Intercultural Communication in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry:

A Study of Message Design Logic Across Two Cultures

by

Rachelle Ng

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelors of Science

In

Hotel Administration

In the

SC Johnson College of Business

Of

Cornell University

Committee in charge:

Professor Andrew Quagliata, Thesis Advisor

Fall 2017

Intercultural Communication in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry:

A Study of Message Design Logic Across Two Cultures

By

Rachelle Ng

The thesis of Rachelle Ng is approved by:

_____

Thesis Committee Chair   Date

_____

Research Committee Chair   Date

Cornell University

December 2017

ABSTRACT

Intercultural Communication in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry:

A Study of Message Design Logic Across Two Cultures

By

Rachelle Ng

Bachelors of Science

Cornell University

This research explores the relationship between cultural background and communication to increase understanding of intercultural workplaces in the hospitality and tourism industry. Questionnaires were given to industry workers in the United States and Singapore to survey their communication styles and communication preferences. This study reveals that industry workers in the United States and in Singapore differed in the messages they sent but shared similar perception of messages. Results also show a modification in communication strategies used by the Singaporean group when the message recipient's power status changed from a supervisor to subordinate while the American group remained consistent. The research identifies benefits of offering training focused on communication differences between cultures to better equip and prepare workers in the hospitality and tourism industry for intercultural interactions in the workplace.

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

Rachelle Ng, SC Johnson College of Business Class of 2018, aspires to be a global-minded professional who brings positivity and creativity to the workplace. She majors in Hotel Administration and minors in Information Science and Real Estate.

Rachelle has always been fascinated by culture. Born in Hong Kong, Rachelle was exposed to a variety of cultures and enjoyed traveling growing up. While in high school, Rachelle led the Global Issues Network (GIN), a group focused on addressing international social and environmental challenges. Through these exchanges, she learned to appreciate the beautiful scenery and people from different countries. To end her high school journey, she chaired the GIN852 Conference, which marked one of her proudest moments.

At Cornell, Rachelle has participated in several organizations. She served as the Vice President of External Affairs in Forte Campus at Cornell and the Co-President in Hospitality Students International. She was inducted into the Ye Hosts Honorary Society in Fall 2016, giving her the opportunity to begin her research in the Latin Honors Program. Rachelle was also involved in Asian American InterVarsity, a Christian fellowship that aims to share the incredible life and love found in Christ on Cornell campus.

Rachelle has work experience in Hong Kong and in New York City. In Hong Kong, she interned at the JW Marriott Hotel Hong Kong and Klook travel tech start up. She then explored her interests in consulting as a Summer Analyst at Accenture. Upon graduation, she will return to Accenture's New York City office as a Strategy Analyst, excited to contribute her ideas and enthusiasm to the business world.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to

Professor Andrew Quagliata, my family, and God,

who continue to inspire and encourage me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTET

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The hospitality and tourism industry is known for its culturally diverse workplaces and companies. Unfortunately, research has shown a lack of proper training for industry managers to overcome the many challenges of communication in intercultural settings (Dewald & Self, 2008). Research suggests that individuals from different cultures place varying levels of emphasis on context (Edwards, 1977) and apply different conflict management styles (Ting-Toomey, 1985). However, the observable expression of these factors in communicative messages has not studied. Little research has sought to understand the fundamental ways in which individuals from different cultures reason communication. The theory of message design logic offers such a tool to measure the default strategy of communication employed by an individual (O'Keefe, 1988). This thesis examines intercultural communication in the hospitality and tourism industry by using the theory of message of design logic to compare industry workers in the United States and Singapore.

To begin, the study investigates the possible relationship that exists between cultural background and communication style. Building on this initial investigation, this thesis uses the theory of message design logic to identify unique communication tendencies and message preferences across cultures. This research also discusses patterns displayed by workers from each culture in how individuals send and modify messages based on the situational context.

The purpose of this thesis is to inform future industry training through understanding the implications of cultural differences in communication. Knowledge about the relationship between cultural background and communication could increase workers' sensitivity when interacting with individuals from another culture (Rozkwitalska, 2017). This information could

help workers, such as hospitality managers, to adapt and better convey messages based on the situational and cultural context of communication. Training workers to recognize communication styles mismatches, which can be attributed to cultural differences, could reduce the risk of cultural clash (Reynolds et al., 2014; Baum et al., 2007). Increased empathy and insight drive intercultural workplaces to become more harmonious, allowing companies to leverage the benefits of cultural diversity (Lauring & Selmer, 2011).

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 reviews existing literature on the study's topic then presents the hypotheses and research questions. Chapter 3 details the research method applied, explaining the procedures, participants, and measures used. Next, Chapter 4 provides the results and Chapter 5 discusses these results, sharing their implications, limitations, and ideas for future research. Finally, Chapter 6 concludes the thesis with the summary.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Culture

The word "culture" first emerged in the late eighteenth century. Contemporaries of the time, including German grammarian and philologist Johann Christoph Adelung, used culture to describe stages of development in a civilization (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). Later on, Victorian anthropologist Edward Tylor (1871) applied the term differently and explained culture as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (Tylor, 1871, p.1). Tylor thought that all humanity shared a universal culture. His idea formed the basis of anthropology, the study of learned attributes of human society.

The modern interpretation of culture came from the American anthropologist Franz Boas (1896), who immigrated from Germany and experienced dissimilarities between countries. Boas challenged Tylor's presentation of one culture and highlighted the uniqueness of each culture exhibited by various groups of people. He introduced plurality into culture (Stocking, 1996). Furthermore, he established the ideology of cultural determinism and built the framework of studying culture as a factor which could influence the behavior of a people group.

Cross-Culture Studies

Cross-cultural studies take collective groups, such as tribes, societies, or organizations, to test hypotheses about the nature of each unit (Naroll, 1961). Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory, developed by Dutch social psychologist Geert Hofstede (1980), has grown to be the most widely known cross-cultural analysis model. The theory studies cultural differences through nation-level dimensions, defined as "an aspect of a culture that can be measured relative to other

cultures" (Hofstede, 2011, p.7). External validations confirmed the cultural dimensions described by the theory and Hofstede (2001) cited over 400 significant correlations between the theory and other studies. The four original dimensions of culture, first published in the book *Culture's Consequences* (Hofstede, 1980), were expanded to six dimensions, including research data from the World Values Survey (Minkov, 2007). The revised theory proposes the following six cultural dimensions: Power Distance Index, Uncertainty Avoidance Index, Individualism Versus Collectivism, Masculinity Versus Femininity, Long-Term Orientation, and Indulgence Versus Resistance.

Intercultural Interactions in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry

Globalization has resulted in an increase in the number of multinational corporations, thus increasing intercultural interactions within companies. The hospitality and tourism industry has a long-standing history of culturally diverse workforces (Baum et al., 1994). Two important types of intercultural relationships exist in the hospitality and tourism industry. First, the industry demands migrant workers to meet the unstable and fluctuating labor needs stemming from its seasonal and cyclical nature (Joppe, 2012). Second, international hospitality firms commonly practice deploying expatriate mangers to operate overseas investments. Expatriate mangers are frequently sent abroad to improve coordination of local operations with corporate headquarters and to facilitate knowledge transfer across global borders (Ozdemir & Cizel, 2007).

Due to the unique context and challenges of multicultural workplaces, companies should be cautioned against simply transferring traditional management principles used in local settings (Erez & Shokef, 2008). Employees need to acquire distinct skills to interpret behaviors from another culture and react according to the appropriate cultural expectations (Rozkwitalska,

2017). Research has found benefits of cultural diversity in knowledge sharing (Lauring &

Selmer, 2011). However, other findings identified various negative outcomes of multicultural

workplaces. For example, culturally diverse teams experience more conflict and less social

integration (Stahl et al., 2010). Although multinational hospitality corporations have established

cross-cultural training (Marriott, 2014; Hilton Worldwide, 2014; Starwood, 2014), most

managers still are unsure of how to address intercultural relationship building (Reynolds et al.,

2014). In addition, migrant workers feel underappreciated (Baum et al., 2007) and expatriate

mangers function at low level of effectiveness and experience failure due to lack of preparation

(Dewald & Self, 2008).

