Dissertations

UMSL Graduate Works

9-10-2007

The Role of Communication Channel, Feedback Valence and Cultural Differences in Performance Appraisal Outcomes

James C. Matchen
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation

Part of the Psychology Commons

The Role of Communication Channel, Feedback Valence and Cultural Differences in

Performance Appraisal Outcomes

James C. Matchen
M.A. in Psychology, May, 2002, University of Missouri-St. Louis
B.S. in Psychology, May, 1999, Illinois State University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate School of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI- ST. LOUIS
In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology with an emphasis in Industrial and Organizational

August, 2007

Advisory Committee

Miles Patterson, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Jim Breaugh, Ph.D.

Mark Tubbs, Ph.D.

Michael Beatty, Ph.D.

Abstract

The effects of feedback valence (positive or negative) across culture
(Individualistic or Collectivistic) for both the verbal and nonverbal communication
channels on performance appraisal outcomes were investigated. It was hypothesized that
participants would react differently to the performance appraisal they received based on
(1) their own cultural values and on (2) the valence of the verbal feedback and nonverbal
feedback provided by the manager. Main effects of both verbal feedback valence and
nonverbal feedback valence were predicted and found. Participants reported more
positive reactions to both the performance appraisal process and to the manager after
receiving positive feedback than after receiving negative feedback regardless of the
communication channel (verbal or nonverbal) used. Predicted interactions between
feedback valence and communication channel and also between culture, feedback
valence, and communication channel were not found. Limitations and directions for
future research are discussed. As business becomes more global, organizations often
enter unfamiliar countries using practices that previously worked in a country that may
have held very different values, limiting their ability to maximize the benefits of the
performance appraisal and potentially leading to negative outcomes. This research was
an attempt to help organizations better understand how to improve one important
organizational process, the performance appraisal, as they expand globally.

The Role of Communication Channel, Feedback Valence and Cultural Differences

in Performance Appraisal Outcomes

The success of an organization relies on the performance of its employees. While factors such as technology, location, or competitive environment can influence an organization, it is the human capital that determines its success. It is for this reason that employee performance appraisals are crucial. As a company plans for the future, employee evaluation provides the company with valuable information needed to determine strengths and weaknesses, and it also provides organizations with the opportunity to relay important feedback to their employees. Effectively providing feedback to employees can facilitate improved relationships with the supervisors, increased trust, and better job performance (Bloom & Hautaluoma, 1987).

Performance appraisals have been defined as "a variety of processes that generally involve the assessment and development of an individual and their performances at work, both in terms of their existing effectiveness and their potential for advancement" (Fletcher & Perry, 2001). Performance appraisals are most commonly used for administrative purposes, for instance to determine pay and promotion, but are increasingly being used to aid in employee development and to create individual development plans for the employees.

Taking the time to assess performance is an important part of the performance appraisal process, particularly those conducted for developmental purposes. Although assessment is a necessary part of the process, relatively little time is devoted to it. Each year organizations spend, on average, seven hours assessing higher-level employees and only three hours for lower-level employees. There are a handful of organizations that

spend up to forty hours per year on these assessments, but many more spend less than one hour (Bretz Jr., Milkovich, & Read, 1992). Due to the short amount of time spent on each employee's appraisal, it is imperative to spend that time wisely.

A variety of potential formats dictate how appraisal ratings are calculated. The Graphic Rating Scale (GRS) provides a general description of employee conduct in specific performance dimensions (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). The competency-focus approach rates employee levels on traits critical to success (Schneier, Beatty, & Baird, 1986). Management by Objectives (MBO), a results-focused approach, evaluates goal accomplishment as measured against pre-set objectives (Henderson, 1984). Two appraisal formats focus specifically on employee behavior. The Behaviorally Anchored Ratings Scale (BARS) uses a description of different levels of performance on a rating scale for each important component of performance for success (Henderson, 1984). The Behavioral Observation Scale (BOS) requires raters to estimate the frequency of an employee's specific behaviors (Reilley & McGourty, 1998).

