peers. Outcomes of the study suggested that previous overseas experience moderated adjustment stress for over 50 percent of the respondents (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 researchers distinguished between anticipatory adjustment, including previous international experience and organization, in-country adjustments, both individual and job related, and non-work adjustment, including association with home and host nationals, cultural novelty, spouse interaction, and general adjustment (Matveev, 2002). Previous international work experience was not related to any of the three factors of 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 & Gregerson, 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 host culture and social decentering (Matveev, 2002). 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 (Matveev, 2002).

This model views effective intercultural interactions as a function of the success of the communication process between culturally different persons. An intercultural 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 & Wiseman (1983), in their study of 57 students from various Japanese universities 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 (Abe and Wiseman, 1983; Matveev, 2002). This study of Japanese students 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 & 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; the ability to establish interpersonal relationships was similar to the ability to develop interpersonal relationships of the Hammer et al. (1978) study (Matveev, 2002).

Martin and Hammer (1989) attempted to identify behavior aspects 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 behavior aspects: 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 (Matveev, 2002).

Wiseman et al. (1989) examined the relationship between intercultural communication competence and knowledge of the host culture and cross-cultural attitudes by surveying subjects from Japan and the United States. They 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 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 (Matveev, 2002).

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 findings 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; Matveev, 2002).

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. They 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 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; Matveev, 2002). Their conclusion, 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 is the most appropriate when examining the level of intercultural communication competence of senior managers in multinational organizations who are also performing with multicultural teams. The proposed model is based on the research of Abe and Wiseman (1983) and Cui Awa (1992). The review of previous models 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. The researchers using these models attempted to move from more narrow contexts of overseas performance and intercultural adjustment, the results of their studies do not 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 behavior patterns (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, integrating different models and approaches in examining intercultural communication competence. The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model of Matveev, (2002) 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 & 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. Matveev 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 model is more general 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 model is consistent throughout different intercultural communication and culture 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 (Matveev, 2002).

**The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model** views a multicultural team in an organization as a basic unit of analysis. Each member of the 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 cultural uncertainty dimension, and the cultural empathy dimension. The four dimensions emerged from the factor analysis of the data collected during the pilot study (Matveev, Rao & Milter, 2001). The four underlying dimensions of intercultural communication competence can be viewed as critical characteristics for members of multicultural teams in multinational organizations.

The four dimensions of intercultural communication competence consist of different specific elements. 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 toward work and decision making of people from other cultures not as bad but as different. Cultural awareness provides an important kind of information upon which the behavior of team members from the other cultures can be better understood and accurately interpreted and predicted (Wiseman, et al., 1989).

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 (Wheelan, 1999).

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. 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).

Lastly, in the 'cultural empathy' dimension, members of a multicultural team have to develop the capacity to behave as though they understand the world as do team members from other cultures (Koester & Olebe, 1998). They must possess 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 researches found cultural empathy to be the most important psychological predisposition for effective intercultural communication (Kim, 1986).

This review concludes that since work processes are mainly organized around teams and most of the communication in multicultural organizations occurs between people with different cultural backgrounds, intercultural communication competence of individuals in such settings has assumed higher levels of importance. With team members engaging in more effective communication organizational tasks can be done more efficiently. The Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model, based on the 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 points to a set of characteristics of an interculturally competent person. This model can be used as a competent tool to examine intercultural communication competence of managers of multicultural teams (Matveev, 2002).

#### **Part IV: Methodology**

In order to determine the self perceptions of intercultural communication competence of senior managers in multicultural organizations, the survey method was used to solicit information from the respondents. The survey method is a common methodology in intercultural communication research - to learn about the characteristics of a large population and to ask questions of respondents representing a specific population about their beliefs, attitudes and behavior patterns (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).