The need for understanding intercultural workplaces, notably in the hospitality and

tourism industry, is critical. The fundamental differences between societies proposed by cross-

cultural studies provide the framework of understanding intercultural relationships. Nevertheless,

there is limited scholarship dedicated to improving intercultural workplace interactions in this

industry (Shore et al., 2009). Further research could inform training programs and preparation of

employees, mitigating difficulties experienced in intercultural workplaces in hospitality.

Role of Communication

Communication acts as a vital part in intercultural interactions. One of the pioneering

works to understand intercultural communication came from Edward Hall (1976), who made the

distinction between high-context culture and low-context culture. Hall (1976) wrote:

A high-context communication or message is one in which most of information is either

in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded,

explicit part of the message. A low-context communication is just the opposite, i.e., the

mass of information is vested in the explicit code. (p.91)

Hall (1976) used Japan as a classic example of a high-context culture, in which members

value collective needs and assume a we-identity. On the other hand, he cited that the United

States as a low-context culture, in which members believe in assertiveness and assume an i-

identity.

Building upon Hall's theory, Stella Ting-Toomey (1985) introduced the face-negotiation

theory. The theory explains conflict resolution styles among different cultures by examining the

idea of "face," which represents a person's protected self-image. Ting-Toomey (1988) theorized

that a person's culture leads to a type of face maintenance, which results in a type of conflict

management. Individuals from high-context cultures tend to focus on face-giving, protecting the

other person's reputation and striving for inclusion; individuals from low-context cultures tend to

employ face-restoration, defending self-face concerns and signaling the need for autonomy

(Ting-Toomey, 1988). As a result, people from high-context cultures are likely to employ

obliging, compromising, and avoiding conflict management styles (Ting-Toomey, 1988).

Contrarily, people from low-context cultures prefer integrating and dominating conflict

management styles (Ting-Toomey, 1988).

Findings from subsequent research support the theory and show that people from certain

cultures indeed exhibit a tendency to use the predicted conflict management styles (Trubisky et

al., 1991; Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Holtgraves et al., 1997). Thus, the face-negotiation

theory serves as a useful tool to navigate intercultural workplace settings and equip workers for

early conflict intervention (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

These theories present valuable insights in understanding cultural blind spots and differences observed in the multicultural workplaces. However, they do not address the observable elements of speech and communication. First, context stresses the interpretation of communication more than the expression (Hall, 1977). For example, the high- and low-context theory indicates that even when speech is the same, the interpretation and underlying meaning can differ. Furthermore, the theory's purpose is to provide a board cultural-level analysis, not an individual-level understanding of each member in the society.

Face negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey, 1985) addresses individual-level comparison of conflict management, seeking to understand actions. Items on the research instruments are framed to measure overall approach, such as "I would blame myself for whatever the problem is," "I would order my classmates to comply with my request," and "I would defend my action" (Cocroft and Ting-Toomey, 1994, p.488-489). The research provides the foundation for inferring communication employed by individuals but does not directly measure communication. For example, "ordering" and "defending" can be expressed in dissimilar ways and tones depending on the speaker. To further understand the role of communication in intercultural workplaces, the consideration of a theory which primarily focuses on expressed communication and allows for the analysis of manifested speech is necessary. The theory of message design logic fulfills this criterion.

Messages Design Logic

The theory of message design logic (O'Keefe, 1988) is a model which analyzes individuals' communication based on their premises of reasoning communication. A person's message design logic affects the construction of communication in attaining desired goals and

completing functional tasks. The three message design logics are expressive, conventional, and rhetorical design logics.

Expressive design logic is grounded on the principle that "language is a medium for expressing thoughts and feelings" (O'Keefe, 1988, p.85). Expressive communicators value openness and honesty in expression. Expressive messages are reactionary to prior events and pay little attention to context. Individuals employing the expressive design logic interpret communication literally and subjectively.

Conventional design logic is based on the premise that "communication is a game played cooperatively by social rules" (O'Keefe, 1988, p.86). Conventional communicators value appropriateness and politeness in communication. Conventional messages center around the present context, with the goal to bring about action. Individuals employing the conventional design logic frame communication with regards to relationships between people and respond in a socially obligatory manner.

Rhetorical design logic is built upon the idea that "communication is the creation and negotiation of social selves and situations" (O'Keefe, 1988, p.87). Rhetorical communicators value flexibility and symbolic depth in communication. Rhetorical messages redefine the context to achieve social consensus. Individuals employing the rhetorical design logic inject individualized interpretations into communication.

Various scholars have applied and used message design logic in communication studies, validating message design logic as a way to classify individuals 'communication. Many studies explored the relationships of message design logic and other factors such as worldviews (Edwards & Shepherd, 2004), complaint strategies (Bonito & Wolski, 2002), and interpersonal

motives (Hullman, 2004), In terms of organizational contexts and professional interactions, research has used the theory of message design logic in studying performance feedback (Peterson & Albrecht, 1996) and career satisfaction (Quagliata, 2012). Yet, no prior research has sought to understand how the theory of message design logic can inform intercultural communication in the workplace.

In fact, one major criticism of this theory is its lack of importance placed on culture. Joy Hart (2002) called for the development of message design logic to consider the influence of cultural upbringing. She wrote, "Just as 'beauty is in the eye of the beholder,' what is regarded as competent communication may be in the judgments of the message evaluator – and as message design logics vary, so may such judgments" (Hart, 2002, p.118). The theory of message design logic has not sufficiently addressed the influence of culture on communication. Differences in message preferences and message selection strategies across cultural groups need to be researched and analyzed.

Shortly after Joy's publication, one study (Cortes et al., 2005) compared the message design logic employed by students in Mexico and in the United States. University students were asked to respond to two hypothetical situations and their responses were coded. The study approached statistical significance between cultural background and message design logic ($\chi2=$ 5.78, p = 0.06). The study indicated that culture and socialization are important considerations in how individuals employ message design logic. Nonetheless, there has been no additional research on the topic beyond this initial investigation of message design logic's intersection with culture.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

This present study responds to both the lack of knowledge about culture's impact on message design logic and the need to improve intercultural workplaces in the hospitality and tourism industry. Message design logic is well tested in communication research; however, the application of this theory to solve problems existing in intercultural workplaces has not been researched. This study seeks to discover unique insights about how hospitality and tourism workers from different cultures send and perceive messages using the theory of message design logic.

This study surveys individuals from two specific cultures – Singapore and the United States. These two countries were chosen to represent comparisons between the East and the West. United States is picked because the largest and most influential multinational hotel chains are founded in and have headquarters in the United States. Also, most literature on message design logic have involved participants form the United States. Singapore is particularly attractive as a country to study because it is an Asian country with English as one of its official languages. The elimination of language barrier and of translation discrepancy helps reduce potential confounding factors in the results.

Research has shown the fundamental cultural differences between the United States and Singapore. Based on Hofstede's six cultural dimensions, the two countries' scores vary dramatically. For example, Singapore shows a much higher tolerance for ambiguity and United States emphasizes normative standards in the present. The profile of the United States compared to Singapore is found in Table 1. Since an individual's message design logic is based on his or her beliefs about communication, the following hypothesis is formed:

H1: The message design logic employed by Singaporean and American workers in the hospitality and tourism industry will differ as a function of their cultural backgrounds.

The message design logic associated with a specific cultural background can be predicted from existing analysis of each culture. For example, Singapore is categorized as a high-context culture (Hall 1976) and individuals who employ the rhetorical design logic rely heavily on context to infer the speaker's intention (O'Keefe 1988).

On the other hand, United States is more individualistic than Singapore. The mentality of members in individualist societies to prioritize themselves suggests that they are inclined to use language as a medium to express personal feelings. Individualistic communicators are more likely to have identity-based definitions of family, which sees the blood-related relationships of member as the unifying bond (Edwards & Graham, 2009). Individuals with expressive design logic scored the lowest among the three message design logics in past helpfulness and civic participation (Edwards & Shepherd, 2007). They overlook the context of situation when trying to achieve their goals and desires. Based on this understanding, the second hypothesis and third hypothesis are postulated:

H2: Hospitality and tourism workers from Singapore will be more likely to employ the rhetorical design logic than those from the United States.

H3: Hospitality and tourism workers from the United States will be more likely to employ the expressive design logic than those from Singapore.

