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ABSTRACT

In this study, performance in the speech event of negotiation was used to investigate the validity of using experiential, linguistic, and psychological/affective/cognitive assessment instruments for training or selecting candidates for intercultural business negotiation between Canadians and Koreans. Instruments used were: background questionnaire, TOEIC scores, and CCAI scores. The participants were 12 businesspeople from Korea and 12 commerce students from Canada. After the bargaining session, each person completed a questionnaire. The negotiation outcome variables considered were source's relative monetary performance and target's relative satisfaction with the negotiation, including process and end-deal aspects. Case analysis suggests that individual experience and middle-to-high TOEIC scores have no significant correlation with either type of performance. Three subsections of the individual CCAI scores were associated with partner satisfaction, but not with monetary performance. Analysis of combined dyadic data revealed strong negative correlation between pair CCAI scores and negotiated end-price. Positive correlation was shown between pair CCAI scores and mutual satisfaction.
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INTRODUCTION

“For humans, culture and communication are acquired simultaneously: Neither exists without the other.” (Haslett 1989:20)

The ability to negotiate with another person of another culture is becoming an increasingly necessary skill as our society continues its upward trend of international trade, communication, and cooperation (Hendon, Hendon, & Herbig, 1998). In the world of international business, no longer the domain of the huge corporation, every coordinated action requires some communication. Conducting negotiations with clients and partners effectively and efficiently is a critical need, and a good understanding of the factors that make a good intercultural negotiator is important. Unsatisfactory financial and political consequences are the unwelcome alternative. To this end, the selection of potential intercultural interlocutors, and the design of their training programs are worthy of attention.

Research has shown that various individual background factors and psychological traits have been associated with learner success in second language acquisition (Citron, 1993; Edwards, 1980; Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Schumann, 1993). As well, specific individual traits have been identified as having probable association with success in adapting to and working in other cultures. The task of intercultural negotiation requires a unique blend of linguistic ability, awareness of intercultural communicative differences, acceptance of ambiguity, knowledge of the field in which the negotiation is taking place, and strategic ability in negotiation. Some research has claimed to identify key factors in predicting the relative importance of these factors, but these projects correlated participant opinion of the importance of these criteria to participant self-reported success. What is instead required is an investigation of intercultural negotiation within an encompassing
factorial structure that uses more empirical assessment of task performance (Hannigan, 1990). Furthermore, although business negotiations have been extensively observed in intracultural interactions, and to a lesser extent, in intercultural settings, virtually no empirical research has been done with Koreans negotiating in English. This thesis investigates experiential, linguistic, and cognitive/affective factors and their connection to behavioral success in an intercultural negotiation task.

The results of the study inform at three levels: 1) those who select candidates for overseas postings or negotiation with foreign clients, 2) those who select curriculum and pedagogy for their specific linguistic or ESP training, and 3) those who wish to become better intercultural communicators, be it for corporate or personal endeavors.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This thesis examines variables involved in intercultural business negotiation performance, and draws upon research and theory from a number of different fields. Linguistics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, commerce, second language acquisition, and marketing studies all have relevance and something to offer in understanding this speech event (Limaye & Victor, 1991; Thompson, 1990b). In this section, I begin to build a foundation for understanding the area of inquiry with a review of culture and why it is a critically important element for anyone learning a second language, or interacting with someone of another culture. Second, I shall review research and theory related to how culture influences communication. Third, I shall review speech act theory and research, investigating cases of differences in how different cultures use language in ways unique to their group, and how these patterns can create confusion when communicants are from different cultural groups.

Following the review of basic theory of culture and communication, I move into an examination of negotiation is a speech event. I look at first intracultural negotiation, and then
intercultural negotiation findings. I then examine the measured differences between Korean and Canadian cultures to explain the potential differences they face in such interaction. After this, I review studies that examine intercultural competence in business settings, and efforts to measure that competence. I end with a description of a pilot study that initially led me to the theme and questions studied here.

Culture and Communication

What is culture? While it is beyond the scope of this paper to attempt a full exploration of the term, choosing an operational definition among the many possible meanings may be necessary for clarity. This is a task made difficult by the problem that the word can mean different things to different people, based on one’s particular field of training, experiences or beliefs. It might be argued that how one defines the word ‘culture’ itself depends on one’s own culture—indeed problematic. Can one definition encompass all the myriad differences? A number of authors have tried, and their work is worth reviewing.

Lancy (1983:101) offers that, culture is “whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to members of the society.” This would be a more culture-as-knowledge definition. Hofstede (1980) avers that “culture consists of patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts.” This definition is remarkably similar to, if more concise than one by Kroeber & Kluckhohn (1952). However, what Kroeber & Kluckhohn have added is important. Specifically they state that “[c]ulture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit...” What this implies for individuals communicating interculturally is that behavioural and linguistic patterns are both seen and unseen, obvious as well as hidden. Kroeber & Kluckhohn continue: “the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values...” and that these values may function “as conditioning elements of future action” (italics mine, 1952:181).
When a group or category of people believes that they are culturally distinct (or when such a distinction is claimed about them by others), then we can say that this is equivalent to having a unique “collective programming of the mind” (Hofstede, 1991:5). This programming is “a socially shared knowledge structure, or schema, [that] giv[es] meaning to incoming stimuli and channel[s] outgoing reactions” (Triandis, 1972, in Brett & Okumura, 1998:456).

When learning a foreign language, one obvious goal would be to function effectively both in the target language and within the target culture. As Lancy (1983) reminds us, to do so “in a manner acceptable to members of the society,” linguistic knowledge alone is not enough. What is also required is an awareness, understanding, acceptance, and expectation of the target culture, including its values, knowledge schemas, and communication patterns: a cultural competence.

Many learners find themselves challenged by the difference between their classroom second language performance and out-of-classroom, real-life performance. In such cases, often the trouble is attributed to the unfamiliar higher speed of speech, poorer enunciation, demands of immediacy (interlocutors expect immediate comprehension and response), and/or diversity of lexis (slang, difficult words). To be sure, these explicit differences are valid and sometimes difficult adjustments. Yet, if we expect that these are the only differences and ignore or fail to be aware of the implicit, or hidden differences of values, pattern of expectations, verbal and non-verbal, that come with intercultural communication, miscommunication will still occur. A classic example may be the poor intercultural communication between Arabs and Jews, in which “communication between member of the two cultures is often impeded by unmatching assumptions and conflicting evaluations of various aspects of the communication process itself” (Griefat & Katriel, 1989). Such differences may occur between any two cultures to some degree, and are insidious saboteurs to understanding, motivation, and both personal and business opportunities.

Canada and Korea: Measurements of Culture

Different cultures may have dissonant styles of conversational interaction and linguistic behaviour (Richards, 1981). As members of a social grouping, be it a nation, region, city,
neighborhood, club, or family, all people have become socialized to communicate according to a shared system perceptions and values (Robinson, 1997) and therefore perform within a specific and predictable range of pragmatic and communicative possibilities. Those “who are socialized in the same culture categorize and interpret situations and behaviours similarly and therefore have similar expectancies” (Detweiler, 1980:279). While individual differences in personality will account for some degree of uniqueness, an overwhelming percentage of communicative behavior is shared with those with whom we associate and identify most.

Quantifying differences among people of different cultures is often done by measurement along Hall’s scales of high- v. low-context, or along one or more of Hofstede’s 5 Orientations (see Tables 2.1 and Table 2.2, below). By either method, South Korea and Canada are shown to differ significantly. In Hall’s high- versus low-context (Hall, 1976, 1987; Hall & Hall, 1987) data, Korea scores at the extreme high, at 10, while Anglophone Canada scores somewhat lower at 4, as interpreted by Graham, Mintu, & Rogers (1994:89). The two countries also differ in measures of individualism/collectivism (Hofstede, 1979, 1980, 1983; Triandis et al., 1988). Korea’s index score is in the bottom quartile at 18, in a range of 6-91. Canada scores considerably higher at 80, or tied for 4th. Hofstede’s later collaboration with Bond (1988) discovered another dimension on which the two national cultures differ: Long-Term Orientation. Anglophone Canada scores low, at 23, while Korea scores near the higher end, at 75 (see Table 2.2).

In another study (Kim et al. 1996), Korea scored statistically uniquely, and lowest among a variety of cultural groupings (including mainland US, Hawaii, and Japan) on an independent (v. interdependence) dimension. This finding is consistent with other research that suggests that Koreans are more collectivist and that Canadians and Americans are more individualistic (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990, 1992; Yum, 1988).

Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars’ (1996) found additional data suggesting differing cultural values between the two groups. They measured degrees of individualism-collectivism, universalism-particularism, and achievement-ascription in managers from South Korea and the United States (among a survey of 43 countries). Anglophone Canada was not included in the
study, but as shown in Table 2.1, Anglophone Canada may be assumed to be similar to the US population. Two dimensions emerged from the data: Conservatism-Egalitarian Commitment (D1), and Utilitarian Involvement-Loyal Involvement (D2). In the first dimension, Korea and the US are shown to differ greatly, with Koreans surveyed as being much more conservative than the more egalitarian Americans. In the second dimension, Koreans show very strong Loyal Involvement tendencies, while Americans showing more neutral, or balanced tendencies (Smith et al., 1996:248).

### Table 2.1: Hofstede's Dimensions for Korea & Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Power Distance</th>
<th>Uncertainty Avoidance</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Masculinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27/28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.2
Hofstede's 5th Dimension & Hall's H/L Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Orientation</th>
<th>High/Low Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hofstede's 5th Dimension&quot;</td>
<td>Hall (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede &amp; Bond (1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>23 (low-20th of 23 regions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>75 (high-5th of 23 regions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two possible weaknesses in Hofstede’s 1983 work include the homogeneity of the population sample and the question of whether such data is still valid after twenty years. Hofstede’s study used the data to assess corporate cultures and, not surprisingly for circa-1970, males made up the majority of his sample populations of corporate employees. His is not a statistically random sampling of entire national or cultural populations. It might be questionable to use these data to generalize about a national or cultural population. However, in this study, the Korean participant population was 92% male executives employed by a large Korean corporation—a close match with Hofstede’s population sample. Although using Hofstede’s data may be a possible criticism for other studies, the data are appropriate to explore participant cultural background in this one.

The second possible weakness to consider would be the validity of Hofstede’s 1970 data today. The Korean Individualism/Collectivism score is perhaps the most significant because it is the dimension that shows the greatest difference from the Canadian score. The 1970 data show Koreans to be a highly collectivistic sample. However, Hofstede (1997:75,78) reports that in his data, a strong and significant correlation (product movement coefficient of .84 with 1970 data, or .77 using 1987 data) exists between a country’s Individualism Index scores and differences in national wealth. Considering that since 1970, Korea’s “affluence has increased at a rate unparalleled in human history,” (Hofstede, 1994:xii), one might wonder if Hofstede’s data still accurately describe the current state of Korean Individualism. To answer that question, we would need a more recent sample.

Two more recent collections of multidimensional cultural data include Korean data and may shine some light on this question. First, Cha’s (1994) study on stability of individualism and collectivism over time in Korea finds that “despite changes toward individualism, the fact remains that Koreans in both age groups [in their 20s, and over 50] were on the whole collectivist in absolute terms as determined on the basis of their beliefs/attitudes” (Cha, 1994:170). This is not unusual, as Smith et al. (1996) and Hofstede (1994) both point out. Smith et al. found “only a moderate relationship between modernity and [values associated with collectivism]” and observed
that countries such as the United Arab Emirates and Singapore also scored highly on both collectivist values and indexes of modernity (1996:257). Hofstede himself has noted that exceptions to the general industrialism-brings-individualism tendency exist, and South Korea is one of them (Hofstede, 1997:74). Thus, despite relatively immediate changes in wealth and modernity, Korean cultural values have shown to be resistant to proportional degrees of change.

One may conclude, after reviewing the data concerning the cultural uniqueness of the two countries, that they are dissimilar in many respects. As stated above, previous research has suggested that cultural dimensions guide negotiator behaviour, expectations, values, and communicative style. It is therefore suggested that the two groups in this intercultural study faced the potential challenges of significant miscommunication. Indeed, “many executives find negotiating business deals with Koreans extremely frustrating. Non-Korean companies often have difficulty reaching agreements with Koreans...” (Elashmawi, 1994). Furthermore, if the effect of culture on the speech event can be assumed to be greater, then demonstrated high performance may be more likely to be the result of ability than of chance.

**Communicative Competence**

“Both cultural values and communicative practices vary widely [cross-culturally]. Communicative practices are based upon and convey cultural values, and such values, as well as practices, will vary across cultures.” Haslett, 1989:27-28.

In the field of second language acquisition (SLA) and teaching, full competence in a target language is incomplete if it includes simply linguistic or grammatical knowledge. As outlined by Canale & Swain (1980, 1981), full competence in a second language also includes sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. While it is the focus of this section to weigh this kind of competence because of its relevance to culture, it may also be argued that effective strategic competence may also depend on the base culture of the speaker, as well as the cultural setting in which he or she attempts to use it. Sociolinguistic competence is made up of both sociocultural rules of language use and also rules of discourse.
Sociocultural rules include “the extent to which certain propositions and communicative functions are appropriate within a given sociocultural context depending on contextual factors such as topic, role of participants, setting, and norms of interaction.” Of secondary concern would be “the extent to which appropriate attitude and register or style are conveyed by a particular grammatical form within a particular sociocultural context.” Rules of discourse refer to communication cohesion and cohesion, or “appropriate combination[s] of communicative functions (Canale & Swain, 1980:30).”

For native speakers, sociocultural and grammatical competences are simultaneously acquired. Second language learners, especially those who have studied in environments apart from the target culture, often find that even though they may have achieved a great deal of fluency, they may not have acquired the ability to use their second language in ways appropriate to the target culture. To use a musical metaphor, while the learner may have acquired the linguistic tools, or instrument, she may not be playing them in harmony with the rest of the new orchestra she is visiting. A language’s rules and norms of communication are very closely shared by members within speech communities, but are never perfectly shared between speech communities with different cultural, and therefore value bases. Such variations can exist “among mother tongues, domains of language use, inter-language attitude, and language learning purposes leads to misunderstanding...” [and] “performance of speech acts depends on ‘culturally specific appropriateness criteria’” (Candlin, 1978, in Schmidt & Richards, 1980:141). In such a miscommunication, each speaker assumes that they share a mutual interpretation of the utterances. However, each person’s understanding is structured by the discourse conventions of his or her own speech community (Ericson & Shultz, 1982; Gumperz, Jupp, & Roberts, 1977, in Tyler, 1995).

Speech Acts

Researchers have documented and compared the distinct verbal and non-verbal ways unique speech communities achieve identical goals. Speech act research investigates the functions
and uses of language, based on the understanding that language is used by a speaker or interlocutor to accomplish a goal. Language is considered to be a kind of action. Just how that language takes shape would depend greatly on the context of the situation, and the identity of the interactants.

Clyne’s review of speech act history (1994:11) explains that Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) conceptualized such communicative acts as having locution (the produced form of an utterance), illocution (the communicative force of that utterance), and perlocution (the communicative effect of that utterance). Austin further suggested that acts are as numerous as English verbs. His idea acknowledges the nuances of related words, such as ask, require, need, implore, and beg, but as Searle (1976) points out, the same verbs might be used to distinct illocutionary ends, depending on the context and intonation. For example, “I’d like a hand, here.” could function as a request, rebuke, or command.