For the present study and its two-fold objective (1) to ascertain what constitutes competent intercultural communication, and (2) to derive the level of such competence of senior managers working in multicultural teams existing in a particular region possessing certain demographics, Karachi was selected as suitable for the purpose. Furthermore, the researcher decided to target multinational organizations listed on the Karachi Stock Exchange. The companies selected were multicultural 'operationally', i.e., they either had their home or branch offices overseas. The fact that the organizations were staffed by Pakistanis was important because the aim of deriving the intercultural competence level of Pakistani senior managers would not be possible otherwise, since the desired results of the study are to understand how different demographic and individual characteristics influence the level of intercultural communication competence and to investigate how the respondents perceive intercultural communication competence and its impact on multicultural team performance in Pakistan. The 23 organizations out of 30 multinationals were chosen because of the scale of their operations, their history of working in teams and their willingness to participate in the study. The respondents were from banks (31.34%), from automobile assemblers (32.05%), from chemicals (6.70%), from food and personal care (7.05%), and from pharmaceuticals (22.89%). Percentages are based on the number of Senior Managers in each organization and sector. Targeting of the participants was based on the following formula:

$$H = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \dots\dots\dots(1) \quad n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where  $n$  is the sample size,  $N$  is the population size and  $e$  is the level of precision with a 90% confidence level and a precision of ( $\pm 10$  percent) i.e.  $P = .10$ . The researcher's total population size was 284 employees of the 30 organizations listed on the Karachi Stock Exchange. Seven organizations failed to provide the basic data and had to be eliminated from the study. The calculations derived from the formula are as follows:

$$n = \frac{284}{1 + 284 (.10)^2} = 75 \text{ participants}$$

To further derive the exact number of respondents from each sector, simple ratio was used to determine the numbers. The details of the organizations are as follows:

**Table 1: Number of Senior Managers by Sector**

Food and Personal Care	
Name of Companies	No. of Senior Managers
Clover Pakistan	Data Unavailable
Gillette Pakistan	4
Nestle Pakistan	Data Unavailable
Treet Corporation	10
Unilever Food	6
Total	20

Commercial Banks	
Name of Companies	No. of Senior Managers
Bank Alfalah	22
Faysal Bank	10
Habib Bank Ltd.	19
NIB Bank	13
Royal Bank Ltd.	Data Unavailable
Samba Bank	10
Standard Chartered Bank	15
Total	89

Chemicals	
Name of Companies	No. of Senior Managers
Berger Paints	10
BOC (Pak) Ltd.	5
Buxly Paints Ltd.	Data Unavailable
Colgate - Palmolive	4
ICI - Pakistan	Data Unavailable
Total	19

Pharmaceuticals	
Name of Companies	No. of Senior Managers
Abbot Labs	14
Glaxo SmithKline Pak	18
Otsuka Pak	Data Unavailable
Searle Pak	19
Wyeth Pak Ltd.	6
Sanofi Aventis	8
Total	65

<b>Automobile Assembler</b>	
Names of Companies	No. of Senior Managers
Al-Ghazi Tractors	5
Atlas Honda	4
Honda Atlas Cars	7
Hinopak Motors Ltd.	20
Pak Suzuki Motor Co.	34
Ghandhara Nissan	21
S.N. Kawasaki	Data unavailable
Total	91

**Table 2: Sectoral Breakdown of the 75 Respondents in the Sample**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>No. of Participants</b>
Food & Personal Care	2
Chemicals	1
Commercial Banks	28
Pharmaceutical	15
Automobile	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>

The questionnaires of the Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence model (Matveev, 2002) were emailed to the selected group by accessing the company websites for the purpose of obtaining the email addresses of the respondents, however, only one response was forthcoming. The exercise was then re-conducted by MBA students to obtain information about how the respondents perceive intercultural communication competence. The response rate of the survey was 100% of the targeted group.

The survey was used to solicit information about each manager's perceptions of intercultural communication competence

and its relation to multicultural team performance. The use of the survey increased the reliability of the study because of the uniformity of the questions asked. The Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire (ICCQ) which possesses test-retest consistency and internal reliability, and used by Matveev (2002), and in this study, 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 reviewed earlier and based on the four underlying dimensions that describe the level of intercultural communication competence of a team member: interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty, and cultural empathy. This researcher used Matveev's (2002) instrument which contains 23 questions of the ICCQ around the four dimensions of intercultural communication competence. The questions based on the four dimensions are randomly distributed to ensure unbiased answers (Matveev, 2002). The research tool has been placed in the Appendices.