The first research question investigates how a person's culture affects the modification of message design logic employed when varying the situational context. Based on O'Keefe's original theory (1988), an individual's understanding of communication, thus message design

11

logic, should remain consistent regardless of the environment. This assumption has been questioned in a recent study published by Fernandez (2017). In her study, participants employed inconsistent message design logics in response to two hypothetical conflict situations, one from the perspective of a superior and the other of a subordinate. This result contradicted the assumed consistency of message design logic across situational factors.

In the workplace, one important situational variation in communication to be considered is an employee's relative power position in the organizational structure. Singapore scored 34 points higher than the United States on the Power Distance Index (PDI), a cultural dimension that measures the extent to which inequality in organizations and institutions is accepted and expected by a society. This variation in PDI provides an interesting opportunity to further test Fernandez's findings in this cross-cultural study. Consequently, the following research question is developed:

RQ1: Do workers in hospitality and tourism industry in the United States and Singapore employ the same message design logic when communicating to subordinates as when communicating to superiors?

In addition to understanding how culture affect messages senders' design logics, this study seeks to investigate culture's impact on the message receivers' preferences. O'Keefe (1988) proposed a hierarchy of sophistication for the three design logics, with expressive design logic at the bottom and rhetorical design logic on the top. Ample research has tested and validated this order. Among undergraduate students, rhetorical communicators were rated as more attractive and effective than conventional and expressive communicators (O'Keefe & McCornack, 1987). Rhetorical communicators reported significantly greater satisfaction with

their support systems than did expressive and conventional communicators (Edwards et al., 2008). In HIV disclosures, messages with expressive logic design received the lowest quality rating and those with rhetorical logic design were rated the highest (Caughlin et al., 2008). Patients' perceptions of pharmacists' effectiveness and attractiveness increased as the message producers went from employing the expressive to rhetorical design logic (Lambert & Gillespie, 1994).

Nevertheless, this hierarchy of message design logic has not been examined extensively in other cultures. In Andrada's study (2013), college students in the Philippines were investigated to aid the negotiations between ethnic groups within the country. The study discovered a significant relationship between the students' preferred message design logic and their ethnic backgrounds. The order of preferences matched O'Keefe's hierarchy of messages. The study was particularly interested in the subcultural differences within the Filipino culture exhibited by different ethnic groups, instead of the overall national culture. Hence, the final research question, adapted from Andarda's study, is put forth to deepen understanding of message design logic preferences across cultures:

RQ2: Do workers in hospitality and tourism industry in the United States and Singapore have similar preferences for the type of design logic messages they receive?

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

This study examined the relationship between culture and communication. The study measured how members in the hospitality and tourism industry from Singapore and from the United States constructed and perceived message qualities based on O'Keefe's theory of message design logic (1988). The study also sought to discover whether the preferred message design logic differed based on the power status of the message sender in each culture.

Procedures

This study collected 192 completed responses to a survey questionnaire (see Appendix A) through a market research company dataSpring. Headquartered in Japan, dataSpring provides online samples, survey software tools, and data collection operations to clients globally. For this study, dataSpring recruited panelists through online advertising on local websites such as search engines, social networks, and online shopping sites. Upon clicking on an advertising link or having been invited to join, potential panelists completed pre-registration by agreeing to the company's Member Terms and completing basic profile information. Next, dataSpring sent confirmation emails to potential new panelists and provided access the final registration URL, which allowed for more detailed profiling information and blocked out all invalid addresses. To be eligible for this study, participants must currently work in the hospitality and tourism industry, be older than 30 years old, and have either Singapore or United States as their country of origin.

Participants were compensated through accumulated panel points, which can be exchanged for cash or various country-specific gifts. Before entering the survey, respondents provided consent to participate in the survey. The survey was hosted on Qualtrics, a secured website to ensure confidentiality. No personally identifiable information was collected in the

survey and results remained anonymous. Of the total sample, 15 respondents failed to show proper understanding of the prompt and their responses were not used for data analysis.

Participants

The final sample (N = 177) included 93 (52.4%) women and 84 (47.6%) men between the ages of 30 and 63 years (M = 41, SD = 8.04). All participants responded that they work as full-time employees (employed on average at least 30 hours of service per week) in the hospitality and tourism industry. Of the 177 participants, 79 participants (44.6%) identified as Asians or Pacific Islanders and 78 participants (44.1%) identified as Caucasians. The largest number of respondents held a Bachelor's degree (40.1%), followed by high school degree or less (27.1%), 2-year college (17.5%), and Master-level or higher (15.3%).

Cultural background was an important aspect of this study. To be counted as possessing a specific cultural background, each participant must be born in his or her current country of residence and must have lived there for his or her entire life. With this definition, 81 participants (45.8%) were categorized in the Singapore group and 96 participants (54.2%) were categorized in the United States group.

Measures

The research instrument, the questionnaire (see Appendix A), comprised of three parts. Participants gave consent in the first section and answered questions that determined whether they fulfilled the research criterions. The second part presented two hypothetical scenarios to which participants produced two responses that were coded for message design logic. The third part collected the participants' perception of messages based on a combined scale to measure likability, conversational appropriateness, and effectiveness.

Message design logic. The study assessed the message design logic of each participant with two modified version of O'Keefe's (1988) "Ron-Test" (Quagliata, 2012). Both scenarios were adapted to the workplace context, instead of the original design for college students. In the first scenario, participants were asked to write out a response to a situation in which Ron, a subordinate, did not complete his assigned task and caused problems for the team. This scenario examined the traditional setting of message design logic, speaking to a message receiver in an inferior position. The second scenario called the "Jake-Test", which was developed for this study to understand the subordinate-superior communication style, asked participants to respond to a scenario in which Jake, a supervisor unable to provide support, claimed to be unhappy with the participant's job performance. This scenario observed the participants' message design logic when responding to a supervisor.

Two coders independently coded each message based on a coding tree (see Appendix B) that was revised based on modifications proposed by Quagliata (2012). The coding tree classified each message as 1 = expressive, 2 = conventional, or 3 = rhetorical. The coders agreed in 91.0% of the cases, yielding an overall intercoder reliability coefficient of 0.85 (Cohen, 1960). Coders reviewed disagreements and collaboratively arrived at consensus to produce the final results.

Likability. Likability measured the message sender's likability to the message receiver. The Wayne and Ferris (1990) scale was developed to understand impression management in workplace settings and thus suitable for this study. The questionnaire asked respondents to rate a series of messages. These messages came from Dan, a hypothetical message sender who was responding to his subordinate Ron in the Ron-Test scenario. The questionnaire included three items from the scale: (a) "I think Dan would make a good friend", (b) "I dislike Dan" (reverse-

coded), and (c) "I think I will get along with Dan." Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

Conversation Appropriateness and Effectiveness. Effectiveness in communication evaluated whether the message sender accomplished the preferred outcomes (Spitzberg, 2003). Appropriateness evaluated the extent to which the message sender met expected societal standards in an interpersonal context (Spitzberg, 2003). Like the likability measure, respondents rated a series of messages from the hypothetical supervisor Dan. Six items from the Canary and Spitzberg (1987) scale were used in this study to measure conversation appropriateness and effectiveness: (a) "Dan is an ineffective conversationalist" (reverse code), (b) "Everything Dan said is appropriate", (c) "Dan's statement is rewarding", (d) "I am comfortable with Dan's remark", (e) "Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark", and (f) "Dan said some things that should not have been said" (reserve code). Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The first part of the results used O'Keefe's message design logics (1988) to code messages. Then, the data were analyzed with the chi-square test of independence, z-test difference between two proportions, and the McNemar-Bowker test. The second part converted the Likert scale rating of each message design logic to a numerical score. The results were analyzed with two-sample z-test of two means.

Expressive Design Logic

Expressive messages fail to move towards accomplishing the task. Expressive communicators insert hurtful comments or non-contingent threats (example 1) and focus on past events (example 2).

Example 1: "You are disrespectful and don't deserve to work with us."

Example 2: "Jake, the problem is many. I received this task with minimum direction. I asked for guidance and you seemed to take my request lightly. I think I am an intelligent person who is not asking for hand holding. Just for some of your knowledge."

Conventional Design Logic

Conventional messages move towards accomplishing the task without seeking consensus with the message receiver. In the Ron-Test scenario, conventional communicators offer assistance or time extension but only in a scripted and obligatory manner (example 1). In the Jake-Test, they request help in a standard and task-focused way (example 2).