Context affecting a speech act would include the roles, ages, genders, and relationships of the speakers, the setting, and the expected norms, as defined by society, for such an exchange. If just one of these (or other) factors is changed significantly, the resulting language and non-verbal communication of that speech act will most likely also reflect that change. Mature native speakers acquire sensitivity to such contextual variables, and are able to produce socioculturally appropriate signals in response. This ability is acquired, in most cases, without instruction, and is accessed unconsciously. For second language learners, this is a challenging task, considering first that it is done with newly learned vocabulary. Consider next that the learner’s already-acquired and subconscious rules-for-interaction may no longer be appropriate in the new context. What is bound to result is imperfect communication. If the learner notices the miscommunication, or lack of intent-perception or perception-intent success, he will no doubt feel frustration. This and other negative feelings may be directed at the learner himself, at the native speaker, or at the host culture. As teachers, we look to speech act research for help in understanding differences in speech act realization across cultures and languages. Once made explicit, learners can be helped to avoid this common and challenging problem.
Speech Acts and Intercultural Settings

As cultures differ, so too will the ways in which their members communicate, even in the same language. Breakdowns or miscommunications in intercultural communication where a shared language is used are often due to the meta-linguistic differences attributable to culture. These unique "systems of conversational inference and cues for signaling speech acts ... combine to form the culture's distinctive interactional style" (Blum-Kulka, House, Kasper, 1989:6; see also Berwick, 1988; Brown & Levinson, 1978; and Scollon & Scollon, 1995). A speech act "as defined against the background of a given socio-cultural system is not the same thing as when seen in another cultural context" (Coulmas, 1981:89, see also Kim & Bresnahan, 1994:336).

Cross-cultural speech act studies have repeatedly demonstrated that distinct cultural groups do not necessarily accomplish the same communicative goals in the same ways. Researchers investigating second language performance in various genres and speech acts have investigated differences between L1 production in different languages and possible transfer of first language structure or discourse aspects onto second language oral texts.

Speech Event of Negotiation

Linguistic goals cannot always be obtained through a single discrete speech act, but will require that a number of acts be used in sequence. Such a combination of speech acts is a speech event (Hymes, 1968). If a speech act may be likened to a block used for construction, made unique based on local ingredients, technique, soil, etc., then a speech event may be likened to the structure to be built with those blocks. As a larger unit of communication analysis, speech events more closely approximate actual speech. While less studied than the subcomponent act, speech event study may be considered more wholistic, and may also be more revealing. During a speech event, cultural influences and differences between interlocutors may become more evident than within a single speech act because it takes into account both: 1) the order chosen to progress through the component acts of the event, including how to begin and end it, and 2) how a speaker realizes each individual component act, including intensity, length, and style. Cultural effects on the communication are compounded. Linguistic architecture differs from place to place not only because of different building material, but also because of preferences and expectations in style.

One example of cross-cultural speech event research is Ranney’s (1992) study of medical consultations. Ranney investigated how speech acts fit together in extended discourse in doctor-patient interaction scenarios. He compared consultations between American doctors and Hmong refugee patients fluent in English and doctor-patient interaction scenarios involving native English speakers. Results suggested that the Hmong and native speakers’ communication patterns were distinct, and influenced by local customs and cultural scripts. Such subconscious, deep culture will direct or affect non-verbal and spoken discourse both at the level of individual speech act, and also in events.

Negotiation as a Speech Event

Negotiation is a speech event, comprised of multiple speech acts which, in combination, serve a communicative goal. More exactly, “a negotiation is a voluntary relationship temporarily established due to the conflict of interest where the exchange activity promotes the possibility of a
mutually beneficial outcome” (Mintu & Calantone, 1991:91). In the case of this study, as in Neu’s (1985), the focus is on business/sales negotiation. As such, I shall refer also to Graham’s definition: a “face-to-face decision-making process between parties concerning a specific product” (Graham, 1980:14).

If negotiation is a multistep, complex speech event, then what are its component parts? The communication requirements even before a face-to-face encounter, such as initial contact, exploration of possible opportunity, explanation of needs or services and goods, offer to meet, etc., are then followed by the intricate steps of the negotiation itself. Lampi’s (1987) analysis of negotiations in British subsidiaries of Finnish companies revealed that the encounter phase could be broken down into three phases: chat, discussion, and bargaining. As well, on the micro-level, three types of speech acts were found within the entire framework: acts contributing to the negotiation climate (mitigation, emphasis, address), topic-oriented acts, and silent acts. Graham (1980:91) reviews the work of six social psychologists and marketing researchers concerning the multiple stages of negotiation, all of whom find the same four basic stages, but name them differently. Neu (1985) offers a solution: generic names for the stages: opening, exchange, change, and closing.

If negotiation has a core, it could be said that it is the exchange-change stages, or in common parlance, the bargaining and argument stages. It is especially in these stages that negotiators communicate, maneuver and perhaps strategically manipulate to reach a satisfactory agreement. Van Eemeren & Grootendorst (1992) call such argument “the process of externalizing a position regarding the relative acceptability of an opinion by cooperative disputants.” They classify such argumentation as “an illocutionary act complex at a textual level” because the conditions necessary for externalizing an argumentative position are elaborate and are “linked by convention to the perlocutionary act of convincing.” The speaker in an externalized argument attempts to induce the listener to perform an illocutionary act through which agreement or disagreement of the opinion is expressed. However, persuasion itself entails the sometimes creative use of subordinate speech acts such as: requesting, explaining, agreeing, disagreeing,
apologizing, arguing, complaining, commiserating, interrupting, persuading, refusing, suggesting, thanking, and more. Negotiation is to a single speech act as a mosaic is to a pebble. As such, it may also provide a more complete picture of a speaker's communicative competence.

**Face**

Negotiation is a speech event wherein ingrained culture and values more heavily influence its realization than other events, such as the aforementioned medical examination, because it involves potential loss of face. As White (1997) relates, “negotiating involves the display of face-threatening behaviour, face being defined by Goffman (1967:5) as ‘the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact’ and further elaborated by Brown and Levinson (1987:13f) as positive face (the desire to be approved) and negative face (the desire to be unimpeded in one’s actions).” Negotiation involves the performance of some speech acts especially sensitive to face issues, such as requesting, offering, and refusing. These inherently threaten negative face and will “necessitate the exercise of politeness strategies to avoid or redress loss of face. Avoiding face threatening behavior calls upon the skills of all parties in attending to mutual face wants, which, in the interdiscoursal context...are influenced by intercultural differences in the calculations regarding social distance, relative power, and the absolute ranking of impositions” (Brown & Levinson, 1987:74, in White, 1997).

An example of possible miscommunication due to the delicacy of such intercultural negotiation/argument event may be seen in Tyler’s (1995) examination of an exchange in English that occurred between a native English speaking student and a native Korean tutor. The interaction involved a negotiation concerning a student’s grade. Tyler found “an initial nonmutual interpretation of participant role & status” apparently resulting from “the Korean tutor's transfer of a Korean conversational routine, which he defined as involving polite speaker modesty, to the US English context.” The speaker’s initial conflicting interpretations were maintained and made worse by “additional mismatches in discourse management strategies, schema, & contextualization cues.” The cumulative effect of these mismatches led both interlocutors to conclude that the other was
uncooperative. Had this negotiation exchange concerned a possible international economic
certainty, such miscommunication could have resulted in lost income and employment, and in
either case, another, more subtle and more serious concern exists: the potential for feelings of
dissatisfaction to contribute to stereotyping and xenophobia: underlying roots of racism.

While odd to pair them, both miscommunication due to intercultural mismatches and xenophobia have their roots in ignorance and inexperience. What will therefore benefit those who need or want to improve their performance in intercultural interactions is a program of awareness training supplemented by experiential learning. One critical way that intercultural business trainers and educators can inform themselves and their field to this end is through analysis of intercultural negotiation at an event level. Mere subcomponent speech act research, even when done through intercultural, as opposed to intracultural (or cross-cultural) observation and comparison, is not enough.

**Intercultural Business Communication**

As a whole, the growth in cross-border commercial interaction has continued unabated for the past 50 years. From multinational corporations to tiny import-expert shops, we exist in an ever-integrating and interdependent world market system. Relaxed exchange restrictions and lowered or removed tariffs have allowed capital and commodities to flow ever more easily over national borders.

The impetus for foreign investment and distant sourcing of goods is profit-seeking. International exchanges take place because of differences in each location. An obvious difference is a difference in local wages. In such cases, labour-intensive stages of production are performed in countries of lower wages. Less obvious, but also important are differences in local values and preferences. Local resources and local culture can lead communities to place different values on the same items or services. Canada’s exporting of sea slugs and sea urchins to Japan is a perfect example of this disparity. As well, different cultures may perceive investment risks differently, thus opening the door for mutually satisfactory investment exchanges (Weber & Hsee, 1998).
What is valuable to those of one culture may be less so to those of another, and so both may benefit from trade. Failed or otherwise unrealized exchanges represent lost opportunities.

Basic economic theory explains that in an ideal free market, goods and services are distributed in a way similar to an auction. That is, they go to whomever desires them the most and can offer the greatest compensation. In a buyer-seller situation, this process is potentially mutually beneficial. A successful exchange will realize the maximum potential utility for both seller and buyer. Once established, trade will continue until it is no longer in the best interest of both parties. Such an exchange system offers higher potential benefits when the number of bidders and suppliers increases, as experienced in international trade.

Trade is less efficient (beneficial) when communication is poor for two reasons. First, in order for the optimal pairing of potential traders and for a smooth process of negotiation, information must be accurate, well sent and well received. Second, poor communication can lead to negative perceptions by the interactants of each other. Thus, while on paper, an exchange may benefit a company, it may fail to go through for non-monetary reasons. As a world community of consumers, buyers and sellers of products and services alike, we stand to benefit from effective intercultural communication.

English is the primary medium of global business and demand for its instruction is booming (St. John, 1996). Are these students receiving instruction concerning culture’s influence on bargaining behaviour as well as in nomenclature? If not, both sides may enter into a dialogue with the false assumption that, as long as they are both speaking English words, they will communicate harmoniously. As Kameda (1996) reminds us, words do not simply impart meaning—only “people ‘mean’ and that meaning will depend greatly on the culture of those involved and on the particular situation. Received and intended messages may or may not be the same. Variations in the value systems determine, at least partially, the differences in the interpretation and construction of speech acts that compose the speech event negotiation (Clyne, 1991) and the culturally determined norms of language use in such circumstances (Halmari, 1995).
Competence in negotiation comes, in part, with the ability to speak with clarity and argumentative power, strengths that require the ability to manage, condense, and (re)structure information (Bulow-Moller, 1996). In NS-NNS interactions, superiority in such linguistic control is almost always ceded to the native speaker of the language agreed upon as the medium. But what if neither speaker is a native, or superior speaker of English? Similarly, what if the NNS possesses not only a fluency, but also a mastery of information management? Alas, the negotiation pairs in these cases as well are not out of the woods yet. Lying hidden ahead for them are the potential pitfalls of miscommunication due to culture.

When do differences in cultural foundation affect communications most? Elgström's review of four texts on the subject (1994:295) offers the following as significant factors: 1) degree of party cultural dissimilarity, 2) newness of the relationship, and 3) the length of time, complexity of the negotiations, and 4) the number of participants. Therefore, we can expect fewer miscommunications in longer, more complex negotiations that involve more participants of culturally similar backgrounds. On the other hand, a worst case scenario would be two persons of highly dissimilar cultural foundations meeting for the first time to negotiate over a short period of time.

When two business persons interact in English, and one is a native speaker, presentation of self can be “seriously affected, since this is achieved to a large extent by the exploitation of stylistic variants, paralinguistic & nonverbal means, all of which are culture-specific…” “...Awareness of the other is also impaired, because interactants interpret linguistic data and paralinguistic/nonverbal cues as intentionally employed and consistent” (Beneke, 1979:1). Sociocultural norms are not necessarily shared, but rather are based on the schema the individual has brought to the exchange. Uncertainty therefore exists as to applicability and application of linguistic and nonlinguistic expressions (Beneke, 1979).

In which circumstances are such communication difficulties minimized? In some contexts, the overriding strength of a corporate or diplomatic culture may mitigate such differences by establishing a shared culture to supplement the shared language (Bilbow, 1995; Zartman and
Berman, 1982:226). A well established professional protocol may support the negotiation by serving as a temporary common schema. As well, some interactants may be already be functionally bicultural, whether through professional training, upbringing, or personal experience.

**Dyadic Business Negotiation Studies**

Researchers interested in studying cultural styles and preferences in business negotiation have typically done so by observing intracultural or intercultural interactions. In these studies, participants usually engage in an artificial dyadic negotiation, such as Kelly's (1966) simulation. While naturally occurring negotiations would be preferable, in that they would add validity, they offer two hurdles to the researcher: number and variability. It is difficult to secure permission to record actual business negotiations. As well, such research activity might also impede normal business operations. Lastly, even if permission were granted, real negotiations are likely to be so different from one another in any number of factors that individual performances would be difficult to group or compare.

**Intracultural Studies**

A number of recent studies have compared the negotiation patterns of distinct speech communities, or cultures, through non-interactive means. Research of this kind observes the norms of negotiation interaction between members of one community. For example, negotiators from Japan may be observed interacting with other Japanese. Using an identical elicitation device, or negotiation simulation, negotiators from another speech community, for example, the US, would also be observed interacting with other Americans. These data sets may then be then compared.

Distinct differences in the interaction norms have been noted between such negotiation data sets. Findings include differences in the importance of participant role and negotiation behaviour and style. The importance of role (buyer or seller) in the negotiation among Japanese and Koreans has been reported to be stronger than in other cultures. Specifically, the Japanese business
transaction appears to be based on complete deference to the buyers' needs and desires (Graham, 1983; Graham, 1993; Graham & Mintu-Wimsat, 1997). This seems to be mirrored by Koreans, as Graham, Kim, Lin, & Robinson (1988) report that in both Japanese and Korean negotiations, buyers achieve higher economic rewards than sellers.

Negotiation styles are found to differ between cultural groups. For example, Adler, Brahm, & Graham's (1992) work compared Chinese and US buyer-seller negotiation styles and found that Chinese dyads asked many more questions and interrupted one another more frequently than the American dyads. This tendency was supported by Ulijn & Xiangling's (1995) findings concerning temporal aspects of turn-taking in multimember group business negotiations in Chinese and Western groups. Adler, Graham, & Schwarz Gehrke (1987) also compared intracultural business negotiation in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. The Francophone Canadian and the Mexican businesspeople had quite different negotiating styles from those of the American and Anglophone Canadian businesspeople. The American negotiators achieved lower levels of target satisfaction than the Mexicans, while the Francophones used many more instrumental negotiation strategies than did either English-speaking group.