#### **Part V: Data Analysis & Findings**

The statistical analysis yielded generalizations about how the groups define intercultural communication competence. The study compared data on the basis of gender, age, level of education, frequency of work in a multicultural team, and length of international experience. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to perform the statistical analyses.

**Table 3:**  
**Demographic Profile of Senior Managers**

		F & PC	Autos	Banks	Pharma
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	1	27	27	9
	<b>Female</b>	2	2	1	6
	<b>Missing</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Age</b>	<b>Under 30</b>	2	4	3	--
	<b>31-40</b>	1	6	14	15
	<b>40+</b>	--	18	10	--
	<b>Missing</b>	--	1	1	--
<b>Education</b>	<b>Bachelor's</b>	--	9	--	3
	<b>Master,s</b>	2	16	27	12
	<b>Doctoral &amp; others</b>	--	3	1	--
	<b>Missing</b>	1	1	--	--
<b>FWMT*</b>	<b>Quarterly</b>	--	--	8	--
	<b>Yearly</b>	2	13	14	14
	<b>Missing</b>	1	16	6	1
<b>IWE**</b>	<b>Under 5 Years</b>	1	8	19	10
	<b>6-10 Years</b>	1	--	7	5
	<b>10+</b>	1	--	--	--
	<b>Missing</b>	--	21	2	--

\*Frequency of Work on Multicultural Teams

\*\*International Work Experience

The majority of respondents were male (85.33%) and the females were in a minority (14.66%). In the category of age, 12% were under 30, 48% were between 31-40, and 37.33% were above 40. As far as education was concerned, 56.66% had master's degrees, 12% had undergraduate degrees and 5.33% had doctoral degrees. Regarding frequency of work on multicultural teams, 60% had worked yearly, 32% had worked quarterly, and 23% of the data was missing for the category of international work experience. 50.6% had under 5 years of experience, 1.33% had 10+ years of experience and for 29.33% the data was missing. To sum up, the majority of respondents were male between ages 31 -40, held master's degrees with yearly multicultural team experience and less than 5 years of international work experience.

Since this research is based on Alexei Matveev's Integrated Intercultural Communication Competence Model (2002), it would be appropriate for this researcher to compare her results with Mateev's findings regarding American Managers who come from a low-context culture, with Pakistani senior managers of multinational organizations who belong to a high-context culture. In a low-context culture, such as the U.S, meaning is expressed explicitly, more clear and factual communication is necessary to arrive at a decision than in a high-context society. High-context cultures rely heavily on restricted codes, contextual clues, and implicit meaning, whereas, the communication in low-context cultures is more elaborate, explicit, demonstrative, and straightforward (Lewis, 1998; Matveev, 2002).

Coming to the demographic profile of senior managers in this research, it can be seen that there is a high degree of similarity in the findings with Matveev (2002) in these areas. In Matveev's (2002) research, the American and Russian respondents based on their gender, age, level of education, frequency of work on a multicultural team, and length of international experience did not differ significantly on their mean scores for intercultural communication competence. The American respondents reported higher mean scores than the Russian managers on the interpersonal skills and the team effectiveness dimensions of intercultural communication competence.

Matveev's research revealed no significant differences between American and Russian respondents on the cultural uncertainty dimension or the cultural empathy dimension of intercultural communication competence (Matveev, 2002). On the other hand, in Matveev's research, the data collected from 124 managers of Russian and American multinational organizations revealed no significant differences in the mean scores for intercultural communication competence for male and female respondents, respondents across different age groups, educational levels, length of international work experience, and frequency of work on multinational teams (Matveev, 2002).

This researcher found that of the four dimensions of intercultural communication competence, the comparison between Financial Institutions and Others revealed no significant difference in the interpersonal skills and cultural empathy dimensions, whereas, team effectiveness was higher in Financial Institutions and cultural uncertainty was lower than that of managers in the other organizations in the research. In comparison with Matveev's (2002) research, Pakistani senior managers revealed much lower scores in all four dimensions than even Matveev's Russian respondents, which shows that Russians despite being a high context culture, possess higher levels of development as compared to Pakistani senior managers who also belong to a high context culture, and yet possess lower levels of intercultural communication competence which resulted in lower mean scores (see Table C7 – Appendix C).