Example 1: "Ron, how much more time do you need? Your performance was disappointing. This is the last chance I am going to give you. I will give you one more week."

Example 2: "Sir, I really do not know what you would like me to do, if it is possible, could you be more patient and explain. I'm sorry, but I did not get properly get introduced to this job."

Rhetorical Message Logic

Rhetorical messages move towards accomplishing the task by collaboratively working with the message receiver towards a solution. In the Ron-Test scenario, besides extending support, rhetorical communicators explore, legitimate, and elaborate on the other person's emotions (example 1). In the Jake-Test scenario, when asking for help, they redefine the question and acknowledge Jake's feelings (example 2).

Example 1: "Ron, I understand you are a great contributor and Achiever in the past! I understand there's some issue in family lately, and I'm concerned you haven't been yourself lately missing meetings and not keeping pace with deliverables! I need you to focus as the deadline is next week and it is crucial for us to retain our client! So if you need help on this I can ask someone to work together with you to get this done with! After that if you still need help or timeout to resolve other family we can talk more about it. How's that sound?"

Example 2: "Jake, while I appreciate your faith in me to accomplish things on my own, I need more information about the tasks you want me to complete. Could we schedule a meeting to go over the questions I have and exactly what you want from me and your expectations of me?"

Relationship between Culture and Message Design Logic as Senders

Table 2 is a two-by-three table of the distribution for the three message design logics across the Singapore group and United States group in the Ron-Test scenario. Among the 96 participants from the United States, the expressive design logic was the most observed, followed by the conventional design logic, and the rhetorical design logic, with 46 (47.9%), 38 (39.6%) and 12 (12.5%) participants respectively. Among the 81 participants from Singapore, participants were most likely to apply the conventional design logic, then the rhetorical design logic, and lastly the expressive design logic, with 38 (46.9%), 24 (29.6%), and 19 participants (23.5%).

Table 3 is a two-by-three table of the distribution for the three message design logics across the Singapore group and United States group in the Jake-Test scenario. In the United States group, 46 participants (47.9%) employed the expressive design logic, 37 participants (38.6%) employed the conventional design logic, and 13 participants (13.5%) employed the rhetorical design logic. For Singapore participants, the distribution was 43 participants (53.1%) employing the conventional design logic, 30 participants (37.0%) employing the expressive design logic, and 8 participants (9.9%) employing the rhetorical design logic.

A chi-square test of independence was used to compare the frequency of message design logics in Singapore and U.S.A in the Ron-Test scenario. A significant interaction was found (χ^2= 14.0, df =2, $p < 0.05$). There was a significant difference between the message design logic strategies employed by hospitality workers in the United States and Singapore in the Ron-Test. Hypothesis 1 was supported.

A separate chi-test of independence was calculated to compare the frequency of message design logics for the Jake-Test scenario. No significant relationship was found ($\chi^2 = 3.76$, df =2,

$p < 0.05$). Participants from the two countries did not appear to differ significantly in their communication approaches in the Jake-Test.

Culture and Preferred Message Design Logic as Senders

To understand how participants in the Ron-Test scenario differed in their message design logics, the proportions of participants who employed a certain type of message design logic were compared between the Singaporean and American groups. An independent-samples z test was used to compare the proportion of two independent groups. Table 4 shows the results from the two-proportion z test. The proportion of United States participants with the expressive design logic was significantly higher. The difference ($\hat{p} = 0.37$) was found to be significant ($z = 3.36$, $p < 0.05$). Moreover, the proportion of Singapore participants with the rhetorical design logic was significantly higher. The difference ($\hat{p} = 0.20$) was found to be significant ($z = 2.82$, $p < 0.05$). No significant difference was found ($z = 0.98$, $p > 0.05$) between the two proportion of participants who used the conventional design. Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 were supported.

Relationship between Gender, Education, and Message Design Logic as Senders

To understand other possible variables influencing the participants' message design logics, two additional chi-tests of independence were conducted. Table 5 shows the frequency of message design logics employed categorized by gender and Table 6 displays the frequency of message design logics employed categorized by education level.

A chi-square test of independence was used to compare the frequency of message design logics in the Ron-Test displayed by men and women. No significant difference was found ($\chi^2 = 2.27$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.05$). Another chi-test of independence found no significant relationship ($\chi^2 = 10.21$, $df = 6$, $p < 0.05$) between message design logic employed and the message sender's

education level. Both gender and education level did not appear to influence the message design logic employed by participants in the Ron-Test scenario.

Communication in Mixed-Status Relationship across Cultures

The McNemar-Bowker test was used to test if the proportions across the message design logics categories were the same for Ron-Test scenario and the Jake-test scenario. Table 7 shows the changes observed in message design logic between scenarios. For the Singapore group, the results of the McNemar-Bowker test showed a significant difference in the proportions between the Ron-Test scenario and the Jake-Test scenario ($\chi2= 13.43$, df = 2, p < .05). For the American group, the results of the McNemar-Bowker test did not show significant difference in the proportions between the Ron-Test scenario and the Jake-Test scenario ($\chi2= 0.51$, df = 2, p > .05). While American workers in the hospitality and tourism industry employed the same message design logic as supervisors and as subordinates in mixed-status relationships, those from Singapore modified their message design logic depending on the power status of the message receiver. Research question 1 was answered.

Relationship between Culture and Preferred Message Design Logic as Receivers

The results in Table 8 show the mean scores of each message design logic in terms of likability of sender, effectiveness, and appropriateness. Ratings from the Likert scale were converted into numbers and interpreted on a 1 to 5 range (de Winter & Dodou, 2010). Messages with rhetorical design logic received the highest score in all three metrics, followed by conventional messages. Expressive messages were evaluated as the least effective and least appropriate. In addition, senders of expressive messages were least liked.

For each message design logic and attribute, a two-sample z-test was applied to test the differences between the mean scores of the Singapore group and United States group. Each of the three row represents one attribute of perception and each of the six columns represents one message that was evaluated. Cell (Effectiveness, Expressive [14]) contains the aggregated mean score difference between the participants in Singapore and United States. These mean score differences were normalized to calculate z-scores. Table 9 describes the z-scores for differences in the two means and the respective p-values for these differences. Out of 18 tests, two tests resulted in statistically significant results. The first significant difference was found in the appropriateness score for Question 17, which asked participants to rate a conventional message ($z = 4.012$, $p < 0.05$). The second came from likability score from the same message ($z = 3.700$, $p < 0.05$). The remaining 16 test found no significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups. Most frequently, the perception and preference of the message design logic remained consistent cross-culturally among hospitality and tourism workers. Workers in hospitality and tourism industry in the United States and Singapore have similar preferences for the type of design logic messages they receive. Research question 2 was answered.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This study applied the theory of message design logic to compare how workers from two distinct cultures in the hospitality and tourism industry send and receive messages. This study's goal was to expand the limited literature about intercultural communication in the hospitality and tourism industry. Analyzing data collected from 177 employed workers in the industry, the study found that individuals from different cultures approach communication differently. Results support the hypothesis that industry workers from Singapore and United States employ different message design logics. The message design logic employed by an individual is dependent on culture. Given that both gender and education background did not influence message design logic, culture appears to a crucial factor in shaping an individual's employed message design logic.

Results reveal two specific variations between the group from Singapore and the group from the United States. These differences correspond with predictions derived from existing findings in cross-cultural studies. Although the conventional design logic was the most observed design logic in both cultures, Singaporeans are more likely to employ the rhetorical design logic than Americans and Americans are more likely to employ the expressive design logic than Singaporeans. Americans tend to use communication to express personal feelings while Singaporeans tend to use communication to invite collaboration in achieving the goal. For example, in response to a subordinate who did not complete an assigned task in a team project, an individual from the United States would say, "you are irresponsible and you should be fired." In the same situation, an individual from Singapore would say, "instead of working on the background work alone, we should work together as a team. I will inform the rest of the team members to come up with some ideas as well so that we can close the working meeting

tomorrow." The two design logics have disparate views on communication, which result in distinct communication styles.