There is no one correct performance appraisal format for every situation. The MBO process is often used for high-level managers and executives, but is rarely used for lower-level workers (Bretz Jr., Milkovich, & Read, 1992). While the GRS is relatively inexpensive and easy to implement, and BARS shows relatively low levels of halo and leniency bias, there is evidence that BOS may be a better format to use for lower-level workers (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). Usage of the BOS in creating performance appraisal ratings and their discussion leads to positive attitudinal reactions from employees (Tziner & Kopelman, 2002). BOS has been linked to better goal clarity and acceptance, increased work satisfaction, stronger goal commitment, ratee satisfaction

with the process, and more favorable perceptions of goals set during the performance appraisal process than GRS and BARS (Tziner, Joanis, & Murphy, 2000; Tziner, Kopelman, & Joanis, 1997; Tziner & Latham, 1989). BOS also leads to improved performance (Tziner, Kopelman, & Liveneh, 1993). Regardless of how ratings are determined, and their ultimate purpose, feedback is generally given to employees in the Performance Appraisal Interview (PAI). The focus of this paper is an examination of the role of nonverbal communication and culture in the PAI. In developing this discussion, I will first review the PAI research and then consider how nonverbal communication and culture may affect the interpersonal dynamics operating in the PAI.

The Performance Appraisal Interview

During the Performance Appraisal Interview (PAI) an employee receives formal performance feedback from a manager or supervisor. Informal feedback is infrequent, and a formal appraisal process typically takes place only once a year. Therefore, the PAI provides a crucial opportunity for employees to learn how their job performance is perceived and how they can improve. While the actual PAI may only be one hour of time out of the year, it affects behaviors and attitudes that last long beyond the feedback session (Fletcher & Perry, 2001).

The Performance Appraisal Context

A model of the PAI, developed by Klein, Snell, and Wexley (1987) describes the context of the interview. The manager, the employee, the features of the appraisal process, and the organizational environment create the context of the PAI. There is no single "correct" performance appraisal format. The appropriate format depends on the context in which it takes place (Mohrman, Jr., Resnick-West, & Lawler III, 1989). The

context of the performance appraisal strongly affects the outcome, as ratings are not made in a vacuum (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991). For example, if a supervisor is afraid that a poor performance review will lead to conflict with employees, she is likely to give higher than deserved ratings to avoid confrontation. It is not uncommon for as many as 90% of employees to be rated as "above average" (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991).

When completing a performance appraisal, raters often have goals that are different from the organization's goals (Cleveland & Murphy, 1992), and these separate goals predict ratings (Murphy, Cleveland, Skattebo, & Kinney, 2004). Because the performance appraisal goals of the rater and the organization do not always match, the resulting ratings may not serve the desired purpose. If the rater's goal is motivating employees rather than accuracy, then his or her ratings are likely to reflect this (Banks & Murphy, 1985). Rating inflation is a common outcome when raters have a goal other than objective accuracy.

Supervisors have admitted to inflating the ratings of their subordinates for a variety of reasons. These reasons include: maximizing a subordinate's merit raise, avoidance of hanging 'dirty laundry' in public, avoiding a written record of poor performance, giving a break to an employee showing recent improvement, avoiding confrontation with a difficult employee, and promoting a problem subordinate out of the department (Longenecker, Sims, & Giola, 1987). Supervisors may also inflate ratings to reflect desired end states, such as a promotion, and to maintain positive relationships with their subordinates (Saal, Downey, & Lahey, 1980).