The process, or style of negotiation also may have unique requirements in different cultures. Campbell, Graham, Jolibert, & Meissner's (1988) work with US, French, German, and British groups showed that the US process of negotiation was different from that of the Europeans in that the sellers' behavior seemed to have no direct effect on sellers' profit. American sellers' profit appeared to depend most on buyers' reciprocating a cooperative approach, unlike in the European data sets. In another study, Druckman, Benton, Ali, & Bagur (1976) observed US, Indian, and Argentinean children and adolescents' bargaining behaviour. Indian bargainers negotiated longer, were more competitive, were more symmetrical in their competitiveness, and had larger discrepancies in their settlements than did either the Argentineans or the Americans. Americans were most compromising in their trial-by-trial offers and in their final outcome, suggesting a convergent bargaining style.
Effective choice of negotiation approaches have been shown to differ, depending on culture. Graham (1983) investigated determinants of outcomes in business negotiations in Japanese, Brazilian, and US samples. The most important variable in US negotiations was related to process: problem-solving-orientation. In Brazilian negotiations, process was also key whether or not deceptive bargaining strategies were employed. Soviet negotiators have been shown to achieve higher individual profits when using a competitive approach in negotiations, while US participants attained higher profits with more cooperative approaches (Graham, 1985a; Graham, Evenko, & Rajan, 1992). Problem-solving approaches resulted in higher negotiation outcomes for Americans (Graham, Kim, Lin, & Robinson, 1988; Graham & Mintu-Wimsat, 1997), while for Spanish negotiators, a problem-solving approach yielded lower profits. In negotiations between Chinese, more competitive strategies led to better results (Graham, Kim, Lin, & Robinson, 1988).

**Limitations**

Comparisons of observations from intracultural negotiations suffer from at least one significant drawback. Any claims that their information may assist the international businessperson in an attempt to interact interculturally are dependent upon the validity of a critical assumption: that individuals will interact in the same way with a person of another culture as with someone from their own culture. Unfortunately, this is not so. There are “significant differences between intraethnic and interethnic communication” (Gudykunst, 1986:203). Negotiators adapt their behaviours in intercultural interactions (Adler & Graham, 1989; Brett & Okumura, 1998; Cai & Drake, 1998; Drake, 1995b; Mintu & Calantone, 1991). A negotiator’s behaviour can be influenced by one or more of the qualities of the person across the table, including that person’s cultural background (Sawyer & Guetzkow, 1966:502). Such background differences may present differences in language and language behaviour, nonverbal behaviour, values, and patterns of thought (Condon, 1974). If we cannot place high confidence in findings derived from
observations of intracultural negotiations, a logical alternative would be to derive findings from observations of intercultural negotiations.

*Intercultural Dyadic Business Negotiation*

Intracultural, or cross-cultural comparisons may be good data for the person who wants to know how people of one culture interact within that culture. However, for the person of one culture who needs to know how to negotiate with those of another culture (or for those who advise and train them), intercultural business (buyer/seller) negotiation data are superior resources. As logical as this argument may seem, research on intercultural negotiations has not been as abundant as intracultural negotiations (Adler & Graham, 1989; Leung, 1997), probably for logistical reasons.

Published research on intercultural bargaining or negotiation was sparse in the 1960s and 1970s. Interestingly, the few intercultural negotiation studies at that time were intercultural, but also intranational, and focused on African-American and Caucasian interaction in the US (Rubin & Brown, 1975:163). These early experiments utilized the Prisoner's Dilemma-type instrument to elicit bargaining behaviours, and did not emulate negotiation as a complex business speech event. Some support was found for differences in behaviour. Findings suggested that cooperative behaviour was more evident in intracultural than in intercultural scenarios (Baxter, 1970; Harford & Cutter, 1966; and Sibley, Senn, & Ephanchin, 1968).

In the mid- to late-1980s, research in business communication between people of different cultural backgrounds and from different countries, often major trading nations, began to increase. This coincided with sharply upward trends in international commerce and travel. Perhaps not surprisingly, the greatest amount of dyadic intercultural business negotiation research, in terms of cultural combinations for observation, has looked at Japanese and US negotiation. These two cultural groups, while economically powerful, have historically found business interaction, and negotiation in particular, difficult. Brett & Okumura's (1998) analysis showed that the problems are due in part to incompatible negotiator scripts and schemas. In their study, US and Japanese
negotiators found it difficult to understand each other’s priorities, identify compatible issues, and therefore realize joint gains. Further confounding efforts were differences in views of power, and the clash of their respective cultural tendencies on the individualism/collectivism and hierarchy/egalitarianism scales. Such lack of a common ground both in terms of inner values and their expression can lower the effectiveness of a negotiation, even when both parties believe they are speaking the same language.

Other problems have been noted in intercultural negotiation between Japanese and Americans. For example, these interactants spend more time trying to influence each other’s opinions and less time effectively exchanging information that would allow them to find optimal results. The result is poorer outcomes for both parties (Rubin & Brown, 1975; Graham, 1985b). Such limited information exchange between Japanese and native English speakers has also been noted by Graham & Andrews (1987), during which less accurate impressions are formed of foreign bargaining opponents. Both communication and perceptions of communication were affected. Graham & Andrews call this problem “interactional asynchrony” (1987:77).

Differences in participant cultural orientation was again blamed for the interactional asynchrony Lituchy (1997) observed in real estate negotiations. Lituchy examined the effects of cultural collectivism (versus individualism) among US and Japanese negotiators. Ingroup collectivist dyads of Japanese reached integrative (win-win) solutions while individualist Americans reached distributive (win-lose) outcomes regardless of the culture (and by extension, collectivist or individualist orientation) of their partner.

Hawrysh & Zaichkowsky (1991) pursued the issue of cultural differences in an ethnographic study, confirming differences in Japanese-US negotiation behavior noted in anecdotal and descriptive works. Cultural differences are found in early stages of the negotiation process, especially in personal relationships, status, styles of decision making, and bidding. Interestingly, cultural differences are not confirmed for the later stages of the negotiation process, namely persuasive tactics, concessions, and outcomes.
White (1997) focused on back channelling, repair, pausing, and private speech in US and Japanese negotiations. Going on the premise that all are used differently in each language, White tested whether they are also used differently in business negotiations and found that they are used somewhat differently in business negotiations than in other speech events. Usage of back channelling tended to blend American and Japanese conventions, but not enough to avoid some misunderstanding. Pause behavior differed from expectations in one dyad, with the American allowing longer unfilled pauses.

In her case study of a Japanese/Australian business negotiation, Marriott (1990) found that each party applied different communicative and sociocultural strategies. In particular, each perceived the function of their interaction differently, and differed further in their views of proposal structure and content. “Adequate linguistic messages which are generated by one party are not comprehended by the other party in the contact situation when there is incongruity between the participants’ communicative or sociocultural norms” (Marriott, 1990:47). Marriott concluded that “not only do individuals use their native norms for the generation of their behaviour but also in their evaluation of the conduct of their “interactant” and “deviations... are negatively evaluated” (1990:58).

In a portion of their samples, Adler & Graham (1989) observed Japanese/US intercultural interaction and found US negotiators to be the least adaptive to intercultural scenarios of the cultures observed, but most satisfied by the interactions. The Japanese were more attracted to US negotiators than to their fellow Japanese, even though their profits were reduced when bargaining with Americans. Adler & Graham hypothesized that the Japanese culture’s traditional hierarchical buyer/seller relationship may be responsible for these data, as the Japanese took the seller’s role. Role (seller/buyer) therefore may influence perceived or expressed attraction in some cultures.

*Other Pairings*

To a lesser extent, researchers have scrutinized dyadic bargaining between other cultural combinations: US and Taiwanese (Drake, 1995b), US and Brazilians (Garcez, 1993), English and
Finns (Kakoköngäs & Kaare, 1988), English and Singaporeans (Lim, 1991, 1997), Mexicans and Norwegians (in English) (Natlandsmyr & Rognes, 1995), Irish and Germans (in German) (Martin, 1993), Dutch and Italian (Niemeier, 1997), US and Filipino (persuasion) (Lowry, 1973), Finns and Chinese (real, small groups, in English) (Ulijn & Xiangling, 1995), and Dutch and Chinese (simulated, small groups, in English) (Ulijn & Xiangling, 1995).

Some researchers have used larger pools of participants from various cultural backgrounds in their studies. Fant & Grindsted (1995) looked at intercultural bargaining among Danes, Swedes, Spaniards, and Mexicans and found evidence of value mismatches. Swierczek (1990) uniquely observed bargaining tendencies among a multiplicity of Asian bargainers. Drake’s wide, but diluted study (1995a:30) used 32 pairs of some 20 cultural backgrounds and found that cultural orientation affects judgment errors in intercultural negotiation, but that other, equally problematic factors not in her study, were involved.

When looking specifically at intercultural negotiation work with Koreans and native English-speakers of any country, I found only one: Kimmel’s (1993) Ph.D. dissertation. Kimmel manipulated (guided) 59 American and Korean participants’ expectations of their foreign counterparts’ culture before a negotiation simulation and observed processes, not final outcomes. Her findings were that “national culture expectations are especially intense compared to other expectations” and that they can “influence judgment and misunderstanding” (1993:70). Findings also suggested that the effect was mediated by subject expectation strength, and information gathering, and perspective taking ability.

In reviewing this listing of previous studies in dyadic intercultural business negotiation, it can be generalized that, other than US and Japanese pairings, a huge ocean of study exists largely uncharted. The more common intracultural comparisons may provide us with some rough soundings, but the necessary, detailed studies of intercultural pairings have not been done. Dyadic intercultural business negotiation specifically with Koreans is open for discovery.
Performance Variables

A wide array of variables have been looked at in relation to negotiation and negotiation performance. They can be divided into four underlying dimensions: “a) the structural context within which bargaining occurs, b) the behavioural disposition of the parties involved, c) the nature and underlying characteristics of the bargainers’ interdependence, and d) the use of social influence and influence strategies in bargaining” (Rubin & Brown, 1975:36). To a researcher, this multiplicity of potential factors can be problematic. For example, Patz (1992) and Gosenpud & Washbush (1996) examined personality aspects as (intracultural) negotiation performance predictors. Patz (1992) found good predictability using Meyers-Briggs components; however, Gosenpud & Washbush could not replicate the findings. Their suggested reason for the lack of finding was the complexity of factors and unique nature of each negotiation interaction. Greater success has come when researchers have examined performance variables by using multiple factor analysis (Cui & Awa, 1992; Cui & Van Den Berg, 1991; Donohue, 1978; Kale & Barnes, 1992; Neu & Graham, 1994), or by making more modest attempts to define factor impact (Gosenpud & Miesing, 1992).

Oral Persuasion-Intercultural Business

Within the field of persuasion, which is an element of negotiation, researchers have investigated culture-specific tendencies in writing (recently, see Bermudez & Prader, 1994; Carrell, & Connor, 1991; Cheng, 1993; Connor & Lauer, 1988; Crismore, Markkanen & Steffensen 1993; Currie, 1990, 1993; Devenney, 1988; Ferris, 1994; Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Graham, 1996; and Sionis, 1995). However, “relatively little work has been done on the overall organization of oral persuasive discourse” (Tyler & Davies, 1990), and even fewer of intercultural events. When we restrict these studies to those which deal with business settings, the numbers are scant (Gulbro & Herbig, 1996).

The few studies in the area of oral persuasion in intercultural settings (Garcez, 1993; Kakoköngäs & Kaare, 1988; Marriott, 1990, 1991; Martin, 1993; Tyler 1995) confirm that
miscommunications occur for many more obvious reasons, but that differences in communicative style and cultural values are insidious in that the conflict source is easily unrealized or misattributed (Johnstone 1986; March, 1982). Conclusions of this research body (also Beneke, 1979) repeat that pedagogical change is needed to reflect negotiators’ needs for target culture sociolinguistic awareness to “improve the quality of their business interaction by reducing tension and time consumption in bargaining mutually satisfactory outcomes” (Garcez, 1993:116).

If intercultural negotiation research concludes that essential elements of successful negotiators are intercultural awareness and sensitivity, then negotiators with higher measured levels of these traits and higher levels of previous exposure should negotiate with greater success than those who do not. As yet, this logic and these factors have not been empirically tested in this field, and this is a gap deserving investigation. Also, these intercultural negotiation studies reveal that problems in intercultural business negotiations occurred despite some speakers’ advanced levels of English, and levels of business and negotiation experience. How these additional factors contribute to failure or success has also not yet been empirically investigated.

Business and intercultural trainers need to know how best to choose and train personnel for short-term intercultural negotiation or long-term overseas assignments. Factors in the success or failure in intercultural communication have been studied from diverse approaches: behavioral assessment (Ruben, 1976), communication competence (Koester & Olebe, 1986), and psychological adjustment (Brein & David, 1971). These divergent approaches have led some researchers (Kim, 1986; Tung, 1981) to call for the development of a more integrative investigatory methodology. Studies by Cui & Van Den Berg (1991), and Cui & Awa (1992) investigated this possibility to some degree by studying the correlation of background and situational variables to participant intercultural effectiveness, under an integrative cognitive-affective-behavioral framework.

Cui & Awa used a multifaceted framework to research the factorial structures for cross-cultural adjustment and overseas managerial performance. Their findings indicated that the importance of factors differed according to the area/task of investigation: cultural adjustment and
job performance. Cui & van den Berg found, for example, that communicative competence (their definition), cultural empathy, and communication behaviour were good indicators of intercultural effectiveness. However, in both papers, only participant opinion of factor importance and opinion of performance were used in correlating dependent and independent variables and are therefore subject to possible participant bias. Similarly, other researchers looking for factorial influence, such as Frankenstein & Hosseini (1988), Graham & Sano (1989), Karrass (1970), and Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida (1989) polled executives for their opinions of important factors and opinions and did not use direct evaluation or objective of performance. To gain a clearer picture of the variables affecting performance, Cui & Awa suggested alternative methodology (Cui & Awa, 1992:326), and that the variables be measured by more empirical data. This step has not yet been made by any intercultural negotiation work that I have found.

**Performance Measurement Models**

Measurement of the success of a negotiation has been done in various ways in different fields. Linguists often use speech analysis (e.g., Marriott, 1990; Neu, 1985), but this method ignores participant success in securing negotiation goals, and does not consider participant satisfaction. Garcez (1993) used a more ethnographic and holistic approach to examine satisfaction, but also ignored the monetary value of the end-deals. Economists, not surprisingly, often consider end-deal profit as the definitive and sometimes only indicator of a negotiation performance (Teach, 1990). However, the effectiveness of any speech event should be a measure of how closely both task and communicative goals are met. For a business negotiation, these are perhaps best expressed as a combination of the end-deal's economics, and counterpart satisfaction. Firms need to sell profitably, and also want their partners in the deal to be satisfied. Satisfied negotiation partners are more likely to return in the future. Dissatisfied customers may seek alternative sources (the competition) or spread negative PR, thus souring deals with customers never even met. Fisher & Ury (1981), Graham (1986), Graham, Evenko, & Rajan (1992),
Graham & Mintu-Wimsat (1997), and Thompson (1990b) have all written in favor of the use of the dual profit-counterpart satisfaction model for negotiation performance assessment.

Another consideration in performance assessment is the satisfaction of both individuals combined. The mutual satisfaction of both sides has the advantage of partially taking into account the resulting desirability and potential of long-term business relationships. From a communicative standpoint, the responsibility for a negotiation’s complete success is dual, as speakers co-construct discourse. This interactional component (Sajavaara, 1988:254) must be appreciated. As such, this thesis uses three measures to evaluate performance: individual performance (financial viability of end-deal), participant (opponent) satisfaction, and mutual (combined opponent and individual) satisfaction.

Framework Summary

The topic, framework, and methodology proposed in this thesis were chosen as a direct result of the implications and gaps in the fields of language, psychology, and business research. The specific topic of intercultural negotiation has been shown to be in need of investigation. The framework and methodologies selected for this research have been called for by previous researchers. Lastly, the combination of Koreans and Canadians in the cultural interaction in this thesis deserves study.