Furthermore, in the Singapore group, participants employed different communication strategies based on the situational context, such as when the power status of the message recipient differed. Hospitality and tourism workers in Singapore modified their message design logic speaking to a subordinate versus speaking to a supervisor. However, workers in the United States remained consistent. The assumption that an individual employs the same message design logic across scenarios is challenged based on the results.

Although participants from the two cultures differed in how they selected to messages to communicate, they did not differ in how they perceived messages. Rhetorical messages were perceived as the most effective and appropriate across both the Singaporean and American groups. Individuals employing the rhetorical design logic were also the most liked. This study explored the perception hierarchy of message design logic in cultures outside the United States and results show that in Singapore, the same perception preferences exist. Unlike the differences found in how individuals select messages to communicate, there is no significant difference in how messages are perceived cross-culturally.

Implications

Known for its intercultural workplaces, the hospitality and tourism industry should prepare its workers to communicate effectively across cultures. The results from this study can be used to inform cross-cultural training and to prepare expatriate mangers in the hospitality and tourism industry for overseas assignments. These findings propose three considerations for the hospitality and tourism industry. First, there are fundamental differences in the premise of

communication across cultures. Second, individuals from different culture do not share the same expectations of communication in mixed-status relationships. Third, when dealing with conflicts, messages with the rhetorical design logic are well-perceived across cultures.

Employees could benefit from the knowledge about the potential discrepancies in basic principles about communication across cultures. This study shows that culture affects the message design logic employed by individuals in Singapore and in United States. Since message design logic is an outward expression of an individual's belief about communication (O'Keefe, 1988), results imply that an individual's view of communication can be influenced by the programing of the culture that the individual belongs to. For example, results suggest that Singaporeans are more likely to strive for social census in communication whereas Americans use communication as a mean to display honest thoughts. In intercultural workplaces, there could be misaligned goals in communication that cause confusion and misunderstanding. This awareness could increase empathy and tolerance in communication differences in intercultural workplaces.

Second, an individual's status in the subordinate-supervisor relationship affects communication to varying degrees based on culture. Results show that when selecting communication messages Singaporean workers are sensitive to the status modification from supervisor to subordinate and American workers are not. This expectation of adjusting communication based on status needs to be explained to employees of intercultural workplaces. For individuals who are accustomed to applying one communication style, companies could focus on training the skill of adapting communication based on the power dynamics between individuals of an organization. For individuals who are accustomed to adjusting communication styles, companies could inform them about certain culture's appreciation for consistent portrayal

of self. This type of training could reduce false judgement on migrant workers, expatriate mangers, and general employees in intercultural workplaces within the hospitality and tourism industry (Baum et al., 2007; Deward & Self, 2008).

Lastly, workers in the hospitality and tourism industry could learn about the advantages of employing rhetorical design logic in conflict resolution. Results reinforce the established research on the perceived effectiveness and appropriateness of messages employing the rhetorical design logic. When dealing with conflicts in intercultural workplaces, messages with rhetorical design logic seem to be best perceived as accomplishing the preferred outcome, abiding to social standards, and preserving the likeability of messages senders. In anticipation of conflicts that arise in intercultural settings (Stahl et al., 2009), companies could improve conflict resolution by presenting to employees the pros of using the rhetorical design logic, which appears to be well-perceived across cultures.

Limitation

Although this study's findings increase our knowledge about intercultural workplaces in the hospitality and tourism industry, several limitations should be noted. The study used a relatively small sample size of 177 participants, 81 from Singapore and 96 from the United States. Furthermore, the sampling method allowed for selection bias. The database and recruitment method came from the resources available to dataSpring. Thus, the sample was a not random selection of the entire population. As a result, the sample did not reflect the population exactly. For example, 65.4% of the United States group in the study's sample had a bachelor's degree or higher while only 29.8% of United State population age 25 and above hold a bachelor's degree or higher. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). In the questionnaire, participants

selected their respective industry from a list of 15 industries, including "Hospitality and Tourism." The option did not provide a definition of the industry or require further clarification from participants. Therefore, the results could include participants with a board range of job roles.

Another limitation of the study is found in the newly developed Jake-Test scenario. While the exact Ron-Test scenario has been used in other academic literature (Quagliata, 2012; Fernandez, 2017), the Jake-Test scenario was created and initially tested in this study. Further testing of the Jake-Test scenario could refine the questionnaire wording and confirm validity of the test in understanding the message design logic.

One critical limitation is the possibility of response bias. The wording of questions allows room for the respondent's interpretation and might carry various types of biases (Choi & Pak, 2005). Social desirability bias occurs when a participant gives a response in a socially desirable direction, even when this response requires deception of self or others (Paulhus, 1984; Nederhof, 1985). This type of response is commonly found in self-reporting surveys (Philips & Clancy, 1972). In both the writing part and the rating part of this questionnaire, respondents could have been affected by the social desirability bias. In the first part, the survey asks respondents to write they "would" say; however, social desirability bias could influence participants to write what they consider as a socially acceptable response, instead of a genuine reaction to the prompt. In the rating part, social desirability bias could motivate respondents to rate message based on the societal standards for effectiveness, appropriateness, and likability, instead of personal perception.

In addition, intentions do not directly translate into behavior (Sheeran & Webb, 2016). The study measured the stated intention and perception, not the actual behavior of participants observed in the workplace. For example, the survey illustrates that participants perceive rhetorical design logic as the most effective design logic but does not inform the actual ability of rhetorical messages to achieve anticipated goals compared to the other design logics. Results should be interpreted with caution of the potential bias in self-reporting questionnaires.

Future Research

Future research could further investigate the relationship of cultural background and message design logic in other contexts. This study examined distinct variations in two contexts, cultural context and situation context. In terms of culture, this study chose to analyze two cultural groups, the United States and Singapore. Additional research can replicate the study in other cultures to determine if the same relationships exist. For situational context, this study offered two scenarios in the mixed-status relationship, one from the perspective of the supervisor (Ron-Test) and another from the perspective of the subordinate (Jake-Test). While previous research found a difference in message design logic employed for Americans between the two situations (Fernandez, 2017), this study did not. This disparity points to the need for future research to continue exploring the modification of message design logic employed by individuals when altering the situational context. Replicating the Ron-Test scenario in different contexts helps to validate this study's results and to understand the boarder implications of message design logic for global workplaces.

Furthermore, this study aimed to discover implications to improve intercultural workplaces in the hospitality and tourism industry. However, the participants of the study were

likely to assume intracultural communication, which is the communication between individuals of the same culture. Results allow for cross-cultural comparisons of communication by comparing individuals from two cultures but do not fully tell of individuals' communication styles in intercultural interactions (Olebe & Koester, 1989). Future research should test the conditions where participants are put into situations of communication with individuals from another cultural background.

Lastly, variables not measured in this study could impact this observed relationship between cultural background and message design logic. Besides culture, this study measured education and gender as potential confounding factors. These variables did not appear to relate to the message design logic employed by an individual. A conceivable confounding variable for future research could be job experience. Would an individual that has managerial experience be more likely to employ a certain message logic design? In addition to confounding variables, future research could expand on testing for other possible mediating factors, such as worldviews (Edwards & Shepherd, 2004) and interpersonal construction differences (Cortes et al., 2005). Since research has shown significant relationships of these potential mediating factors, it would be fruitful to understand how they tie into an individual's cultural background and how they act to strengthen or weaken the relationship between cultural background and message design logic.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This present study shows that culture plays an integral role in shaping an individual's reasoning of communication. A relationship is found between an individual's cultural background and communication strategy employed. Hospitality and tourism workers from Singapore were more likely to employ the rhetorical design logic than those from the United States. On the other hand, workers from United States were more likely to employ the expressive logic design than those from Singapore. Moreover, culture acts as a factor in determining whether workers modified their message design logic employed based on the power dynamics in mixed-status relationships.

By learning about differences in communication styles and message design logics, the hospitality and tourism industry could provide workers with more effective training and preparation for overseas assignments. Through increased awareness of different communication expectations, workers could better empathize and achieve desired outcomes in intercultural settings. For future research, scholars should investigate the findings of this thesis in a boarder range of cultural and situation contexts.