Accountability also influences ratings. Mero and Motowidlo (1995) found that when raters were informed their ratings were too low and were held accountable by

having to justify their ratings, they provided higher ratings than those raters who did not have to justify their similarly low ratings. The more open the organizational environment is to feedback, the more managers feel pressured to give high ratings, presumably because they know that employees will learn what ratings they gave to others (Fried, Levi, Ben-David, & Tiegs, 1999). Taken together, it is clear from these studies that implicit and explicit goals (i.e., just one part of the context) for the performance appraisal influence the process and the ratings. Another important part of the context is the person responsible for providing feedback.

The Source of Performance Appraisal Feedback

The person providing performance appraisal feedback is a major factor in determining how the employee receiving feedback will react. Ilgen, Fisher, and Taylor (1979) hypothesized that a manager's credibility would impact whether a subordinate accepted that manager's feedback. People are more likely to accept and be more satisfied with the appraisal system when they feel the manager has provided unbiased ratings (Levy & Williams, 2004; Roberts & Reed, 1996). Source credibility is related to an employee's desire to respond, which is, in turn, related to later performance (Kinicki, Prussia, Wu, & McKee-Ryan, 2004). The supervisor is a common, though not sole, source of feedback to employees.

Employees prefer receiving feedback from their supervisor than from their peers. Nervertheless, peer feedback is happening more often with the introduction of 360-degree feedback systems (Becker & Klimoski, 1989; Gosselin, Werner, & Halle, 1997). In this type of appraisal, feedback may be collected from an employee's supervisor, peers, subordinates, or even customers. Furthermore, feedback from an experienced source is

perceived to be more accurate than feedback from an inexperienced source. This is important in the appraisal process because perceived accuracy correlates with employees' reactions to feedback (Brett & Atwater, 2001).

The use of power by the feedback source also impacts employee reactions. People are more likely to respond to a manager the greater the manager's perceived power (Wexley & Snell, 1987). The extent to which this occurs is dependent on the type of power used. French and Raven (1959) created a framework of five types of supervisory power: reward, referent, legitimate, coercive, and expert. Wexley and Snell (1987) found high correlations among reward, referent and expert power, which together they termed "positive power." They found that employees are more likely to participate in the process and show greater career development when interacting with managers using positive power (Wexley & Snell, 1987). Perceptions of appraisal accuracy and motivation to improve performance correlated positively with the use of both positive and legitimate power while negatively correlating with the use of coercive power (Wexley & Snell, 1987).

Feedback Valence

While the context of the appraisal and the source of the feedback are important factors in PAI outcomes, the feedback itself is also a distinct, driving factor in a successful appraisal session and leads to stronger reactions to the PAI than does feedback source behavior. Kacmar, Wayne, and Wright (1996) found that, while the use of impression management tactics by supervisors giving feedback did influence employee reactions, feedback valence had a much larger effect. Even though the results of past studies in this area are mixed, feedback valence (referred to hereafter as valence), or

whether feedback is positive or negative in nature, likely has some impact on reactions. Kluger and DeNisi (1996) determined that valence, though nonsignificant in their meta-analysis, is a moderator of the link between feedback and later performance and that it merits further research.

Not surprisingly, employees react more favorably after receiving positive feedback, and attribute more positive intentions to their supervisors, compared to those receiving negative feedback, who feel neutral at best (Bloom & Hautaluoma, 1987; Kacmar, Wayne, & Wright, 1996). There is also evidence that valence is positively correlated with feedback accuracy perceptions, source credibility, and increased job commitment, but is not correlated with seeking verification of feedback (Bloom & Hautaluoma, 1987).

Negative feedback may lead to performance improvements in certain situations. Van-Dijk and Kluger (2004) found that a person's regulatory focus impacts performance. The authors define regulatory focus as either promotion (a desire to improve) or prevention (a desire to avoid negative outcomes). They found that people are motivated to perform better when their regulatory focus is congruent with the valence of feedback received. The people most highly motivated to perform were those who had received negative feedback and had a prevention focus (Van-Dijk & Kluger, 2004). This may be the result of negative feedback leading individuals to set higher performance goals (Podsakoff & Farh, 1989). That is, those who initially receive negative feedback become dissatisfied with their performance, set higher goals and show higher future levels of performance. This effect is stronger the more credible the source. Although this performance improvement is shown when negative feedback is first received,

performance levels begin to drop after receiving consistent negative feedback (Campion & Lord, 1982).