Table C2 (see Appendix C) shows the comparison of means on the basis of gender. In this case the mean score of males is higher than that of females. First in the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, the tested value 0.678 is greater than 0.05 at significance level. Hence, the variances are approximately equal. Here t value is 0.398, with  $df = 73$ . Thus, there is no significant difference between the groups.

In Table 3 (see Appendix C) estimations show differences in the mean scores for every group. 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. As shown in Tables 3 – 6, the sample of respondents is, however, homogeneous on all five demographic variables. The significance value comparing the groups is 0.275, that is more than 0.05, so there is no difference in the two groups (see Appendix C – Tables C)

#### **Part VI: Conclusion**

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. This confirms Matveev's findings. However, mean scores obtained are much lower than those for Matveev's sample of both American and Russian managers. Thus the key findings are as follows:

1. Senior managers did not reveal significant differences in their mean scores for intercultural communication competence across the identity spectrum.
2. Senior managers in the categories of Financial Institutions and Others did not differ significantly in their mean scores for the interpersonal skills and team effectiveness dimensions.
3. Senior managers did not differ significantly in their mean scores of the cultural uncertainty or the cultural empathy dimensions of intercultural communication competence.
4. In all groups, senior managers scored higher on team effectiveness as compared to other dimensions.
5. The overall scores of Pakistani managers did not differ significantly from the mean scores of both Russian and American managers in the intercultural communication competence dimension.
6. In the comparison between Financial Institutions and all other organizations tested there was no

significant difference, however, team effectiveness scores were somewhat higher, whereas, cultural uncertainty scores were somewhat lower.

The study can be considered exploratory in nature. Communication has changed with time and technology and those involved have to communicate with limited opportunities to meet face-to-face. In Pakistan's high-context culture, there is more emphasis on face to-face communication rather than electronic communication since personal characteristics and emotions prevail over task-oriented communication.

Future research on the subject of intercultural communication competence could be done with a larger and more representative sample size and more diversity of organizations. The effort would help increase awareness of intercultural communication competence and its importance in successful international operations of companies seeking to increase performance in the areas of interpersonal skills, team effectiveness, cultural uncertainty and cultural empathy.

Ibad (2009) has already identified the determinants of intercultural communication competence by communication researchers on the subject. However, this research reveals that the determinants identified do not contribute to determining the level of intercultural communication competence. Therefore, a study of the determinants of intercultural communication competence in the Pakistani context could be undertaken to improve understanding of this subject and help multinational organizations in Pakistan success fully utilize cultural diversity in their workforce in order to achieve a competitive edge and become more effective in their interactions.

**References:**

Abe, H., & Wiseman, R. (1983). A cross-cultural confirmation of the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 53-67.

Bennet, J.M (1997), *Handbook of intercultural training*. *International Journal of International Relations* 21(4), 535-539.

Berger, C.B., & Calabrese, R.J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research* 1, 99-112.

Black J.S., Morrison, A.J., & Gregersen, H.B. (1999). *Global explorers: The next generation of leaders*. New York: Routledge.

Black, J.S., & Gregerson, H.B. (1991), Antecedents to cross-cultural adjustments for expatriates in Pacific Rim assignments. *Human Relations*, 44, 497-515.

Brian H. Spitzberg, "Communication Competence: Measures of Perceived Effectiveness." *A Handbook for the Study of Human Communication*, ed. Charles H. Tardy (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1998), 67-105.

Brislin, R. (1981). *Cross cultural encounters: Face-to-face interaction*. New York: Peragamon Press.

Clark, J.S., & Gregersen, H.B. (2000). The right way to manage expats. In J.E. Garten (Ed.), *Worldview: Global strategies for the new economy* (pp. 187-200). Boston MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Cleveland, H. Mangone, G., & Adams, J. (1960). *The overseas Americans*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Cui, G., & Awa N.E. (1992). Measuring intercultural effectiveness: An integrative approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 311-328.