REFERENCES

Andrada, M. C. (2013). Preferred Message *Design Logics in Negotiation of Ethnic Group Member in the Zamboanga Peninsula*. Paper presented at 22nd AMIC International Conference, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Baum, T., Hearns, N., & Devine, F. (2007). Place, People and Interpretation: Issues of Migrant Labour and Tourism Imagery in Ireland. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *32*(3), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2007.11081538

Boas, F. (1896). The Limitations of the Comparative Method of Anthropology. *Science*, *4*(103), 901–908. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.4.103.901

Bonito, J. A., & Wolski, S. L. (2002). The Adaptation of Complaints to Participation Frameworks. *Communication Studies*, *53*(3), 252–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970209388589

Caughlin, J. P., Brashers, D. E., Ramey, M. E., Kosenko, K. A., Donovan-Kicken, E., & Bute, J. J. (2008). The Message Design Logics of Responses to HIV Disclosures. *Human Communication Research*, *34*(4), 655–684. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.00336.x

Choi, B. C. K., & Pak, A. W. P. (2004). A Catalog of Biases in Questionnaires. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, *2*(1). Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1323316/

Cocroft, B.-A. K., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). Facework in Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *18*(4), 469–506. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(94)90018-3

Cohen, J. A. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 37–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104

Cortes, C., Larson, C., & Hample, D. (2005). Relations among message design logic, interpersonal

    construct differentiation, and sex for Mexican and U.S. nationals. *Journal of Intercultural*

    Communication Research, 34, 108–118.

de Winter, J., & Dodou, D. (2010). Five-Point Likert Items: t Test Versus Mann–Whitney–Wilcoxon.

    Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, *15*. Retrieved from

    http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.650.3292

Dewald, B., & Self, J. T. (2008). Cross Cultural Training for Expatriate Hotel Managers: An

    Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, *9*(4), 352–

    364. https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480802427305

Edwards, A. P., & Graham, E. E. (2009). The Relationship Between Individuals' Definitions of

    Family and Implicit Personal Theories of Communication. *Journal of Family Communication*,

    9(4), 191–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267430903070147

Edwards, A. P., & Shepherd, G. J. (2004). Theories of communication, human nature, and the world:

    Associations and implication. *Communication Studies*, *55*, 197–203.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970409388614

Edwards, A., Rose, L. M., Edwards, C., & Singer, L. M. (2009). An investigation of the

    relationships among message design logic, loneliness, and social support. *Human*

    Communication, 4, 437–454. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970701648574

Edwards, A., & J. Shepherd, G. (2007). *An Investigation of the Relationship between Implicit*

    Personal Theories of Communication and Community Behavior, 58.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970701648574

Erez, M., & Shokef, E. (2008). The Culture of Global Organizations. In *The Handbook of Cross-*

    Cultural Management Research, 285–300. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved

from http://people.hbs.edu/cmarquis/ob_seminar_spring_2008_papers/erez-shokef_global_work_culture_chapter.pdf

Hall, E. T. (1989). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books.

Hart, J. (2002). Cultural assumptions underlying Message Design Logic: Premises of development, preference, and understanding. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 11(4). 109–120. Retrieved from http://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/07-Joy-L.-Hart.pdf

Hilton Worldwide. (2014). Global talent management. *Hilton Worldwide Corporate Responsibility Report.*

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Holtgraves, T., Eck, J., & Lasky, B. (1997). Face Management, Question Wording, and Social Desirability. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(18), 1650–1671. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb01618.x

Hullman, G. A. (2004). Interpersonal communication motives and message design logic: exploring their interaction on perceptions of competence. *Communication Monographs*, *71*(2), 208–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/0363775042000250411

Joppe, M. (2012). Migrant workers: Challenges and opportunities in addressing tourism labour shortages. *Tourism Management*, *33*(3), 662–671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.07.009

Kroeber, A. L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture; a critical review of concepts and definitions*. Cambridge, Mass., The Museum.

Lambert, B. L., & Gillespie, J. L. (1994). Patient perceptions of pharmacy students' hypertension

    compliance gaining messages: Effects of message design logic and content themes. *Health*

    Communication, *6*, 311–325. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327027hc0604_6

Lauring, J., & Selmer, J. (2012). Knowledge sharing in diverse organisations. *Human Resource*

    Management Journal, *22*(1), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2010.00158.x

Marriott. (2014). Marriott's sustainable hotel development boosts economies and creates jobs: Half of

    company's future hotel growth to come from emerging economies. *Marriott News Center*.

Maura Fernandez, M. (2017). What Is the Relationship Between Conflict Management and Employee

    Empowerment? A Message Design Logic Perspective and its Importance for Managers and

    Supervisors. *Theses*. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses/9533

Minkov, M. (2007). *What makes us different and similar: A new interpretation of the World Values*

    Survey and other cross-cultural data. Sofia, Bulgaria: Klasika i Stil.

Naroll, R. (1961). Two Solutions to Galton's Problem. *Philosophy of Science*, *28*(1), 15–39.

    https://doi.org/10.1086/287778

Nederhof, A. J. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European Journal*

    of Social Psychology, *15*(3), 263–280. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420150303

O'Keefe, B. J. (1988). The logic of message design: Individual differences in reasoning about

    communication. *Communication Monographs*, *55*(1), 80–103.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758809376159

O'keefe, B. J., & McCornack, S. A. (1987). Message Design Logic and Message Goal Structure

    Effects on Perceptions of Message Quality in Regulative Communication Situations. *Human*

    Communication Research, *14*(1), 68–92. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1987.tb00122.x

Olebe, M., & Koester, J. (1989). Exploring the cross-cultural equivalence of the behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *13*(3), 333–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(89)90016-3

Ozdemir, B., & Cizel, R. (2007). International hotel manager as an emerging concept: A review of expatriate management literature and a model proposal. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management*, 14(2), 170–187. https://doi.org/10.1375/jhtm.14.2.170

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(3), 598–609. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.598

Peterson, L., & Albrecht, T. (1996). Message design logic, social support, and mixed-status relationships. *Western Journal of Communication*, *60*, 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570319609374551

Phillips, D. L., & Clancy, K. J. (1972). Some Effects of "Social Desirability" in Survey Studies. *American Journal of Sociology*, *77*(5), 921–940. https://doi.org/10.1086/225231

Quagliata, A. B. (2012). *Message design logic and career success*. Buffalo: University at Buffalo. Retrieved from http://ubir.buffalo.edu/xmlui/handle/10477/47573

Reynolds, D., Rahman, I., & Bradetich, S. (2014). Hotel managers' perceptions of the value of diversity training: an empirical investigation. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *26*(3), 426–446. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2013-0079

Rozkwitalska, M. (2017). Cognition of the Multicultural Work Environment in Multinational Corporations and Intercultural Interaction Outcomes. In M. Rozkwitalska, Ł. Sułkowski, & S. Magala (Eds.), *Intercultural Interactions in the Multicultural Workplace: Traditional and Positive Organizational Scholarship*, 37–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39771-9_3

Sheeran, P., & Webb, T. L. (2016). The Intention–Behavior Gap. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *10*(9), 503–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12265

Shore, L. M., Chung, B., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., Jung, D., Randel, A., & Singh, G. 2009. Diversity and inclusiveness: Where are we now and where are we going? *Human Resource Management Review*, 19, 117–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.10.004

Spitzberg, B. H. (2003). Methods of skill assessment. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills,* 93–134.

Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *41*(4), 690–709. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2009.85

Starwood. (2014). Starwood greater China. Growing with Starwood.