Pilot Study

It was a pilot study in intracultural negotiation that led me to do this study in intercultural negotiation. I investigated business negotiation by three (Taiwanese, Canadian, and German) same-culture dyads in English. Background variables under investigation were: experience in negotiation, experiential knowledge of business, and English fluency. Evaluation of negotiation performance was done holistically (success in effecting the multiple goals of their position) and by evaluating the equality of the end agreement for each negotiator.
Although the sample size was small (n=3 negotiations), results had implications deserving further consideration. For example, in the study, high negotiation experience appeared to be more correlated with success than was linguistic proficiency. As well, personality seemed to play a role, in that aggressive, stubborn behavior was rewarded by concessions on the part of the negotiation partner, albeit unhappily. When speakers of comparable linguistic abilities were matched up, experience and personality differences led to a superior result over an unhappy partner. When linguistic and experiential levels were even, and both participants displayed similar bargaining personality, the participants reached a fair/balanced deal.

These findings begged a number of questions. How would negotiators be ranked if negotiation performance assessment took into consideration opponent satisfaction? Would these findings be different in intercultural communication, where participants are faced with a double cultural lens that may distort sent and perceived messages? Would experience in the task, language skill, (and therefore confidence), or personality (high degree of cross-cultural sensitivity), prove most significant? It was this pilot study and the questions it raised that brought me to the work at hand.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

It has been argued above that there is a need to examine more empirically the influences of language ability, background experience, and personality/psychological traits on intercultural negotiation performance. In the section below, the participants, instruments, and analysis to accomplish this goal are explained.

Site & Participants

This study was coordinated through the UBC Continuing Studies’ Intercultural Training and Resource Center (ITRC), now known also as the Centre for Intercultural Communication (CIC). The CIC has considerable experience in training Korean executives from large corporations through content and English language modules, with the goal of improving clients’ global management potential. Specific experts on negotiation and intercultural communication were used to design and instruct these modules. This research worked with a small-sized group of executives, scheduled for a 3-week program at the CIC. Of the 36 Korean executives in the program, this study worked only with the group of 12 designated as “Advanced” because of their higher levels of linguistic ability and experience. It was only the Advanced group which was to receive the negotiation learning module of which elements of this study were a part.

For the negotiation, Canadian Commerce students were recruited for interaction with the Korean executives. Recruitment was done by the University of British Columbia, Office of Executive Training, Department of Commerce. The recruitment announcement may be see in
Appendix J. The desired profile for the Canadian negotiators was: native English speakers with
over 10 years of Canadian residency. Gender and ethnicity were not controlled for. Two groups,
12 Korean and 12 Canadian participants, completed individual data and negotiated in 12
intercultural dyads.

It has been noted by Fouraker & Siegel (1963) that that students and businesspeople
bargain differently. If so, this would be a complicating factor in the study’s design. However,
their claim is dependent on differences in participant experience. In this study, 75% of Canadian
participants were MBA students. Another 17% were enrolled in business/commerce programs at
an undergraduate level. The remaining participant was a business/commerce program instructor.
Therefore, it is believed that the potential disparity of experience that Fouraker and Siegel warned
of was minimized, if not eliminated.

Independent Variables and Instruments

This study collected its data through participant background questionnaires, reported
TOEIC scores, self-reports of intercultural adaptability, task results, and post-task satisfaction
questionnaires. Data collection for the Korean executives occurred in three steps. First, following
an introduction to their negotiation training module, consent forms and background questionnaires
were distributed to the Korean participants on April 4th, 1997 (see Appendix A). A translator
assisted in explaining the study itself, as well as details of both the consent forms and background
questionnaires. On April 8th, the intercultural adaptability instrument (CCAF™) was used in a CIC
training session by the Korean participants. See Appendix C for a sample of the CCAI.

The Canadian participants were given consent forms and background questionnaires (see
Appendix B), as well as their CCAI forms upon recruitment. Forms filled out by Canadian
participants were collected by the researcher before and in some cases, after the negotiation
simulation. On April 10th, the negotiation simulation was run, again as part of a learning unit for
the Korean participants. See Appendix D for the simulation instructions for each side. Interpreted
ranges of the instructions are graphically represented in Appendix E. Satisfaction surveys were
administered to both Canadian and Korean participants immediately after the simulation, and can be read in Appendix F.

**Background Questionnaires**

"Unlike other communication studies, the crux of intercultural communication that distinguishes it from the rest of the field is the relatively high degree of difference in the experiential backgrounds of the communicators due to cultural differences" (Kim, 1984:16).

Both Korean and Canadian participants completed written background questionnaires designed to elicit information about participants’ levels of: time spent abroad in cultures other than one’s own, daily interaction in-country with persons of a cultural background other than one’s own, experience in general negotiating in-country, business negotiating experience, business negotiation training, and intercultural business experience. Other questions were asked, but not used in this study’s analysis. The units of description included time (years, months, days, days per month) and incidences (interactions per month).

**Language Ability**

Korean participants reported their most recent TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) scores as a representation of their ability in English. As can be seen below in Table 3.1, the TOEIC is a popular standardized test of English worldwide. The TOEIC is used worldwide, but primarily in Asia, and by corporations. It is especially common in Korea, where it is used as a benchmark for judging linguistic ability (Wilson, 1989). In contrast with the test more frequently used in North America, the TOEFL, the TOEIC differs in targeted register. Where the TOEFL tests academic English, the TOEIC tests English in work (business) settings (Gilfert, 2000). Canadian participants were not similarly tested and were assumed to be fully communicatively competent in English. Later communication with this researcher strengthened this assumption.

**Table 3.1: TOEIC STATISTICS**
Psychology

As a measure of psychological and attitudinal traits, participants completed the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory™, or CCAI™, a Likert-scaled inventory with 50 questions targeting psychological aspects previously identified in intercultural research in the field to be associated with successful cross-cultural adaptation, including communication. These areas are: Perceptual Acuity, Personal Autonomy, Flexibility/Openness, and Emotional Resilience. The CCAI™ is a self-administered questionnaire designed to be used “as a training instrument...to provide information to an individual about his or her potential for [general] cross-cultural effectiveness” (Kelley & Meyers, 1995). This instrument was the only one commercially available at the time to measure psychological traits associated with intercultural adaptation. It is considered to have face, content, and construct validity and has an overall reliability of .90 (Kelley & Meyers, 1995:30). Authors advise that participants have at least a ninth-grade reading level. While the advanced section of Korean participants was decided by their relative superior English ability, and while the lowest scoring individual was still a 580, Korean participants were assisted in their filling out the inventory by a CIC trainer, experienced in CCAI administration to non-native speakers.

Dependent Variables and Instruments

There were two general dependent variables in this study: Monetary Performance and Partner Satisfaction. Monetary performance was decided through the process of the negotiation simulation. Satisfaction was elicited through the Post-Negotiation Questionnaire.
Participants in this study performed an oral, dyadic, face-to-face business negotiation simulation in English with Canadian MBA students from UBC. The simulation was written by Mr. Graham Bullent, a co-worker of the CIC's negotiation unit's instructor, and had been used successfully in a previous CIC Korean business training program. While still artificial, unlike typically used instruments in intercultural negotiation studies, the simulation design was considered by the instructor to be more realistic than the Kelly (1966) simulation, which is arguably the most often used simulation in dyadic negotiation studies.

In the simulation, the Korean participants played the roles of Korean suppliers, while the Canadian MBA students assumed roles as Canadian purchasing representatives for a national department store chain. The simulation was a multi-issue case, with some integrative opportunities, but which also had fixed-sum design. To aid in later objective evaluation, the simulation had numerical (monetary) final agreement goals. All participants completed the simulations within the 1-hour limit.

Monetary performance was found for each individual by calculating the price per unit agreed upon in his or her negotiation. Because the contracts included a stream of payments in the future, these future earnings were discounted by the 30-year bond rate at the time of the negotiation (about 7%) to calculate present value. The total price of the contract was divided by the number of units in the agreement to find unit cost. A higher unit cost was considered good for sellers (Koreans) and bad for buyers (Canadians).

Post-Task Questionnaire

Post-negotiation questionnaires were administered to record participant perceptions about their own and their counterpart’s perceptions of the negotiation, as well as about the bargaining situation (see Thompson & Hastie, 1990). Participants responded to 44 statements on a 6-point Likert scale. Areas assessed were: language, behavior, negotiation performance, and deal satisfaction. Half the statements were negatively worded (and reverse scored) to reduce positive respondent bias. As well, twenty-four of the questions elicited respondents’ assessment of his or
her partner in the negotiation. These questions targeted areas of participant satisfaction with the end-deal, partner's language and communication ability, and partner's behavior (see Appendix F).

The behaviour questions were formulated to target desirable traits as outlined in Gudykunst (1991) and Casse (1979), and also similar to the post-negotiation questionnaire used by Graham (1990). Areas of behavioural assessment were opponents': politeness, trustworthiness, flexibility, empathy, professionalism, manners, compatibility, preparedness, patience, respect, trust, and behaviour accommodation. Areas of communicative/linguistic assessment were opponents': listening comprehension, effectiveness at sending information, effectiveness at receiving information, speech accommodation, listening comprehension, comprehensibility, and frequency/severity of miscommunications. An additional four (4) questions were considered to be especially significant in assessing overall satisfaction. These four core questions were: willingness to do future business with this opponent, overall opinion, satisfaction with final agreement, and miscommunications. These four were doubly weighted in the final satisfaction scores to reflect their importance. See Appendix G for a list of the specific questions and the formula used to add the 24 scores.

An general overview of the study's variables and corresponding instruments can be seen in Table 3.2 below. A more detailed graphic representation of the study can be seen in Figure 3.1 below.
Table 3.2: SUMMARY OF VARIABLES AND INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Background Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Ability</td>
<td>TOEIC score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aptitude</td>
<td>CCAI scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary Performance</td>
<td>Negotiation Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Satisfaction</td>
<td>Post-Task Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Data Collection: Recordings

The negotiations were audio tape recorded. Negotiation pairs were set up with a table, two chairs, and at least 10 meters of privacy. Both standard tape recorders and more sensitive PZM-type table microphone and recorders were used. These recordings were ultimately not used in this study.
**Background Questionnaire**

- Cultural Exposure I
  - Travel
- Cultural Exposure II
  - In-country interaction
- General Task Experience
  - Non-business negotiation
- Area Task Experience
  - Business Negotiation
- Area Task Training
- Specific Task Experience
  - Intercultural Business Negotiation

**Standardized Test of Linguistic Proficiency**

Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) scores.
Total score (Listening + Reading) range: 10 - 990

**CCAI™: Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory**

50 questions, 6 point Likert Scale

- Emotional Resilience Subset
  - 18 questions: Scores: 18 - 108
- Flexibility/Openness Subset
  - 15 questions: Scores: 15 - 90
- Perceptual Acuity Subset
  - 10 questions: Scores: 10 - 60
- Personal Autonomy Subset
  - 7 questions: Scores: 7 - 42

**TASK**

Intercultural Negotiation
NNS-NS dyadic business negotiation simulation.
Cost per unit determined.

**Post-Negotiation Satisfaction Questionnaire**

46 Assessment Questions

6-point Likert scale
Self- and Partner- Behavior, Negotiation, and Language targeted
Also: opinion of simulation

**DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Task Performance Measures

- **Monetary Success**
  - Price of contract
    - higher = better for Korean sellers
    - lower = better for Canadian buyers
- **Interpersonal Success**
  - Partner satisfaction
    - 24 questions about participant and scored by opponent
- **Mutual (dyadic) satisfaction**
  - combined interpersonal satisfaction scores
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Overview

This chapter explains the data analysis and findings. First, I explain the variable constructions. Second, I test for correlations between independent and dependent variables in the sample group. Based on these results, I support or reject hypotheses regarding variable associations. Also, I report other inter-variable associations that were discovered during analysis.

Variable Construction

This study sought to explore possible correlations between independent variables and dependent performance variables. Independent variables were negotiator experience, language ability, and psychological traits. Dependent variables were relative partner satisfaction and relative monetary goodness of the negotiate deal. Analysis of correlation required these variables to be expressed quantitatively. For some variables, such as the TOEIC scores, this was simple; others needed some manipulation. The background questionnaires, end contracts (unit price), and post-negotiation surveys had to be interpreted and re-expressed as sets of figures for all buyers and sellers.
Independent Variables

Independent Variable: Experience

The background questionnaires elicited details of the frequency and depth of individuals’ exposure and interaction with people of cultures different from what they considered to be their own. It also elicited information about participants’ experience in the negotiation speech event. Responses were given in units of time or occurrences per year. Six categories were formed from the data: out-of-country cultural exposure, in-country cultural exposure, non-business negotiation, business negotiation, negotiation training, and intercultural business negotiation.

To use experience as a single variable, the six sub-categories would need to be combined. Simple addition was inappropriate, as the data within the six categories were quite dissimilar. For example, days spent abroad were in some cases quite high, while very few participants had much negotiation training. A system of score standardization was employed to reduce the possibility of one category overwhelming other categories. To combine the categories into one experience score, the six sub-component scores were standardized with the following formula:

\[
Z\text{-score} = \frac{\text{sub-category score} - \text{MEAN (all sub-category scores)}}{\text{standard deviation of all sub-category scores}}
\]

The Z-standardization reins in extreme variables, typically producing a range of results between -3 and 3: a kind of six point spread system within each category. The six standardized scores were then added to produce a final variable: ALLEXPZ. Weighting of the six sub-components within ALLEXPZ was balanced.

It was decided not to weight the sub-categories differently. Should the sub-component, “intercultural business negotiation” be weighted more when forming a single experience variable, to reflect the fact that it’s theoretically closer in nature to the target task? Perhaps. Yet, in order to weight any of the sub-components, it must be first known how important each category of exposure or experience is to the measures of negotiation performance. However, that information,
the closeness of association, is a desired *end-product* of this research, and not an *a priori* assumption. This study was exploratory in that respect, and therefore, each category was given equal weighting in the ALLEXPZ variable.

After the correlations were performed, a comparison of correlations of the sub-components to performance variables was performed. Those results are reported later.

*Independent Variable: Language*

Canadian participants were selected for native or near-native English fluency and did not take a standardized language test. For the Korean participants, reported TOEIC test scores were used directly as the variable, KORTOEIC. Sub-scores for reading and listening were not available. Although ultimately not used, in some explorations of correlation, the language data for the two groups were combined. In those cases, Canadian participants were artificially assigned a score equal to that of the highest score in the Korean group, and this variable was named TOEIC.

*Independent Variable: Psychology*

The psychological traits variables used the CCAI™, an instrument designed for numerical scoring. Subset scores were used directly as: EMORES, FLEXOPEN, PERCEPT, and AUTONOMY. The weighting system inherent in the test was not altered. These scores were added directly to create the overall psychological variable, CCAIALL. After the correlations were performed, a comparison of correlations of the sub-components to performance variables was performed and are reported later.

*Dependent Variable: Negotiation Performance and Money*

In the negotiation of a business agreement, money is an obvious concern. In the sales negotiation used in this study, unit cost was used to evaluate the quality of the agreement, and therefore, the negotiation performance of the individual securing that price. For the Koreans, who
represented the sellers, the goal was a higher per-unit price. Inversely, the Canadian buyers were striving for lower per-unit pricing.