Dean, O., & Popp, G.E. (1990). Intercultural communication effectiveness as perceived by American managers in Saudi Arabia and French managers in U.S. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 405-424.

Dinges, N.G. (1983). Intercultural competence. In D. Landis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural training: Issues in theory and design*, (pp. 176-202). New York. Pergamon Press.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (1992). *Research methods in the social sciences* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Frey, L.W. Botan, G.H. Friedman, P.G., & Kreps, G.L. (1991), *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gudykunst, W.B. (1997). Cultural variability in communication: An introduction. *Communication Research*, 24, 327-348.

Gudykunst, W.B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, E.T. (1956). Orientation and training in government for work overseas, *Human Organizations*, 15, 4-10.

Hammer, M. (1987). Behavioral dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: A replication and extension. *International Journal of International Relations*, 11, 65-68.

Hammer, M., Gudykunst, W., & Wiseman, R. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. An exploratory study. *Intercultural Relations*. 2,282-393.

Hofstede, G (1980). *Culture consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the mind*. London, U.K: Mc Graw Hill.

Ibad, F. Promoting Intercultural Communication. *Pakistan Business Review*, Vol 2, No. 1. 2009.

Kealey, D.J. (1989). A study of cross-cultural effectiveness: Theoretical issues, practical applications. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 13, 387 – 428.

Kealey, D.J., & Protheroe, D.R. (1996). The effectiveness of cross-cultural training for expatriates: An assessment of the literature on the issue. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20 (2), 141-165.

Kim, Y.Y. (1984). Searching for creative integration. In W.B.Gudykunst & Y.Y Kim (Eds.). *Methods for intercultural communication research* (pp.13-30). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Kim, Y.Y. (1986). Cross cultural adaptation: a critical assessment of the field. Presented to the Annual Conference of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Koester, J., & Olebe, M. (1988). The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness. *Intercultural Journal of Intercultural Relations* 12, 233-246.

Lewis, R.D. (1998). *When cultures collide: Managing successfully across cultures*. London, United Kingdom: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Lustig, M.W. & Koester, J. (2002). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Martin, J.N., & Hammer, M.R. (1989). Behavioral categories of intercultural communication competence: Everyday communicator's perceptions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 303-332.

Matveev, A.V. (2002). The perception of Intercultural Communication Competence by American and Russian Managers with Experience on Multicultural Teams. Ohio University.

Matveev, A.V., Rao, N., & Milter R.G. (2001). Developing a scale to measure intercultural communication competence: A pilot study in multicultural organizations. Paper submitted to the International and Intercultural Communication Division of the National Communication Association, Atlanta. GA.

Meggison, L.C. (1967). The interrelationship and interaction between the cultural environment and management effectiveness. *Management International Review* 7(6), 65-70.

Mendenhall, M.E. (2001). New perspectives on expatriate adjustment and its relationship to global leadership development. In M.W. Mendenhall, M.K. Torsten, & K.S. Gunter (Eds.), *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes, and innovations* (pp. 1-18). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Moosmuller, A (1995). Learning objectives in intercultural competence: Decoding German everyday knowledge from a Japanese perspective. In A. Jensen, K. Jaeger, & A. Lorentsen (Eds.), *Intercultural Competences 2* (pp. 191-207). Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Neuliep, J.W. (1999). *A contextual approach to intercultural communication*. Boston, MA: Houghton – Mifflin.

Parks, M.R. *Communication Competence*. Speech Communication Association, San Francisco.

Podsiadlowski, A., & Spiess, E. (1996). Zur evaluation eines interKulturellen training in eineur deutschen grossunter-nehmen. *Zeitschrift for Personalforschung*, 1, 48-66.