Stocking, G. W. (1966). Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective. *American Anthropologist*, *68*(4), 867–882. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1966.68.4.02a00010

Ting-Toomey, S. (1985). Toward a Theory of Conflict and Culture. *Communication, Culture, and Organizational Processes*, 71–86.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1985). Toward a theory of conflict and culture. In W. Gudykunst, L. Stewart, & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim, & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: an updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *22*(2), 187–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00004-2

Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S.-L. (1991). The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *15*(1), 65–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(91)90074-Q

Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive culture: researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art, and custom*. London: J. Murray. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3728750

U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States. (2016). Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045216

Table 1

Profile of United States and Singpore based on Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Theory

Cultural Dimension	United States	Singpore
Power Distance	40	74
Indivdualism	91	20
Masculinity	62	48
Uncertainty Avoidance	46	8
Long Term Orientation	26	72
Indulgence	68	46

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Messages with Different Design Logics for Ron Scenario

	Expressive		Conventional		Rhetorical	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequncy	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Singapore	19	23.5%	38	46.9%	24	29.6%
USA	46	47.9%	38	39.6%	12	12.5%

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages of Messages with Different Design Logics for Jake Scenario

	Expressive		Conventional		Rhetorical	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequncy	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Singapore	30	37.0%	43	53.1%	8	9.9%
USA	46	47.9%	37	38.6%	13	13.5%

Table 4

Proportion Differences of Messages with Different Design Logics Across Two Cultures

	p^	Z	p
Expressive	0.37	3.36	>0.00
Conventional	0.43	0.98	0.25
Rhetorical	0.20	2.82	0.01

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages of Messages with Different Design Logics for Ron Scenario

	Expressive		Conventional		Rhetorical	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequncy	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Female	37	39.8%	35	37.6%	21	22.6%
Male	28	33.3%	41	48.8%	15	17.9%

Table 6

Frequencies and Percentages of Messages with Different Design Logics for Ron Scenario

	Expressive		Conventional		Rhetorical	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequncy	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
2-Year College	16	51.6%	11	35.5%	4	12.9%
Bachelor's Degree	18	25.4%	37	52.1%	16	22.5%
High School or Less	20	41.7%	20	41.7%	8	16.7%
Master-level Degree	11	40.7%	8	29.6%	8	29.6%

Table 7

Observed Shifts in Message Design Logic Between Scenarios (Singapore)

		Jake		
		Expressive	Conventional	Rhetorical
Ron	Expressive	14	5	0
	Conventional	12	21	5
	Rhetorical	4	17	3

Observed Shifts in Message Design Logic Between Scenarios (United States)

		Jake		
		Expressive	Conventional	Rhetorical
Ron	Expressive	28	15	3
	Conventional	14	17	7
	Rhetorical	4	5	3

Table 8

Appropreiateness Mean Scores

	Expressive (14)	Expressive (16)	Conventional (17)	Conventional (18)	Rhetorical (21)	Rhetorical (22)
Singapore	2.16	2.58	3.05	3.73	3.61	3.82
USA	2.06	2.77	3.58	3.85	3.62	3.91

Effectiveness Mean Scores

	Expressive (14)	Expressive (16)	Conventional (17)	Conventional (18)	Rhetorical (21)	Rhetorical (22)
Singapore	2.32	2.63	2.93	3.44	3.49	3.68
USA	2.19	2.84	3.08	3.45	3.26	3.59

Likeability Mean Scores

	Expressive (14)	Expressive (16)	Conventional (17)	Conventional (18)	Rhetorical (21)	Rhetorical (22)
Singapore	2.35	2.64	2.94	3.61	3.69	3.97
USA	2.43	2.79	3.41	3.63	3.59	3.78

Table 9

Raw Score Differences between two means (Singapore - US)

	Expressive (14)	Expressive (16)	Conventional (17)	Conventional (18)	Rhetorical (21)	Rhetorical (22)
Appropreiatenes	0.10	-0.19	-0.53	-0.12	-0.01	-0.09
Effectiveness	0.13	-0.22	-0.15	-0.02	0.23	0.09
Likeability	-0.09	-0.15	-0.47	-0.01	0.10	0.18

Z-Scores of Differences between two means (Singapore - US)

	Expressive (14)	Expressive (16)	Conventional (17)	Conventional (18)	Rhetorical (21)	Rhetorical (22)
Appropreiatenes	0.65	-1.19	-4.01	-0.97	-0.06	-0.76
Effectiveness	1.03	-1.65	-1.29	-0.14	1.83	0.68
Likeability	-0.61	-1.02	-3.70	-0.12	0.93	1.64

P-values of Differences between two means (Singapore - US)

	Expressive (14)	Expressive (16)	Conventional (17)	Conventional (18)	Rhetorical (21)	Rhetorical (22)
Appropreiatenes	0.32	0.20	0.00	0.25	0.40	0.30
Effectiveness	0.23	0.10	0.17	0.40	0.08	0.32
Likeability	0.33	0.24	0.00	0.40	0.26	0.10

"Inter-cultural Communication in the Service Industry" Study Consent Form"

I am asking you to participate in a research study titled "Inter-cultural Communication in the Service Industry". I will describe this study to you and answer any of your questions. This study is being led by Rachelle Ng, School of Hotel Administration. The Faculty Advisor for this study is Andrew Quagliata, School of Hotel Administration.

What the study is about: The purpose of this research is to examine the relationships between culture and communication styles.

What I will ask you to do: I will ask you to fill out an online questionnaire. The questionnaire requires around 10-15 minutes to complete.

Risks and discomforts: I do not anticipate any risks from participating in this research.

Benefits: Information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future by increasing knowledge about intercultural communication in the service industry.

Compensation: The survey will ask you some qualifying questions. You will only be permitted to continue the survey if you fulfill the requirements. The compensation will be based on the completion of the survey, paid on behalf of the survey company.

Privacy/Confidentiality/Data Security: This study will protect your privacy and confidentiality. No identifying information will be collected in the survey. I anticipate that your participation in this survey presents no greater risk than everyday use of the Internet.

Data Sharing: Data from this study may be shared with the research community at large to advance science and health.

Taking part is voluntary: As a participant, you may refuse to participate before the study begins or discontinue at any time. However, to receive compensation for participation, all questions on the survey must be answered.

If you have questions: The main researcher conducting this study is Rachelle Ng, an undergraduate student at Cornell University. If you have questions, you may contact Rachelle Ng at rhn25@cornell.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a subject in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Participants at 607-255-6182 or access their website at http://www.irb.cornell.edu. You may also report your concerns or complaints anonymously through Ethicspoint online at www.hotline.cornell.edu or by calling toll free at 1-866-293-3077. Ethicspoint is an independent organization that serves as a liaison between the University and the person bringing the complaint so that anonymity can be ensured.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study. By completing and submitting the questionnaire, I have provided consent to participate in the research.

Q1 How old are you?

Q2 What is your country of birth?

Q4 Have you lived in your country of birth your whole life?
- Yes
- No

Q5 Are you currently a full-time employee (employed on average at least 30 hours of work per week)?
- Yes
- No

Q6 In which industry do you work for?

- Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing
- Finance (eg. banking, insurance, accounting, tax)
- Business services/consulting
- communication/phone
- Computer related products or services
- Construction
- Education
- Engineering, architecture
- Government
- Healthcare
- Hospitality and Tourism
- Legal
- Manufacturing/Production
- Mining
- Others

Q9 Imagine that you are working on a very important team project within your current profession. Your annual merit increase will depend to a great extent on how well the team project turns out. You were assigned to your group by your supervisor who also designated you to be the leader of the team. Your duties as group leader will include reporting to your supervisor about the individual contributions of each person on your team.

One of your teammates (whose name is Ron) has been causing some problems. Ron seldom makes it to team meetings on time and entirely skipped one meeting without even letting the team know in advance. When Ron missed that meeting, you overheard some of your colleagues commenting on Ron's performance, but you decided to give him the benefit of the doubt. At the next meeting Ron arrived late but apologized for missing the previous meeting and mentioned something about family problems. Ron offered to do all the background work on one important aspect of the project, saying he had a special interest in that area.

The project deadline is next week. The team plans to put together the final details of the report at a meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. Ron stops into your office today and says he doesn't have his background work done and can't get it finished before the meeting. He says he just needs more time.

Using the space below, quickly write exactly what you would say to Ron.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q12 Imagine you took on a new position in a different department at your current company. You were excited for the new opportunity and eager to make a contribution in your new role, but after being in the position for only a brief time, things haven't been going the way you hoped they would.

Your direct supervisor, whose name is Jake, enthusiastically welcomed you, but unlike previous positions you have had, he didn't introduce you to your new coworkers or explain how things get done in his department. In addition, he doesn't seem to have a regular schedule. So when you do have questions, he is not around to help.

Last week, Jake assigned you your first major task. He described what he wanted you to do in about 30 seconds and then told you he was going home for the day. You begin working on the task but quickly realize you need more information. The following week, when you finally get a chance to speak with him, he appears frustrated by your questions and says, "I think you can figure it out." You attempt to ask another question, but his phone rings and he says he has to take an important call. You notice later that day that Jake seems to be giving the other new employees more attention and begin to wonder if Jake doesn't like you.