The dependent variable for monetary performance, REL$PER, was calculated by finding the relative quality of the price obtained by each negotiator. An index was created whereby the price an individual agreed to was divided by the average price for all negotiated contracts in the study. Therefore, a score of 1.15 for a seller would mean that that individual secured a unit price 15% better (higher) than the average of all sellers. Such a score for a Canadian buyer would indicate that that individual secured a unit price 15% better (lower) than the average of all buyers.

**Dependent Variables**

*Negotiation Performance and Partner Satisfaction*

As explained above, when evaluating a negotiator's performance, it is also necessary to consider partner satisfaction. Post-negotiation survey questions were administered through Likert-scale responses to statements about aspects of the negotiation process. Of particular interest were twenty statements which elicited an evaluation of various aspects of the negotiator's opponent/partner's performance. The dependent variable for partner satisfaction, RELSATP, was calculated by adding the scores for positive statements, and adjusted scores for negative statements. Four core satisfaction statements were considered to describe overall satisfaction and were given double weight and added to the variable. Next, these scores were indexed to show relative individual performance. Each Korean seller's index score was calculated by dividing his or her score by the average score given by all Canadians to all Koreans. Similarly, each Canadian buyer's score was calculated by dividing his or her score by the average score given by all Koreans to all Canadians. Therefore, a satisfaction score of 1.15 for an individual would mean that he or she was evaluated 15% higher than the average of those of his or her group.

*Negotiation Performance: Dyadic/mutual Data*

A final set of variables was constructed to explore correlations between combined pair independent variables (experience and CCAI scores) and performance variables (mutual
satisfaction and unit cost). Combined language within the dyad was not believed to be a relevant variable because the Canadian language scores were believed to be equal (fully communicatively competent). Therefore the addition of fictional Canadian language scores to the KORTOEIC scores would dilute them. Furthermore, the correlations between KORTOEIC scores and measures of performance are performed in the non-dyadic analyses.

Combined experience within each dyad was calculated by adding individual ALLEXPZ scores to form PAIREXPZ. Combined psychological trait strength within each dyad was calculated by adding individual CCAI scores to form PAIRCCAI. The performance variable representing satisfaction within the dyad, or MUTSAT, was found by adding individual RELSATP scores. Finally, the performance variable representing monetary value of the deal within the dyad was represented by COSTUNIT.

Data Analysis

To what extent is there a relationship between individual experience, language ability (as measured by a standardized test), and psychology (as measured by a standardized test), and individual negotiation performance, as measured by relative monetary quality of the deal? In previous studies, serious miscommunication occurred even when speakers exhibited fluency in the language of interaction. As well, speakers highly experienced in business and business negotiation in their first language and culture suffered problems in communication. Apparently, selecting negotiators by linguistic ability and domestic negotiation experience alone does not ensure optimal performance. Would negotiator selection by the additional variables described above result in more effective intercultural communication? Significant correlations between the independent and dependent variables would suggest that selection by screening of candidates through such a tripartite test (background questionnaire, TOEIC, and CCAI) would be valid.

Correlation Tests
Following data entry and variable construction, all data calculations were done on SPSS (Version 9) software. Nonparametric tests were used because much of the data did not meet the assumptions required for parametric tests (Pett, 1997). Specifically, in the individual analysis, persistent outliers in the moderate-sized sample (n=24) data set endangered result validity in all but one variable pairing. Similar outliers in the lower-sized sample (n=12) dyadic data set precluded all but nonparametric analogs to the Pearson product-movement correlation coefficient as measurements.

**Hypotheses**

This study seeks to explore associations between independent, individual variables and dependent individual performance variables in the hope that the data will inform corporate managers, intercultural business professionals, and intercultural trainers. As such the twelve theoretical hypotheses to follow should not be interpreted as beliefs of the researcher, but rather as simply null hypotheses to be investigated.

**Hypotheses 1-3**

Hypothesis 1:

$H_0$: There is no association between individual experience and individual negotiation performance, as measured by relative monetary quality of the deal.

Hypothesis 2:

$H_0$: There is no association between individual language ability, as measured by the standard TOEIC test, and individual negotiation performance, as measured by relative monetary quality of the deal.

Hypothesis 3:
H₀: There is no association between the individual psychological trait scores measured by the CCAI and individual negotiation performance, as measured by relative monetary quality of the deal.

Results for Relative Financial Performance

The following are the correlations between the independent variables and monetary performance, RELSPERF. For the ALLEXPZ general experience variable, nonparametric testing with Spearman's $r_s$ and the Kendall's $\tau$ correlations did not show significance: $r_s = .200$, $p > .05$, and $\tau = .138$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

When correlation tests were performed between experience sub-component categories and monetary performance, only TRVLEXPO, or exposure to other cultures outside of one's own country showed moderate correlation that satisfied the $\alpha=.05$ level of confidence limit: $r_s = -.456$, $p < .029$. A Kendall's test also showed significance at just outside the $\alpha=.05$ level: $\tau = -.278$, $p < .064$.

Correlations for just the Korean group KORTOEIC and monetary performance were calculated. They showed no significant association in either test: $r_s = -.164$, $p > .05$, $\tau = -.200$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is accepted. Although outside the hypothesis testing, a significant association between experience and language ability was also discovered. Again, looking only at the Korean participants, a significant negative correlation was found between ALLEXPZ and KORTOEIC: $r_s = -.627$, $p < .039$, but this was slightly weaker in the Kendall's test: $\tau = -.455$, $p < .052$.

For the CCAI psychological variable, CCAIALL, the correlations with monetary performance were not significant: $r_s = -.089$, $p > .05$, $\tau = -.018$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 is accepted. Subsequent correlation tests performed between all CCAI subsets and monetary
performance were insignificant as well. Those tests showed EMORES $r_s = -.113$, $p > .05$, FLEXOPEN $r_s = -.094$, $p > .05$, PERCEPT $r_s = -.007$, $p > .05$, and AUTONOMY $r_s = .077$, $p > .05$.

Although outside the hypothesis testing, an exploration of correlation between experience subcomponents and CCAI subcomponents revealed an association between DALYEXPO, the variable for in-country exposure to those of a culture considered different from one’s own, and FLEXOPEN, the psychological traits of flexibility and openness. Tests showed $r_s = .471$, $p < .023$.

**Hypotheses 4-6**

**Correlations with Partner Satisfaction**

To what extent is there a relationship between individual experience, language ability (as measured by a standardized test), and psychology (as measured by a standardized test), and individual negotiation performance, as measured by opponents’ satisfaction? Hypotheses for testing are as follows.

Hypothesis 4:

$H_0$: There is no association between individual experience and individual negotiation performance, as measured by opponents’ satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5:

$H_0$: There is no association between individual language ability, as measured by the standard TOEIC test, and individual negotiation performance, as measured by opponents’ satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6:
There is no association between the individual psychological trait scores measured by the CCAI and individual negotiation performance, as measured by opponents’ satisfaction.

**Results for Relative Satisfaction**

The following are the correlations between the independent variables and individual negotiation performance, as measured by his or her opponent’s satisfaction, RELSATP. For the ALLEXPZ general experience variable, the Spearman’s $r_s$ and the Kendall’s $\tau$ correlations did not show significance: $r_s = .231$, $p > .05$, $\tau = .160$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is accepted. Surprisingly, when correlation tests were performed between experience sub-components and satisfaction performance, no category showed any significant correlation.

Correlations for the Korean group language ability variable, KORTOEIC, and satisfaction performance showed no significance: $r_s = .396$, $p > .05$, $\tau = .330$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 is accepted.

For the CCAI psychological variable CCAIALL, the correlations with satisfaction performance were found to be moderate to strong, and significant: $r_s = .540$, $p < .006$, $\tau = .366$, $p < .014$. A scatterplot of the two variables revealed normal distribution and no outliers. Therefore, a parametric test of correlation was additionally performed on the data. A Pearson’s product movement test of correlation supported the previous findings: $r = .471$, $p < .020$. We can therefore confidently reject Hypothesis 6.

Subsequent correlation tests performed between CCAI subsets and satisfaction performance showed some significant associations as well, but only for three of the four subsets: EMORES $r_s = .452$, $p < .027$, $\tau = .301$, $p < .044$, FLEXOPEN $r_s = .444$, $p < .030$, $\tau = .315$, $p < .034$, and PERCEPT $r_s = .553$, $p < .005$, $\tau = .331$, $p < .028$. The subset AUTONOMY showed no such association: $r_s = .140$, $p > .05$, $\tau = .106$, $p > .05$. 
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Correlations with Dyadic Data

Although each negotiating pair is more than a ‘sum of their parts’, doing just that might reveal associations between dyadic mixes of individual traits and negotiation performance and outcomes. For example, no significant association was suggested above by the data between individual experience and individual relative monetary performance. Can the same be said for dyads? Will the data show that dyads with collective high or low degrees of experience or scores on the CCAI correlate in any way with negotiated unit cost? Similarly, do these combined dyadic traits associate in any way with mutual satisfaction? Hypotheses for testing are as follows.

Hypotheses 7-8

Correlations with Dyadic Data: Unit Cost

Hypothesis 7:

$H_0$: There is no association between a dyad’s combined experience and the negotiated unit cost.

Hypothesis 8:

$H_0$: There is no association between a dyad’s combined psychological trait scores, as measured by the CCAI, and the negotiated unit cost.

Results for Unit Cost

The following are the correlations between the combined independent variables within the pairings and monetary performance, as measured by final cost per unit, COSTUNIT. For the PAIREXPZ general experience variable, the Spearman’s $r_s$ and the Kendall’s $\tau$ correlations showed some correlation, but at a level of significance poorer than $\alpha=.05$. Tests showed that $r_s = -0.582$, $p < .060$, and $\tau = -0.418$, $p < .073$. Therefore, Hypothesis 7 is accepted.
For the psychological variable PAIRCCAI, the correlations with unit cost were found to be moderate to strong, negative, and significant at $\alpha < .05$. Tests showed $r_i = -.669$, $p < .017$, and $\tau = -.504$, $p < .023$. We can therefore reject Hypothesis 8.

Although outside the hypothesis testing, a possible correlation between PAIRCCAI and PAIREXPZ was revealed in the variable correlation matrix generated by the SPSS software. Specifically, there was a moderate correlation just above the $\alpha = .05$ level of confidence. A Spearman’s test revealed $r_s = .564$, $p < .071$.

**Hypotheses 9-10**

*Correlations with Dyadic Data: Mutual Satisfaction*

Hypothesis 9:

$H_0$: There is no association between a dyad’s combined experience and the mutual satisfaction score of that dyad.

Hypothesis 10:

$H_0$: There is no association between a dyad’s combined psychological trait scores, as measured by the CCAI, and the mutual satisfaction score within that dyad.

**Results for Mutual Satisfaction**

The following are the correlations between the combined independent variables within the pairings and MUTSAT, or mutual satisfaction as measured by the combined RELSATP individual satisfaction scores. For the PAIREXPZ general experience variable, neither the Spearman’s $r_s$, nor the Kendall’s $\tau$ correlations showed any correlation. Tests showed $r_i = .345$, $p > .05$, and $\tau = .236$, $p > .05$. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 is accepted.
For the psychological variable PAIRCCAI, the correlations with mutual satisfaction were found to be moderate to strong, positive, and significant at $\alpha < .05$. Tests showed $r_s = .704$, $p < .011$, and $\tau = .534$, $p < .016$. We can therefore reject Hypothesis 10.

Although outside the hypothesis testing, a correlation between MUTSAT, mutual satisfaction and COSTUNIT, or unit cost, was revealed in the SPSS software-generated variable correlation matrix. Specifically, there was a moderate, negative correlation (but above the $\alpha = .05$ level of confidence). A Spearman’s rho test revealed $r_s = -.497$, $p < .101$. Further investigation of this possible association in the individual data showed greater significance. Specifically, COSTUNIT was negatively correlated with RELSATP. Kendall’s tau showed $\tau = -.292$, $p < .052$, a level of confidence that still warrants attention. Spearman’s rho was more confident, showing $r_s = -.415$, $p < .044$. 
DISCUSSION

The need for intercultural communication training has been professed by both industry and academia. Seventy-four percent of US corporations surveyed by Harris and Moran (1991) reported that negotiation skills training for international interaction was the number one most needed kind of educational support for their employees. Black and Gregersen report that “nearly 80% of mid-sized companies send professionals abroad-and 45% plan to increase the number they have on assignment [abroad]” (1999:52). Researchers Ting-Toomey (1992) and Tung (1981, 1982) also assert that personnel must be trained and tested before being sent overseas to work, or to negotiate with other cultures.

The need for training and assessment seems to be clearly stated, but what shall the trainers use to reach this goal? What tools are at hand and are they up to the task? Often, attention is focused on individual experience, language, and psychology. The tools to measure them are usually standardized questionnaires and tests. These instruments assist managers when choosing personnel for training and assignment, individual business people when doing self-analysis of training need and strength awareness, and intercultural trainers when performing intake evaluation, or deciding training module design, weighting, and scheduling. However, when intercultural
business negotiation is the specific communicative speech event, is the use of these tools justified? Are they valid guideposts to training and gatekeepers to opportunity?

The primary goals of this thesis were to explore associations between experiential and cognitive/affective factors and communicative/behavioral success in intercultural negotiation, and to do so through the use of the tools most likely to be used in corporate or academic settings. The negotiation assessment instruments in this study measured performance in linguistic, behavioral (process and end-result), and monetary dimensions for speech event. The findings of the data have implications for individuals and institutions concerned with intercultural training and performance.

Summary of Findings

The individual data from the experience questionnaire, the TOEIC test, and the CCAI did not show any connection to negotiator monetary performance. Presumably, other factors not included in this study, or perhaps alternative instruments for the same dimensions would show correlation. The experience questionnaire showed probable moderate negative correlation between the dyads’ combined data and unit cost.

Neither the experience questionnaire nor the TOEIC test showed any connection to satisfaction performance. The CCAI test as a whole, and especially the subsets of emotional resilience, flexibility/openness, and perceptual acuity, showed good correlation with partner satisfaction. Combined pair CCAI and mutual satisfaction also had good correlation. The CCAI showed moderate to strong negative correlation between the dyads’ combined data and unit cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Individual Experience &amp; Monetary Performance</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Individual Language Ability &amp; Monetary Performance</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Individual Psychology &amp; Monetary Performance</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Individual Experience &amp; Partner Satisfaction</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Individual Language Ability &amp; Partner Satisfaction</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Individual Psychology &amp; Partner Satisfaction</td>
<td>Significant correlations found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Dyadic Combined Experience &amp; Unit Cost</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Dyadic Combined Psychology &amp; Unit Cost</td>
<td>Significant correlations found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Dyadic Combined Experience &amp; Mutual Satisfaction</td>
<td>No significant correlation found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Dyadic Combined Psychology &amp; Mutual Satisfaction</td>
<td>Significant correlations found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Experience and Background Questionnaires

The questionnaire instrument data as a whole failed to correlate individual experience with negotiation performance on both the monetary and satisfaction measurements. While this may indeed be because experience, at least among young negotiators, is not a major factor in performance (and, by extension, some factors not included in this study, are), the non-correlation might also be because the instrument was poor at assessing relevant experience. One possible clue to this explanation was the sub-component analysis. When the entire experience variable was broken down into subcomponents, only individual travel experience was found to be associated with monetary success, and that correlation was negative. This might be explained by problems with the experience questionnaire. While the instrument did elicit data concerning such issues of time spent abroad, it did not discriminate among different activities during that stay. For example, a participant who spent a lot of time abroad, but usually in a hotel or otherwise insulated from meaningful interaction with that other culture would score highly in that category. Also, participants may have reported exaggerated amounts of other intercultural interactions or activity frequencies. Lastly, non-correlation might also have been the result of poor distribution in some of the experience sub-categories. These weaknesses, alone or in combination, would sabotage validity of the experience data, and throw off findings. Solutions to these problems would be: more detailed questioning, outside corroboration of experience, and a larger experience distribution in the data.