Porter, R.E. (1972). An overview of intercultural communication. In L.A. Samovar & R.E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural*

Communications: A reader (pp.3-18). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Porter, R.E., & Samovar, L.A. (1994). An introduction to intercultural communication. In L.A. Samovar, & R.E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication: A reader* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.) (pp.4-25). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Redmond, M.V., & Bunyi, J.M. (1991). The relationship of intercultural communication competence with stress and the handling of stress as reported by international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17, 235-254.

Rubin, R.B. Rubin, A.M., & Piele, L.J. (1996). *Communication research: Strategies and sources*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Samovar, L.A., & Porter, R.E. (1991). *Intercultural communication: A reader* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Shonk, J.H. (1982). *Working in teams: A practical manual for improving work groups*. New York: Amacom.

Spiess, E. (1996). *Kooperatives Handeln in Organisationen*. Munchen: Peter Hamp Verlag.

Spiess, E. (1998). *Daz Konzept der empathie*. In E. Spiess (Ed.) *Formen der cooperation: Bedingungen und Perspekiven* (pp.53-62). (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, N.Y: Anchor Press.

Spitzberg, B.H. (2000). A model of intercultural communication competence. *Intercultural communication: A Reader*. L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 9<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 375-378.

Spreitzer, G.M., McCall, M.W., Jr., & Mahoney, J.D. (1997). Early identification of international executive potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 6-29.

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

Wheelan, S.A. (1944). *Group processes: A developmental perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wheelan, S.A. (1999). *Creating effective teams: A guide for members and leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wheelan, S.A., & Hochberger, J.M. (1996). Validation studies of the group development questionnaire. *Small group development questionnaire*. *Small group research*, 27(1), 143-170.

Wiseman, R.L. Hammer, M.R., & Nishida, H.(1989). Predictors of intercultural communication competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 349-370.

Wiseman, R.L. *Intercultural Communication Competence. Handbook of Intercultural and International Communication*. Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications, 2001.

**Promoting Intercultural Communication Competence**

**Appendices**

**Appendix A: Intercultural Communication Competence Questionnaire**

**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 \_\_\_\_\_ every six months \_\_\_\_\_ once a year \_\_\_\_\_

International work experience: 0 y \_\_\_\_ <than 3y \_\_\_\_ >than 5y \_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_

maximum ever worked \_\_\_\_\_

Foreign language(s): (1) \_\_\_\_\_ (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (3) \_\_\_\_\_

Past work experience: (1) \_\_\_\_\_ (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (3) \_\_\_\_\_

**Promoting Intercultural Communication Competence**

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither agree Nor disagree	Moderately agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

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 of 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\_\_\_\_\_.
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\_\_\_\_\_.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither agree Nor disagree	Moderately agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

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 \_\_\_\_\_.

## **Promoting Intercultural Communication Competence**

### **Appendix B: Request to Participate in Research**

Dear Research Participant

The Institute of Business Management, Sindh's premier business school has inculcated a tradition of research excellence which is a mandatory requirement for all full time faculty at the institute. In keeping with this requirement the institute has established a research division which is producing research in various corporate areas aimed at helping institutions improve their business practices. In this regard, you are invited to take part in the research study "Promoting Intercultural Communication: An Empirical Study"

The primary goals of this research are to

- ascertain what constitutes competent intercultural communication,
- derive the level of such competence, and
- provide researchers and practitioners with recommendations regarding the value of developing intercultural communication skills of employees in multinational 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 Thank you for your attention. Do you have any question about the information presented to you? Awaiting an early response so as to complete the study within institutional deadlines for timely publication.

Regards,

Fareeda Ibad  
Head of Department, Communication  
College of Business Management  
Institute of Business Management  
UAN: 111-002-004 ext: 308

**Promoting Intercultural Communication Competence**

**Appendix C: Tables**

**Table C2 T. test for ICC score based on GENDER M/F**

**Group Statistics**

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ICCSCORE	Male	63	4.4569	.57181	.07204
	Female	12	4.3877	.42294	.12209

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
ICCSCORE	Equal variances assumed	.174	.678	.398	73	.692	.06919	.17385	-.27729	.41566
	Equal variances not assumed			.488	19.572	.631	.06919	.14176	-.22694	.36531