The following day, Jake asks you for an update on your assigned task, which is due next Friday. You don't have much to show because you are still guessing at what he wants you to accomplish. Jake indicates he is not happy with the results and asks you, "what is the problem?"

Using the space below, quickly write exactly what you would say to Jake.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q13 Imagine that Dan is working on a very important team project within your current profession. Dan's annual merit increase will depend to a great extent on how well the team project turns out. Dan was assigned to a group by his supervisor who also designated him to be the leader of the team. His duties as group leader will include reporting to your supervisor about the individual contributions of each person on his team.

 One of his teammates (whose name is Ron) has been causing some problems. Ron seldom makes it to team meetings on time and entirely skipped one meeting without even letting the team know in advance. When Ron missed that meeting, Dan overheard some of his colleagues commenting on Ron's performance, but he decided to give him the benefit of the doubt. At the next meeting Ron arrived late but apologized for missing the previous meeting and mentioned something about family problems. Ron offered to do all the background work on one important aspect of the project, saying he had a special interest in that area.

 The project deadline is next week. The team plans to put together the final details of the report at a meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. Ron stops into Dan's office today and says he doesn't have his background work done and can't get it finished before the meeting. He says he just needs more time.

 Evaluate the following responses from Dan based on the scales given on the next page.

Q16 Dan's Statement: You are not going to get away with this. You just don't seem to care about this team project. We worked so hard and you did nothing. I am going to suggest that you be reprimanded for not doing your work. We can't continue to tolerate this misconduct.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think Dan would make a good friend.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan is an ineffective conversationalist.	○	○	○	○	○
Everything Dan said is appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○
I dislike Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan's statement is rewarding.	○	○	○	○	○
I am comfortable with Dan's remark.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark.	○	○	○	○	○
I think I will get along well with Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan said some things that should not have been said.	○	○	○	○	○

Q14 Dan's Statement: You are so lazy! I knew you wouldn't do your work.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think Dan would make a good friend.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan is an ineffective conversationalist.	○	○	○	○	○
Everything Dan said is appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○
I dislike Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan's statement is rewarding.	○	○	○	○	○
I am comfortable with Dan's remark.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark.	○	○	○	○	○
I think I will get along well with Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan said some things that should not have been said.	○	○	○	○	○

Q17 Dan's Statement: It was your responsibility to meet this deadline. You volunteered to complete the task. Please turn the work around as quickly as possible.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think Dan would make a good friend.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan is an ineffective conversationalist.	○	○	○	○	○
Everything Dan said is appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○
I dislike Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan's statement is rewarding.	○	○	○	○	○
I am comfortable with Dan's remark.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark.	○	○	○	○	○
I think I will get along well with Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan said some things that should not have been said.	○	○	○	○	○

Q18 Dan's Statement: Our team appreciated it when you volunteered to do the background work. But it is important to carry through when you say you'll do it. So, please complete your task. If you put in the effort, you can get it done.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think Dan would make a good friend.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan is an ineffective conversationalist.	○	○	○	○	○
Everything Dan said is appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○
I dislike Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan's statement is rewarding.	○	○	○	○	○
I am comfortable with Dan's remark.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark.	○	○	○	○	○
I think I will get along well with Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan said some things that should not have been said.	○	○	○	○	○

Q21 Dan's Statement: Things have gone so well that we still have one week before we have to complete this project. You have shown interest in doing the background work. Why don't you take one more day and see if you can work on your part some more?

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think Dan would make a good friend.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan is an ineffective conversationalist.	○	○	○	○	○
Everything Dan said is appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○
I dislike Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan's statement is rewarding.	○	○	○	○	○
I am comfortable with Dan's remark.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark.	○	○	○	○	○
I think I will get along well with Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan said some things that should not have been said.	○	○	○	○	○

Q22 Dan's Statement: I am sorry you have been having family problems lately. I know it must be difficult to deal with work at the same time. But all is not lost. I bet a few hours on this research

will help our team a lot. I know you are as eager as the rest of the team to do well. If you have any questions, you can call one of us. What do you say?

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think Dan would make a good friend.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan is an ineffective conversationalist.	○	○	○	○	○
Everything Dan said is appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○
I dislike Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan's statement is rewarding.	○	○	○	○	○
I am comfortable with Dan's remark.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan achieves everything he has hoped to achieve in his remark.	○	○	○	○	○
I think I will get along well with Dan.	○	○	○	○	○
Dan said some things that should not have been said.	○	○	○	○	○

Q19 What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Prefer not to say

Q7 What is your highest level of education?
- Less than high school
- High school
- 2-year college degree
- Bachelor's degree (4-year college degree)
- Master-level degree (MS, MA, etc...)
- Ph.D. or Professional degree

Q8 What best describes your racial group?
- Caucasian
- African American
- Hispanic
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Multiracial
- Other (please specify) _____

Message Design Logic Coding Tree

Does the message:

- Doesn't move towards accomplishing the task (i.e., move towards solution in any way).
- Include non-contingent threats (e.g., "You're fired!" "We'll decide what we'll do to you after this is over.")
- Insults or hurtful comments (e.g., you're an asshole! you're not a good teammate.)
  - Sarcasm
  - Contentious
  - Personal attack
- Message states individual will be removed from group (cutting Ron out of the process; "give us what you've got done and we're taking over for the rest") WITHOUT recognizing the broader context/ quitting
  - "Ron, go and settle his family problem. We will finish the background work with other teammates."
- Explicit criticism ONLY (e.g., You did a terrible job managing this part of our project!), without progress towards completing roll (i.e., holding someone accountable is ok, but needs progress towards goal completion) OR DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM
  - Complaints that the hearer can do nothing about
- Include a series of questions geared toward one's own interests (e.g., "do you even care about this project?" "What have you been doing?" "How much time do you need? 12 hrs? 24 hrs? A year?")
- Focus solely on reacting to prior events? (e.g., only talk about what they didn't do, things that can't be changed)
  - "You didn't give me enough information to complete the task."
- Makes the situation personal
  - "What is your problem with me?"

If YES to any item above, code 1 for Expressive. If NO to each item above, continue.

Does the message:

- Moves towards accomplishing the task without seeking consensus with Ron
- Offers ONLY scripted, obligatory, conventional assistance or supportive statements (e.g., "That's too bad" "I'm sorry to hear that")
  - (without indicating a commitment to take on the situation together)
- Mention the responsibility of the hearer (rights, obligations), ONLY or WITH DIRECTIVE to solving task

- o Use of "we" or "Us" does not automatically make something collaborative. If the speaker is laying down the law and explaining what will happen next, this is directive, even if we/us language is used (Give us what you have and we will get this done).
  - o Can include implied/indirect reference to the importance of people fulfilling obligation
  - o Explicit criticism (e.g., You did a terrible job managing this part of our project!) is OK, IF COUPLED WITH progress towards completing the task (i.e., holding someone accountable is ok, but needs progress towards goal completion)
- Contingent threats (e.g., "get this done OR ELSE!" "Get it done or you are off the team")
- Direct hearer with solutions or commands to solve the problem (e.g., "I don't know how you're gonna get it done, but finish your work before the meeting!" "A couple of hours in the library should be enough to get this done")
- Asking for help in a standard way: task focused
  - o "I'm sorry my work isn't up to par but I need more special instructions from you to finish my tasks correctly"
- Offering to extend time without offering assistance

If YES to any item above, code 2 for Conventional. If NO to each item above, continue.

Does the message

- Moves towards accomplishing the task by COLLABORATIVELY working towards solution
- Support that goes beyond obligatory statements and focuses on exploring, acknowledging, legitimating, or elaborating on the other person's feelings
- Can mention the responsibility of the hearer (hold accountable, referencing responsibility, obligation, etc.), but must ALSO move towards resolving problem by COLLABORATIVELY working towards solution
  - o Any threats (contingent or otherwise) preclude Rhetorical
- Elaboration of how to achieve goals
- Indicate a collective remedy (define the situation as "our problem" or "our solution")
- Attempt to achieve consensus
- Asking for help in a way that redefines the question - acknowledges Jake's frustration while focusing on collaboratively completing the task
  - o "I'm sorry Jake but I have questions about the assignment and I haven't been able to reach you. Can we please go over exactly what it is you need from me and will you give me some time to ask for clarification?"

If NO to items above, refer to secondary coding document to obtain further clarification.