Another theoretical explanation for the lack of correlation between experience and performance is that the uniqueness of the task limited the potential benefit of previous, different experience. Experience in negotiation tasks of a different nature than those in a subsequent task can hinder performance by conditioning patterns of expectation and behaviour that may transfer poorly to the new task (Thompson, 1990a, 1990c). So, while experience may be helpful, it is possible that the various experience the participants had was different from the setting or skill demands of the simulation.
Combined experience within the dyad did not correlate with mutual satisfaction. When experience within the dyad was examined in relation to negotiated unit cost, the findings were also not significant. However, the correlations were at a low enough p-value (between .06 and .073) to warrant further study. The data suggest that pairs that had more experience settled on prices that were lower than those settled by pairs with less experience. One explanation for this could be that the pairs with less collective experience had sellers with less individual experience. Theoretically, the more-experienced buyers could then haggle them down to a lower price. However, if this were so, then individual experience as a whole or some sub-component would have correlated significantly with relative monetary performance. The explanation for this may be statistical aberration, or not. Further study with larger groups, and accounting for the other possible problems mentioned above may shed some light on this matter.

**Language Ability and TOEIC**

Language proficiency is of course important in intercultural communication, but how much is really necessary? Although the TOEIC test is promoted as a potential benchmark for business English performance, this result of this study suggest that even moderate-level scores do not hinder task outcomes.

The individual language component for the Korean ESL participants did not correlate significantly with either monetary or satisfaction performance. One explanation for this finding could be that appropriate partner expectations mitigated the possible linguistic challenges of the interactants. Intercultural miscommunication is more prevalent and potentially damaging when interactant awareness of it is low. In the case of the participants in this study, prior to the simulations, interactants were exposed to various awareness-raising conditions. For example, both groups knew that they were involved in a study of intercultural negotiation (and were being observed), and had recently completed 50-item cross-cultural adaptability inventories. As well, the Korean group was in Canada taking an intensive training international business course, which
included cross-cultural awareness. It is possible that the heightened awareness resulted in fewer
miscommunications for those of lower linguistic proficiency.

The lack of correlation finding for the Korean language data may also suggest that the
potential negative effects of communication style difference may not be manifested when
negotiators are of a moderate-to-advanced linguistic proficiency in the linguistic medium, as were
the participants of this study. Any possible problems may be slight enough as to be overcome, or
the linguistic proficiency of the interactants may be sufficient to repair missteps. This interpretation
is supported by Kleifgen & Saville-Troike, who assert that “within certain well-defined recurrent
situations, a common linguistic code is neither necessary nor sufficient for coherent
communication, whereas shared background knowledge is both necessary and often sufficient for
communication to be successful” (1992:183). While business negotiation may not always be
mutually “well-defined” between interactants of different cultures, the interactions examined in this
case were arguably more defined and limited than a true-life negotiation scenario.

The precedent for adequate task performance with nonnative levels of English is seen in the
historical occurrences of pidgin languages between cultural groups. When a dominant group (in
this NS-NNS case, let us take this to mean native speakers) and a subordinate group (again, in this
case, Koreans who are operating in the NS language) are in contact, “a pidgin may spring us for
very limited use, usually in trade” (Finegan, 1994:291). Pidgins are effective “in the workplace to
communicate with traders.” (Finegan, 1994:287). Indeed, the etymology of pidgin reveals that it
is an alteration of the words, Business English (Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary,
1988). A pidgin develops between people of different languages to accomplish the immediate and
limited need of accomplishing the task at hand: doing business.

It may be, however, that such non-standard forms of English are sufficient only when
motivation of the negotiators is high (because, for example, of few alternatives), and/or if the
attitude (perhaps measured by the CCAI) of the interactants is open to this kind of communication.
Unfortunately, while similar conditions may have occurred in this study, in real world, competitive
conditions, this is unlikely to always be so.
The unintentional finding of negative correlation between the all-experience variable and the Korean participants' language test scores variable was initially surprising, but may possibly be explained in one of three ways. First, the general experience score was made up of a six experience sub-components, only two or three of which could have related to foreign language exposure, and none of which specifically required any English use. Second, participants with higher experience scores may have had lower TOEIC scores because they were allocating their resources and time to activities other than the study and practice of English. Lastly, as mentioned above, the experience data might have some weaknesses.

_Psychology and CCAI_

The individual psychology component, as measured by the CCAI, correlated well with satisfaction performance. This suggests that participants' self-perceptions of cross-cultural adaptability and their partners' perceptions of their cross-cultural negotiation performance were well matched. Also of interest are the different correlations between CCAI sub-components and satisfaction performance. Tests showed significant positive association between emotional resilience, flexibility and openness, and perceptual acuity with partner satisfaction. The subcomponent with strongest correlation with satisfaction was perceptual acuity. The subcomponent of personal autonomy did not show significant correlation with satisfaction. Personal autonomy may instead be an element that correlates better with success in living in another culture. Within the dyads, combined CCAI scores also correlated highly with dyadic satisfaction. These results suggest that the CCAI test, and especially the first three quadrants of it, would be appropriate to use as an assessment or training instrument, but only as it relates to partner satisfaction.

In contrast, the CCAI scores did not correlate significantly with monetary performance. Sub-components of the CCAI also showed no meaningful correlation. These individual results would suggest that strong individual cross-cultural adaptability has little effect on the bottom line. However, when CCAI values within the dyad were examined in relation to negotiated unit cost, a
moderate to strong negative correlation was shown. Pairs that had higher combined CCAI settled on prices that were lower than those settled by pairs with lower combined CCAI scores.

How can this be explained? Lower combined CCAI interactant combinations are associated with lower satisfaction scores. Satisfaction scores are composed largely of perceptions of negotiation process. Poor negotiation processes would result in more no-deal end results. Even if a deal is reached, the negotiation process is likely to be less efficient, meaning that end decisions are likely to be of greater utility inequity (lacking end-deal fairness). That the end-deals may be lopsided in low-CCAI pairs is understandable. What is not clear is why low combined-CCAI dyads ended up with lopsided unit cost in favour of the Korean sellers, or why high combined-CCAI dyads ended up with lopsided unit cost in favour of the Canadian buyers.

A secondary analysis of the data was done. Specifically, I looked at correlation between CCAI scores and unit cost. I separated the data into two groups: buyers and sellers and did the analysis once for only sellers’ CCAI scores, then with only buyers’ CCAI scores. The Korean seller CCAI scores only, KORCCAI, and negotiated cost per unit, COSTUNIT, showed no significant association in Kendall’s test: $\tau = -.364, p > .05$. However, the Spearman’s test showed: $r_s = -.573, p < .051$. Similarly close to the point of significance were the Canadian buyer CCAI scores only, CANCCAI, and negotiated cost per unit, COSTUNIT: $r_s = -.571, p < .053, \tau = -.412, p < .063$. While interesting in their near-significance, these findings do not have sufficient levels of significance to draw conclusions. Additional testing is needed to understand these potential associations.

Another consideration about the CCAI and financial performance must be considered. While no individual background or trait brought to the table seemed to matter in terms of immediate monetary results, the CCAI variable might do so in the long-term. The CCAI did correlate with partner satisfaction, which in itself has potential financial rewards in the long run. For example, strong sales competitors are bound to provide buyers with comparative price and service information. A buyer will soon know if he or she is overpaying. That client’s future stream of
patronage will more likely continue if the price is fair and the process satisfying. Thus, while monetary and satisfaction performance are separate, they may be measuring short- and long-term monetary performance, respectively. Therefore, in this light, the CCAI correlation may be considered to be correlated with long-term monetary performance.

One finding outside the hypothesis testing of correlation between in-country exposure to foreign culture and the psychological traits of flexibility and openness suggests a relationship that may, after further testing, prove to be mutually causative. That is, daily exposure to other-cultured people may change psychology that is manifested in perception. A more likely explanation is that persons with high flexibility and openness self-select to have more frequent interaction with those people of other cultures.

Other

Although not significant at the p<.05 level, a correlation at the p<.10 was found between combined dyadic satisfaction performance and unit cost. The association suggests that higher dyadic satisfaction occurred when the final price per unit was low. That buyers would say this is not surprising. What is counter-intuitive is that because the variable used was unit cost and not relative monetary performance, the association is shown for sellers and buyers alike.

To further investigate, secondary data analysis revealed that buyers' reported satisfaction (not received satisfaction scores from partners) had no significant correlation with unit price. Specifically, Canadian opinion CANOPEN and COSTUNIT showed: \( r_s = -.284, p > .05 \), and \( r = -.168, p > .05 \). Sellers' reported satisfaction, KORSAT and COSTUNIT showed correlation closer to the level of significance: \( r_s = -.529, p > .077 \), and \( r = -.382, p < .086 \). That is, higher seller satisfaction seems to be also associated with low prices, and lower seller satisfaction seems to be associated with high prices. Why would sellers be more satisfied with lower prices?

On the one hand, there is good reason to discount these findings. First, the findings came from a low sample size of data (n=12). Second, the correlations are not at a significant p level. On
the other hand, trying to understand surprising findings can sometimes bring discovery. Other factors besides price might be affecting the responses. What could they be?

The observed associations may reveal types of motivation and be a by-product of the mixed process/end-deal weighting of the satisfaction variable. First, Canadians' reported satisfaction was not associated with the price on the contract. It may be that the Canadian buyers, who volunteered to join the study, were there simply for the experience. Likewise, the Korean sellers were not negotiating for their company: the simulation was an exercise. Second, the Korean satisfaction scores, although formulated in part by participant opinion of the end-deal, were also formulated from opinions of the negotiation process. Wouldn't the sellers be more pleased with the process of a negotiation in which their Canadian opponents were pleasant and not demanding, accepting and not refusing? This would be the case in lower price negotiations, and less so in cases where the prices offered to the Canadians were higher. In high-price cases, the Canadians would be more likely to fight hard, bringing about lower reported process satisfaction by Koreans. Therefore, the combination of low price motivation, and higher satisfaction in easy exchanges may have weakened the expected correlation between satisfaction and price, and brought about the unbalanced findings.

It could also be that the observed associations reveal values in part dependent upon culture. The Korean sellers' moderate pleasure or displeasure could be founded in cultural values. It could be that sellers who agreed to a low price were somewhat pleased in that they suspected their partner was happy with the deal. Pleasing the customer, tied in with the value of a successful long-term relationship with one's buyers, is a value shared by many cultures, including the Koreans (Graham, 1987, in Hellweg, Samovar, & Skow, 1989; Tung, 1991). These value orientations might be contributing to the effect.

Another possibility is that seller satisfaction with a lower price may demonstrate Korean respect for a strong negotiator. Conversely, reporting low satisfaction may have revealed a lack of respect for a weak negotiator. Earley reports that in Korean negotiations, "an emphasis is placed on ... avoiding actions that threaten the negotiating partner and therefore potentially dishonor the
negotiating group” (1997:209). Korean sellers who negotiated hard to get a high price may have been feeling some post-negotiation vendor remorse. Understanding whether the data are hinting at motivational or cultural factors, or are in fact statistically insignificant would more likely be explained in a larger study. With the limited study at hand, there is simply not enough statistical significance to move beyond supposition and speculation.

Limitations

There are some aspects of this study which limit the generalizability of the data. The most obvious is low sample size (24 individuals, 12 dyads) which restricted statistical significance for any causal analysis of independent variables. It may be possible that the findings would be reversed in studies with more samples. Also, a number of findings were at a p-level just above the .05 limit. Having more data would possibly clarify these points. Second, this study is limited in its scope and therefore does not claim to represent all steps or elements of negotiation, nor all kinds of negotiation. In many cases, it is suspected that other factors are having an effect, but were not included in the study. Also, additional other aspects potentially essential for a specific negotiation’s success such as strategic ability and pre- and post-negotiation elements (phone skills, data analysis, tax-hedging strategies, etc.) of the negotiation process are not studied here.

The measurement of the success of the performance of negotiation based on a one-time event may be considered insufficient and possibly culturally biased, as it rewards a short-term business relationship horizon. Unfortunately, it might be argued that any possible evaluation construct would have a cultural bias. The simulation in this study did have a longer-term element (a maintenance contract), but did not introduce the idea of possible, additional deals between the parties in the future. Thus, that possibility was left open to interpretation. How a person interprets this possibility, and therefore how he or she behaves in the negotiation process would result in different performance scores. For example, a negotiator might accept a less profitable, one-time agreement, with the longer-term goal of establishing a deeper business relationship in the future.
In the evaluation used in this study, such a strategy would result in a low individual profit performance score. The judgment that high, immediate (short-term) monetary outcomes are superior to lower ones may be questioned. Yet, for immediate analysis of negotiator monetary performance, only immediate profits could be used in the evaluation. Ideally, multiple performances, or analysis under real-life negotiation would be a superior evaluation design.

Participant diversity is limited in this study and may not be taken as a representative sample of either all Koreans or Canadians. However, because the task is not an uncommon or unfamiliar one for business executives, and as the potential implications of the study's findings are to be targeted at the training of international business negotiators, the participants groups may be considered appropriate. The participants of the study were also relatively young (mean =31). As a result of their limited diversity of experience, some experience subcategories had poor distribution. This study focuses on examining association of variable scores among those more likely to be receiving training and assessment: MBAs and younger executives. If moderate experience is associated with performance measures, it may not have been properly tested with this sample.

Another limitation was the negotiation simulation itself. By being a simulation and not a real interaction, negotiator motivations may be different. Also, no simulation can adequately replicate the multiple facets and reality of an actual business negotiation. For practical reasons, it was also important that the simulation be simple enough that it could be completed in one sitting (in this case, one hour). Additionally, it may be unrealistic that a corporate negotiation involving so much money would be decided by one person from each party. A more complex simulation, including multiple people, and involving multiple meetings would be more realistic, but such a design would make it complicated to extract conclusions about individual traits. As well, the conclusions would have been stronger had there been multiple negotiations and/or role reversal. Unfortunately, logistics and time limitations did not allow for this design.
Contributions & Implications

Despite its limitations, this study contributes to Business English and the field English for Specific Purposes by identifying the variables and sub-components that are associated with intercultural negotiation performance. From these data, we can draw inferences regarding the appropriateness of using such background questionnaires, TOEIC scores, and/or CCAI psychological profiles as training or gatekeeping instruments.

The results of the study can inform corporations seeking to select candidates for overseas postings. For example, one Korean company assesses candidates for foreign assignments by asking them to complete a survey of “about 100 questions designed to rate their preparation for global assignments and their cross-cultural skills.” The survey questions generally ask people not to evaluate their own characteristics but to describe their past behavior (Black & Gregersen, 1998). The findings of this study would suggest that such an approach may be more appropriate than the write-in type employed here because it can better discriminate the kinds of experience.