Table C2: ANOVA for ICC Score based on Age

Descriptives								
ICCScore								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than 30	9	4.3188	.30973	.10324	4.0808	4.5569	3.96	4.96
30-40	36	4.5761	.43096	.07183	4.4303	4.7219	3.91	5.57
40+	28	4.3292	.71250	.13465	4.0529	4.6055	1.48	5.30
Missing	2	4.3043	.36893	.26087	.9897	7.6190	4.04	4.57
Total	75	4.4458	.54880	.06337	4.3195	4.5721	1.48	5.57

ANOVA					
ICCScore					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.177	3	.392	1.319	.275
Within Groups	21.111	71	.297		
Total	22.288	74			

**Table C3: ANOVA for ICC score based on EDUCATION****Descriptives**

## ICCScore

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Bachelors	12	4.5109	.38805	.11202	4.2643	4.7574	3.91	5.04
Masters	57	4.4447	.58690	.07774	4.2890	4.6004	1.48	5.57
Doctoral	4	4.4348	.59296	.29648	3.4912	5.3783	3.91	5.22
Missing	2	4.1087	.09223	.06522	3.2800	4.9374	4.04	4.17
Total	75	4.4458	.54880	.06337	4.3195	4.5721	1.48	5.57

**ANOVA**

## ICCScore

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.279	3	.093	.300	.826
Within Groups	22.009	71	.310		
Total	22.288	74			

Table C4: ANOVA on International Work Experience on Multinational Teams

## Descriptives

## ICCSCORE

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Strongly Disagree	38	4.5252	.43624	.07077	4.3818	4.6686	3.91	5.57
Disagree	8	4.5435	.42663	.15084	4.1868	4.9002	3.74	5.13
Moderately Disagree	1	4.1739	.	.	.	.	4.17	4.17
Neither Agree nor Disagree	23	4.2665	.74126	.15456	3.9460	4.5871	1.48	5.30
Moderately Agree	5	4.5652	.41362	.18497	4.0516	5.0788	3.96	5.00
Total	75	4.4458	.54880	.06337	4.3195	4.5721	1.48	5.57

## ANOVA

## ICCSCORE

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.200	4	.300	.996	.416
Within Groups	21.088	70	.301		

Table C5: ANOVA on Frequency of Work on Multinational Teams

**Descriptives**

GROUPS

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Strongly Disagree	3	3.3333	2.08167	1.20185	-1.8378	8.5045	1.00	5.00
Disagree	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
Moderately Disagree	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
Total	5	3.0000	1.58114	.70711	1.0368	4.9632	1.00	5.00

**ANOVA**

GROUPS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.333	2	.667	.154	.867
Within Groups	8.667	2	4.333		
Total	10.000	4			

Table C5: t-test for ICC scores and ICC Dimensions (t-test is not possible, as there are more than two groups to be analyzed in this table)

**Group Statistics**

group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
IPS	OTHERS	29	4.4000	.49484
	Financial Institutions	46	4.3791	.59920
TE	OTHERS	29	4.7652	.70249
	Financial Institutions	46	5.0798	.92541
CU	OTHERS	29	4.2303	.61739
	Financial Institutions	46	3.9785	.93322
CE	OTHERS	29	4.2931	.96147
	Financial Institutions	46	4.3207	.81932

## Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
IPS	Equal variances assumed	2.073	.154	.157	73	.876	.02087	.13313	-.24446	.28620
	Equal variances not assumed			.164	67.698	.870	.02087	.12747	-.23351	.27525

TE	Equal variances assumed	.072	.789	-1.567		.121	-.31461	.20080	-.71481	.08559
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.667	70.371	.100	-.31461	.18877	-.69106	.06184
CU	Equal variances assumed	6.233	.015	1.285	73	.203	.25187	.19597	-.13869	.64243
	Equal variances not assumed			1.406	72.789	.164	.25187	.17910	-.10509	.60883
CE	Equal variances assumed	1.585	.212	-.133	73	.895	-.02755	.20785	-.44178	.38669
	Equal variances not assumed			-.128	52.641	.899	-.02755	.21557	-.45999	.40489