Also, those who select curriculum and pedagogy for international and intercultural negotiator training may use component variables to evaluate weaknesses and strengths in clients and adjust their training curriculum accordingly. The post-negotiation survey may prove to be an excellent pedagogical tool worthy of study in instructional methodologies. Those who wish to become better intercultural communicators for corporate or personal endeavors may use the results of this study to plan their careers and/or training needs. For example, for advanced ESL students, precious time and financial resources may be more wisely allocated to training in specific culture/task and sociocultural awareness. Generally, these courses involve cognitive training, behaviour modification, experiential training, cultural self awareness, or attribution training (Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie, & Yong, 1986). For trainers and managers, the data suggest that the CCAI may assist in developing (or finding) negotiators with high partner satisfaction, but that the three instruments should not be used to judge a candidate’s potential for short-term financial task performance.
This research also contributes by adding to the insufficient data on intercultural negotiation in general, and especially to the data concerning Korean and Canadian negotiators. It is the first study to simultaneously evaluate these cultures using experiential, linguistic, and psychological independent variables and both affective and objective performance measures.

**Directions for Future Research**

Because intercultural negotiation is a multidisciplinary field, with unexplored areas and combinations, there are nearly unlimited directions for future research. What shall be considered here are extensions to this study or to similar studies.

First, the validation of the findings of this study through more extensive data could be done, incorporating the changes implied in the findings. Also, the importance of certain independent variables for these Korean-Canadian interactions may not necessarily translate into other cultural combinations, and other combinations should be studied. Later, the comparison of other existing pedagogical instruments, such as the 100-item experience questionnaire, the TOEFL test, or Meyer-Briggs Inventories would follow. Also, the development of effective instrument combinations could be explored. Through the use of larger population samples, regression analysis could find more powerful and predictive models for individual factors and intercultural communication performance.

Performance measures should also be expanded to allow each participant to engage in multiple negotiations with different opposition. Negotiation type, such as distributive- and integrative-type settings may yield different results for predictive instrumentation. Subsequent real-life corroboration, perhaps through post-training sales figures, would also be a welcome step.

The future of the field may hold a lot of answers, but it is also bound to frustrate researchers who have ambitious plans. Indications from this study and others are that multiple factors can be at play in negotiation. How many there are is unknown, but perhaps dozens, scores, or even more than one hundred. Finding the most important few might only be possible after enormous logistical effort, sample size, and multiple factor inclusion. Even then, the findings may be valid
only for unique settings: a certain kind of negotiation, between only certain cultural interactants, etc. It is doubtful that many researchers will attempt such a labour-rich, potential-poor endeavor. Yet, limiting the study of negotiation to simplified, and fewer variables and participants has its own problems with lower generalizability and diluted variable significance, due to other factors not included in the study.

One idea, however, has come to light. With enough data, a comprehensive understanding of negotiator variables across major cultures may be possible. If the study of all possible blends of different cultures is too unwieldy and time-consuming a task, more efficient analysis could be done by drawing conclusions from interactions between major cultural types. Hofstede has already found 5 cultural dimensions, and they may be used as a framework for larger-scale, but inherently simpler intercultural communication analysis.

What is most convincing about the possibility of such an endeavor is the mathematics. Even if we restrict our hypothetical analysis to 50 cultures, the possible number of unique intercultural dyadic combinations is \( n(n-1)/2 = 1250 \). If instead we look at pools of cultures that Hofstede has identified along his continua, the number of combinations would be greatly reduced. For example, in Figure 5.1, Hofstede’s Individualism/Collectivism vs. Power Distance data has defined 6 pools of cultures that share similar traits (1997:54). Using these trait pools, researchers would have to deal with only \( n(n-1)/2 = 15 \) possible combinations. The culturally pooled members and number of pools may differ according to the specific 2-dimension plot chosen, but the concept would still potentially save a great deal of labour. By restricting cultural communication analysis, in negotiation, or any measure of communication competence, to behavioural and value systems along these fewer combinations, a comprehensive, global picture of negotiator variables and possible challenges to communication can be more easily drawn. This kind of study, alongside carefully constructed, modest studies mentioned above, will continue to advance the field. It is expected that such advances would lead to greater economic benefit and improved international and intercultural understanding.
Fig. 5.1: ISO-TRAIT POOLS

Hofstede (1997:54).
APPENDIX A
Background Questionnaires (for Korean Participants)
- Do NOT write your name on the questionnaire. You will be given a private code that you will use for identification purposes during the study.
- Answer ALL the questions for each section. Write N/A if the section does not apply to you.
- If you need more space, you may write on the side or back of the page.
- If you are unsure of a question, please ask the researcher for explanation.
- Please use a dictionary or any other aid if you wish.

**Participation:**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardizing your participation or standing in the LG Global Business Communication Program at UBC.

If the questionnaire is completed, it will be assumed that consent has been given.

**Time:**

There is no time limit. The estimated amount of time required for completion of the background questionnaire is 20 minutes.

**Returning the Questionnaire:**

When you have completed the background questionnaire, please return it personally to the Co-Investigator, David Karkut, at the Intercultural Training and Resource Center.

**Confidentiality:**

Any information resulting from this background questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. Participants will not be identified by name. Identification will be only by code number and all related documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Access to data records kept on computer hard disk will require a password.
Background Information Questionnaire

PART A
1) Participant Identification Code: K-

2) Year of birth (e.g., 1965):

3) Gender (circle one): Male Female

4) Total Experience with LG (e.g., 5 years, 3 months):

5) Present Job Title:

6) Experience at present position (e.g., 2 years, 3 months):

7) Total years of work experience post-university:

8) How many years/months have you studied English in a classroom setting? (e.g., 6 years, 4 months)?

9) What languages do you speak well? If you speak more than one, circle your first language. If you consider yourself bilingual, circle both.

Korean

PART B
Personal Exposure to Western Culture:

1) If you ever lived for longer than 1 month in an English-speaking country, please describe where, why, and for how long:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. San Francisco, USA</td>
<td>university exchange program</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1 year, 2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) If you have ever *traveled* (less than 1 month) to an English-speaking country, please list what country, for how long, and why. Do not describe the time listed in the previous question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TIME</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Australia</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>vacation/travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you have ever lived with (same home, apartment, dormitory room, etc.) any native English-speaking people, please list the place, situation, the year, and the length of time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>place</th>
<th>situation</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Los Angeles</td>
<td>homestay with family</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) If you have had any contact with native English-speaking people who are working for your company, please explain the time and language you use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On average, how many hours a month do you speak to each other and/or work together?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What language do you use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) If you have any contact with native English-speaking people who are working for other companies that you do business with, please explain the time and language you use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On average, how many hours a month do you speak to each other and/or work together?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What language do you use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) If you have had any native English-speaking friends, please list their nationalities and how many:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>How many?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. American (US)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) If you have ever had any native English-speaking teachers, please list the class, the years, and the length of time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. University English class</td>
<td>1988-1989</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) If you have experienced personal contact with native English-speaking persons that you have NOT yet explained in the questions above, please explain in the space below:
PART C
Personal Exposure to Non-English Speaking Cultures:

1) If you have ever lived for longer than a month in a country where the first language was not English or Korean, please list the length of and reason for your stay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Jakarta, Indonesia</td>
<td>work assignment</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) If you have traveled to (less than a month) a non-English speaking country, please explain how long you were in each place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TIME</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. China</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>vacation/travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you have ever lived for longer than a month with a non-Korean person whose first language was not English, please explain your experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>place</th>
<th>situation</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Shared a house with a German engineer.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) If there are any non-Korean, non-English speaking persons working in your company, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many hours a week do you speak to each other and/or work together?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What language do you use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) If you have any contact with non-Korean, non-English speaking persons who are working for other companies that you do business with, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On average, how many hours a month do you speak to each other and/or work together?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What language do you use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) If you have ever had any friends whose first language was not Korean or English, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>How many friends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Malaysian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) If you have studied any languages besides English and Korean, please list what language(s), for how long, and where you studied, and percentage of native instruction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>How long</th>
<th>Class location</th>
<th>% time with native instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>In Korean high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) If you have experienced personal contact with persons of another culture/language, besides English-speaking) that you have NOT yet explained, please do so in the space below:
PART D

Exposure to Negotiation:
1) If you *personally* experience kinds of buying/selling negotiation in your daily life outside of work (such as shopping, selling your car, or buying food), please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (setting)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exposure to BUSINESS Negotiation:

2) If you have had any negotiation training before coming to Canada, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of training</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>company course</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you have done any business negotiations with Koreans in a *face-to-face* setting, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>How long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>distributors</td>
<td>5 times per month</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) If you have done any business negotiations with Koreans by phone, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>How long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>distributors</td>
<td>2 times per week</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) What do you like about negotiation with Koreans?

6) What do you NOT like about negotiation with Koreans?

7) How confident do you feel about your ability to negotiate when negotiating in Korean with other Koreans?

Check one box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very high confidence</th>
<th>High confidence</th>
<th>Above-average confidence</th>
<th>Average confidence</th>
<th>Below-average confidence</th>
<th>Low confidence</th>
<th>No confidence or N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**PART E**

**Exposure to Intercultural Negotiation:**

1) If you have done business negotiations with non-Koreans in a face-to-face setting, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations?</th>
<th>With what cultural group?</th>
<th>Frequency?</th>
<th>Time for each negotiation</th>
<th>Language used?</th>
<th>Was a translator used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing contracts</td>
<td>Thai battery companies</td>
<td>twice a year</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Only for legal paperwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) If you have done business negotiations with non-Koreans by phone, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations?</th>
<th>With what cultural group?</th>
<th>Frequency?</th>
<th>Time for each negotiation</th>
<th>Language used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>Hong Kong manufacturers</td>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>1 day (6 hours)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you have had *intercultural* negotiation training before coming to Canada, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of training</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>university seminar</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) What do you like about INTERCULTURAL negotiation?

5) What do you dislike about INTERCULTURAL negotiation?

6) How confident do you feel about your ability to negotiate interculturally when negotiating in English with non-Koreans?

Check one box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very high confidence</th>
<th>High confidence</th>
<th>Average confidence</th>
<th>Below-average confidence</th>
<th>Low confidence</th>
<th>No confidence or N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PART F

Factors for Managerial Success:
2) How important do you think the following factors are for selecting the individual best able to succeed overall as an International Manager? Rank items from 1 to 11, (where 1=most important). Please write in other items if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RANK (1 - 9+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language test scores (e.g. TOEIC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University's reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors for Success in Intercultural Negotiation:
2) How important do you think the following items are to success in negotiating with people of other cultures? Rank items from 1 to 8 (1=most important). Please write in other items if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RANK (1 - 8+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Background Questionnaires (for Canadian Participants)
- Answer ALL the questions for each section. Write N/A if the section does not apply to you.
- If you need more space, you may write on the side or back of the page.
- If you are unsure of a question, please ask the researcher for explanation.
- Please use a dictionary or any other aid if you wish.

**Participation:**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardizing your participation or standing in your courses or program at UBC.

If the questionnaire is completed, it will be assumed that consent has been given.

**Time:**

There is no time limit. The estimated amount of time required for completion of the background questionnaire is 15 - 20 minutes.

**Returning the Questionnaire:**

When you have completed the background questionnaire, please return it to the Co-Investigator, David Karkut, on the day of the negotiation simulation.

**Confidentiality:**

Any information resulting from this background questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. Participants will not be identified by name. Identification will be only by code number and all related documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Access to data records kept on computer hard disk will require a password.
Background Information Questionnaire

PART A
1) Participant Identification Code: C-

2) Year of birth (e.g., 1965):

3) Gender (circle one): Male Female

4) Previous employment title(s):

5) Industry or industries:

6) Total work experience in business field: years months

7) What languages do you speak well? If you speak more than one, circle your first language. If you consider yourself bilingual, circle both.

   English

PART B
Personal Exposure to Non-English Speaking Cultures:

1) If you have ever lived for longer than a month in a country where the first language was not English, please list the length of and reason for your stay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>reason</th>
<th>year(s)</th>
<th>length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Jakarta, Ind</td>
<td>summer work exchange</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2) If you have traveled to (less than a month) a non-English speaking country, please explain how long you were in each place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TIME</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. China</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>vacation/travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you have ever lived for longer than a month with a non-Canadian person whose first language was not English, please explain your experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>place</th>
<th>reason/person</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Vancouver</td>
<td>shared a door room with a Spanish student</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) If there are any non-Canadian, non-English speaking persons now studying in your program, please explain:

- How many hours a week do you speak to each other and/or work together?
- What language do you use?

5) If there are any non-Canadian, non-English speaking persons working at your previous job, please explain:

- How many hours a week did you speak to each other and/or work together?
- What language(s) did you use?
6) If you have ever had any friends whose first language was not English, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>How many?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Malaysian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) If you have studied any languages besides English, please list what language(s), for how long, and where you studied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>Class location</th>
<th>% of instruction time with native language teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex. Chinese</td>
<td>32 months (4 school-years)</td>
<td>In high school</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART C

Exposure to Non-Employment Related Negotiation:

1) If you personally experience kinds of buying/selling negotiation in your daily life outside of work (such as shopping, selling your car, or buying food), please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exposure to BUSINESS Negotiation:

2) If you have had any negotiation training before, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of training</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>university course unit</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3) If you have done any business negotiations with Canadians in a face-to-face setting, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>How long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>door to door sales</td>
<td>homeowners</td>
<td>6 hours/day</td>
<td>summer job of 2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4) If you have done any business negotiations with Canadians by phone, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>How long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>distributors</td>
<td>2 times per week</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5) What do you like about negotiation in English with other Canadians?
6) What do you NOT like about negotiation in English with other Canadians?

7) How confident do you feel about your ability to negotiate when negotiating in English with other Canadians? Check one box:

- Very high confidence
- High confidence
- Above-average confidence
- Average confidence
- Below-average confidence
- Low confidence
- No confidence or N/A

PART D
Exposure to Intercultural Negotiation:

1) If you have done business negotiations with persons of a different culture in a face-to-face setting, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations?</th>
<th>With what cultural group?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Time for each negotiation</th>
<th>Language used?</th>
<th>Was a translator used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing contracts</td>
<td>Thai battery companies</td>
<td>twice a year</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Only for legal paperwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) If you have done business negotiations with people of another culture by phone, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of negotiations?</th>
<th>With what cultural group?</th>
<th>Frequency?</th>
<th>Time for each negotiation</th>
<th>Language used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>Hong Kong manufacturers</td>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>1 day (6 hours)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you have had intercultural negotiation training before, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of training</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>university seminar</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) What do you like about INTERCULTURAL negotiation?

5) What do you dislike about INTERCULTURAL negotiation?
6) How confident do you feel about your ability to negotiate interculturally when negotiating in English with non-Canadians? Check one box:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very high confidence</th>
<th>High confidence</th>
<th>Above-average confidence</th>
<th>Average confidence</th>
<th>Below-average confidence</th>
<th>Low confidence</th>
<th>No confidence or N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PART E
Factors for Managerial Success:
1) How important do you think the following factors are for selecting the individual best able to succeed overall as an international manager? Rank items from 1 to 11, (where 1=most important).

Please write in other items if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RANK (1 - 11+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language test scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors for Success in Intercultural Negotiation:

2) How important do you think the following items are to success in negotiating with people of other cultures? Rank items from 1 to 8 (1=most important).

Please write in other items if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RANK (1-8+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Background Questionnaire Procedures:

To complete this questionnaire:
- Do NOT write your name on the questionnaire. You will be given a private code that you will use for identification purposes during the study.
- answer ALL the questions for each section.
- if you are unsure of a question, please ask the researcher for explanation.

Participation:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardizing your participation or standing in your program.

If the Cross-Cultural Inventory is completed, it will be assumed that consent has been given.

Time:

There is no time limit. The estimated amount of time required for completion of the background questionnaire is 10-20 minutes.

Returning the Questionnaire:

When you have completed the CCA Inventory, please return it personally to the Co-Investigator, David Karkut, at the Intercultural Training and Resource Center.

Confidentiality:

Any information resulting from this background questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. Participants will not be identified by name. Identification will be only by code number and all related documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Access to data records kept on computer hard disk will require a password.
The purpose of this inventory is to help you assess your ability to adapt to living in another culture and to interact effectively with people of other cultures. Read each statement carefully and choose the response that best describes you right now. Indicate your response by circling the appropriate abbreviation to the right of the statement. For example, if you think a statement "tends to be true" about you, circle TT next to that statement.

Some items may sound very similar. Don't worry about being consistent in your answers. Just choose the answer that best describes you right now.

Use a ball point pen or a pencil to circle your answers (DT TT TNT NT DNT). Press firmly when making your choice. If you decide to change an answer, draw an X through your original answer and then circle your new answer (DT TT TNT NT DNT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>TNT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>DNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have ways to deal with the stresses of new situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that I could live a fulfilling life in another culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I try to understand people's thoughts and feelings when I talk to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel confident in my ability to cope with life, no matter where I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can enjoy relating to all kinds of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe that I can accomplish what I set out to do, even in unfamiliar settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can laugh at myself when I make a cultural faux pas (mistake).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like being with all kinds of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have a realistic perception of how others see me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When I am working with people of a different cultural background, it is important to me to receive their approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I like a number of people who don't share my particular interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe that all people, of whatever race, are equally valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I like to try new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I had to adapt to a slower pace of life, I would become impatient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am the kind of person who gives people who are different from me the benefit of the doubt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If I had to hire several job candidates from a background different from my own, I feel confident that I could make a good judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If my ideas conflicted with those of others who are different from me, I would follow my ideas rather than theirs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I could live anywhere and enjoy life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Impressing people different from me is more important than being myself with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I can perceive how people are feeling, even if they are different from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I make friends easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. When I am around people who are different from me, I feel lonely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I don't enjoy trying new foods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. I believe that all cultures have something worthwhile to offer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel free to maintain my personal values, even among those who do not share them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Even if I failed in a new living situation, I could still like myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am not good at understanding people when they are different from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I pay attention to how people's cultural differences affect their perceptions of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I like new experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I enjoy spending time alone, even in unfamiliar surroundings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I rarely get discouraged, even when I work with people who are very different from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. People who know me would describe me as a person who is intolerant of others' differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I consider the impact my actions have on others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It is difficult for me to approach unfamiliar situations with a positive attitude.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I prefer to decide from my own values, even when those around me have different values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I can cope well with whatever difficult feelings I might experience in a new culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When I meet people who are different from me, I tend to feel judgmental about their differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. When I am with people who are different from me, I interpret their behavior in the context of their culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I can function in situations where things are not clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. When I meet people who are different from me, I am interested in learning more about them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My personal value system is based on my own beliefs, not on conformity to other people's standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I trust my ability to communicate accurately in new situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I enjoy talking with people who think differently than I think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. When I am in a new or strange environment, I keep an open mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I can accept my imperfections, regardless of how others view them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I am the kind of person who gives people who are different from me the benefit of the doubt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I expect that others will respect me, regardless of their cultural background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I can live with the stress of encountering new circumstances or people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. When I meet people who are different from me, I expect to like them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. In talking with people from other cultures, I pay attention to body language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plotting and Interpreting Your CCAI Scores

Comparing your scores on the four CCAI dimensions will help you identify your strengths and weaknesses. The score that is closest to the outer edge of the profile (page 2) indicates your strongest area, and the score that is closest to the center of the profile indicates your weakest area. Although it is interesting to see how your scores compare to other people's scores, it is more important to look at how your scores compare with each other.

To Plot Your Scores:
Copy your total scores from the worksheet on page 4 into the appropriate boxes on page 2. To plot your score for each dimension, put a dot where your score falls and draw an arc through the dot. Then shade in the band that includes your score.

CCAI Scale Dimensions

The CCAI helps you evaluate yourself on four characteristics that are related to cross-cultural effectiveness. These characteristics can be modified through training and experience.

Read the descriptions of the four CCAI dimensions below. This information will help you understand your results.

Emotional Resilience (ER):
Being among people from another culture can be frustrating, confusing, and lonely. In these situations, it is important to be able to maintain a positive attitude, to tolerate strong emotions, and to cope with ambiguity and stress. It is also helpful to be able to maintain one's self-esteem and self-confidence. Other characteristics associated with emotional resilience include confidence in one's ability to cope with the unfamiliar and to react positively to new experiences. This can require courage, risk taking, and a sense of adventure.

Flexibility/Openness (FO):
Adapting to different ways of thinking and acting requires an ability to be open to ideas that are different from one's own and to people who are different from oneself. These characteristics are also helpful in developing relationships with people who are different from oneself. Tolerance, lack of rigidity, and a liking for and comfort with all kinds of people are also features of a person who is strong in this dimension.

Perceptual Acuity (PAC):
Unfamiliar language—verbal or nonverbal—makes communication more difficult. Perceptual sensitivity is the key to successfully meeting this challenge. Perceptual acuity is associated with attentiveness to interpersonal relations and to verbal and nonverbal behavior. It also involves paying attention to the context of the communication, being able to read people's emotions, being sensitive to one's effect on others, and communicating accurately. In addition, a person who scores high on this dimension is able to interpret information objectively.

Personal Autonomy (PA):
When one encounters people whose values and beliefs are different from one's own, self-knowledge is important. The main characteristic associated with personal autonomy is a strong sense of identity. Personal autonomy also includes the ability to maintain one's own personal values and beliefs, to take responsibility for one's actions, and to respect oneself and others. People with high personal autonomy feel empowered. They know how to make and act on their own decisions while respecting the decisions of others.
APPENDIX D
Negotiation Simulation: Instructions
COVECO & SILVERSTAR

COMMON FACTS

Coveco, a large Canadian company involved in sales of general merchandise with specialty lines in electronics has been contacted by Silverstar, a Korean conglomerate with over 30 subsidiaries.

Silverstar has developed a patented computer-based sales register ("Units") which reduces the personnel required, deletes much of the paper flow and provides daily (as well as hourly) financial breakdowns of all sales from as many as 250 outlets (that is, stores or departments).

Silverstar has produced an independent report from a Japanese consulting firm that indicates that North American merchandising outlets with over 15 outlets could reduce overhead costs by between 15% and 18%.

Silverstar has communicated to Coveco that it is prepared to sell the Units to Coveco but the transaction must be accompanied with a maintenance contract. Silverstar has also contacted two other large Canadian stores, Beacons, and Besears, but is prepared to consider an exclusive arrangement with Coveco, subject to an exclusivity fee.

The parties have agreed to meet in Vancouver in June to attempt to:

(a) negotiate the sale of the Units;

(b) discuss an exclusive contract and the fee; and

(c) negotiate a maintenance contract for the Units sold.
CONFIDENTIAL FACTS: COVECO

Coveco has done an independent study and while the Japanese figures are somewhat inflated there is no question that Coveco could save approximately 10% on its overhead if it installed the units in its 110 store. Coveco would very much like to purchase the Units and get them on an exclusive basis which would give them a very competitive edge over Beacons and Besears across Canada.

The negotiating team has formulated the following preliminary negotiating plan:

1. Independent research indicates that the cost of a Unit is somewhere between $5,000 and $6,000 and therefore, to purchase a Unit should cost approximately $10,000 to $13,000. The team hopes to get each Unit for less than $10,000 but no more than $13,500.

2. The exclusivity fee arrangement is very important to Coveco and they have decided to offer between $100,000 and $950,000 per year for a ten year period. The longer the period, the more money they feel they can pay.

3. The maintenance contract, while important, is not a high priority matter for Coveco. If the maintenance contract per Unit per year was under $1,5000, the independent studies done by Coveco indicate it would be worth securing.

The Coveco negotiators have been given the discretion to increase one price if they can decrease another and not turn down any deal that may be outside their financial range if it was within 20% of the maximum amount in the range.

In addition, Coveco has been given the flexibility of creating value in any they may deem appropriate in the circumstances.

Finally, Coveco’s research has indicated that a competitor of Silverstar - a Japanese company called Hico - is developing a similar unit, but it may not be available for two to three years.
CONFIDENTIAL FACTS: SILVERSTAR

The negotiating team for Silverstar has formulated the following preliminary negotiating plan:

1. They will endeavor to sell each Unit for no less than between $15,000 and preferably $25,000, or somewhere in between.

2. The Units cost Silverstar $4,500 per unit to produce.

3. The competitive advantage that Coveco would secure by an exclusivity arrangement to be a valuable asset for them and the negotiating team hopes to secure $1 to $1.5 million for exclusivity payable each year for a period of five to ten years.

4. However, Silverstar’s overtures to Beacons and Besears have not met with a lot of success for reasons that are not entirely clear to the negotiators for Silverstar; thus, the exclusivity concept which could be very important to Coveco may not provide the leverage the Silverstar desires to secure a large amount of money.

5. Silverstar is also concerned that Coveco may secretly talk to Beacons and Besears and find out that the exclusivity is not as valuable as represented.

6. The negotiating team wants the maintenance contract to run for five years but preferably ten or more. The range of the value of the maintenance contract has been set at $2,000 per Unit to $4,000 per Unit per year (the best estimate of the maintenance costs per year is $1,250 per Unit.

7. The Silverstar negotiating team has determined that they could sell the Units on a reducing cost basis providing the number of Units is in excess of 100.

8. The Silverstar negotiators have been given unlimited authority to negotiate the best transaction available in the circumstances.
APPENDIX E
Negotiating Ranges of Each Side
Negotiation Target Ranges A
Cost per Unit

(C) Coveco  
(K) Silverstar

Negotiation Target Ranges B
Exclusivity Fee per Year

(C) Coveco  
(K) Silverstar
Negotiation Target Ranges C
Maintenance Contract

(C) Coveco

(K) Silverstar
APPENDIX F
Post-Negotiation Questionnaire
Post-Negotiation Satisfaction Questionnaire

Respond to the following statements by circling one number on the scale on the right side.

**EXAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I was nervous during the negotiation.</th>
<th>1\ldots\ldots 2\ldots\ldots 3\ldots\ldots 4\ldots\ldots 5\ldots\ldots 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEGOTIATION DECISION**

1. At the end of the negotiation, we: (circle one)
   - a) Did not reach an agreement. (GO TO NEXT SECTION, #1)
   - b) Reached a partial agreement.
   - c) Reached an agreement on all 3 points.

2. If you reached an agreement on the *Silverstar Units*, please describe the:
   - a) Price per Unit:
   - b) Number of units to be purchased:

3. If you reached an agreement on the *Exclusivity Contract*, please describe the:
   - a) Fee per year:
   - b) Number of years agreed upon:

4. If you reached an agreement on the *Maintenance Contract*, please describe:
   - a) Fee per year per Unit:
   - b) Number of years covered:

1. With someone from my own country, we would have reached a different agreement.
   
   | 1\ldots\ldots 2\ldots\ldots 3\ldots\ldots 4\ldots\ldots 5\ldots\ldots 6 |
   | Disagree strongly | Agree strongly |

2. We were not compatible as negotiators.
   
   | 1\ldots\ldots 2\ldots\ldots 3\ldots\ldots 4\ldots\ldots 5\ldots\ldots 6 |
   | Disagree strongly | Agree strongly |
3. The other side's attempts to fulfill their negotiation goals created negative feelings on my part.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The other side would not be very pleased to negotiate with my side again in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The other side showed correct politeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The other side was not properly prepared for this negotiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The other side was not patient with my side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The other side was flexible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The other side was empathetic to my situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The other side was effective at explaining their position to my side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The other side did not treat me with the proper respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The other side is pleased with the final deal they got.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The other side did not understand what I was talking about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The other side did not feel that they could trust me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The other side did not change the way they spoke so that I would understand better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The other side did not adapt their negotiating behavior to match my side.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The other side appeared to be more experienced in negotiation than my side.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The other side acted professionally.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The final decision was equally good for both sides.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Nothing the other side did offended me in any way.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My attempts to fulfill my negotiation goals created negative feelings on their part.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Miscommunications were a problem in our negotiation.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It was easy for me to understand the other side’s spoken English.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It was difficult for the other side to understand my spoken English.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I’m pleased with the final deal I got.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I would be very pleased to negotiate with the other side again in the future.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I was not properly prepared for this negotiation.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I was not properly patient with the other side.</td>
<td>1...</td>
<td>2...</td>
<td>3...</td>
<td>4...</td>
<td>5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I was perfectly polite in this negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I was flexible in this negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I was effective at explaining my position to the other side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I showed that I was empathetic to the other side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I did not treat the other side with the proper respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I felt that I could trust the other side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I did not understand what the other side was taking about during the negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I did not change the way I spoke to be better understood by the other side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I did not adapt my negotiating behavior to match the other side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am pleased with the way I negotiated during the exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am not pleased with the way the other side negotiated during the exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I acted professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The final end-agreement favored my side more than the other side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIMULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If this had been a real negotiation, I would have behaved differently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The tape-recording done during this negotiation made me feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I improved my knowledge of negotiating with another culture because of this exercise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Given the limitations of this negotiation (time, information, etc.), the decision we reached was the best we could do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
Participant's Opponent's Satisfaction (POS) Formula
POS = sum of:

a) Likert scores of PNO questions # 5, 8, 9, 10, 18, 20, 23, 34, 41

b) (7 - Likert score) for negative PNO questions # 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 24, 35

c) (2 * Likert score) for Core PNO Questions # 25, 26

d) (2 * (7 - Likert score)) for Core PNO Questions # 22, 39

Targeting: Behaviour (B), Communication (C), and Negotiation (N)

5 politeness B,
8 flexibility B,
9 empathy B,
10 effective at sending information C,
18 professionalism B,
20 manners B,
23 listening comprehension C,
34 deemed trustworthy B,
41 opponent’s positive feeling (end) N

2 compatibility B,
3 opponent’s positive feeling (process) N,
6 preparedness B,
7 patience B,
11 perceived as respectful B,
13 effective at receiving information C,
14 seemed to show trust B,
15 speech accommodation C,
16 behaviour accommodation B,
24 listening comprehension C,
35 comprehensibility C

25 final deal satisfaction N,
26 willingness to do future business with this opponent N
22 miscommunications C,
39 overall opinion N/B/C
APPENDIX I
Informed Consent Forms
I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardizing my participation in the ITRC program.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

I consent to participate in this study.

Subject Signature Date

Signature of a Witness Date
APPENDIX J
MBA Participant Recruitment Letter
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