Valence can have different effects depending on the form of feedback. Ang and Cummings (1994) found that participants who received positive feedback in either a computer-mediated or computer-generated environment were more likely to seek additional feedback on subsequent tasks. In contrast, participants who received negative feedback in a face-to-face environment were more likely to seek additional feedback on subsequent tasks. The authors speculated that this response to negative face-to-face feedback occurs because it provides an opportunity for the participant to rebuild his or her reputation in the eyes of the supervisor.

Because many employees do not receive frequent, routine verbal feedback from their supervisors, formal performance appraisals provide employees with much needed feedback. In addition to the verbal content of the feedback given, the manager's nonverbal communication affects how feedback is received.

Nonverbal Communication

Communication permeates our lives as people receive a variety of information throughout their day. It is the primary way in which the "psychological expanse" between people is crossed (Burgoon & Bacue, 2003, p. 179). When someone speaks with another person, all aspects of the communication need to be considered for the message to be fully comprehended as the verbal content does not tell the entire story. The nonverbal component of communication is important in helping us decipher and make sense of our world. When a spouse says "I love you," was he looking into his wife's eyes, or was his gaze elsewhere? When a boss says "I want to see you in my office," was

she smiling as she said it, or was her brow furrowed and her demeanor stern? Depending on the nonverbal behavior of the spouse or boss, very different assumptions would be made about the meaning of their true message. While the verbal exchange in social interactions may accomplish the transmission of information, particularly when it is detailed, a great deal of information is transmitted nonverbally. In fact, nonverbal communication has a greater impact than verbal communication on how we ultimately get along with others (Patterson, 2002).

In general, nonverbal communication may be defined as "the sending and receiving of information and influence through one's immediate environment, appearance cues, and behavior (Patterson, 2002, p. 2)." Nonverbal communication plays an important role in people's lives and is always present. Even when two people are not speaking, they are still communicating nonverbally. Facial expressions, gaze, distance, and touch are just a few of the ways in which communication can occur without the benefit of speech (Patterson, 2002).

One way in which nonverbal communication has an advantage over verbal communication is that sending and receiving occur simultaneously (Patterson, 2002). Verbal communication may break down when two or more people try to speak at once, as it is nearly impossible for all voices to be heard and understood. Nonverbal communication is not limited in this way. In fact, sending and receiving nonverbal messages occurs not only simultaneously, but often outside of conscious awareness. This facilitates efficient communication, allowing cognitive resources to be used for other matters (Patterson, 2002).

People tend to rely on the nonverbal channel when forming impressions of others (McMahan, 1976; Rotenberg, Simourd, & Moore, 1989). This reliance on the nonverbal channel is likely due to the large amount of information that is transmitted nonverbally and that the verbal channel is easily manipulated. While nobody knows for sure exactly how much information is communicated nonverbally, it is fairly well established that the nonverbal channel accounts for more information transmission than the verbal channel (Argyle, Salter, Nicholson, Williams, & Burgess, 1970; Mehrabian & Ferris, 1967; Philpott, 1983).

Nonverbal communication is also important because it is the first step in many facets of communication. For the human race, nonverbal communication evolved before verbal communication. On the individual level, nonverbal communication is present long before verbal communication. A baby is not born knowing how to say she is feeling happy, but she can smile at her mother. Nonverbal communication is also the first channel of communication opened in most interactions. People can size up another individual from a distance and begin to communicate nonverbally before ever saying a word to each other, signaling desired outcomes such as approach or avoidance (Patterson & Tubbs, 2005). The utility of nonverbal communication is manifested in many different ways, including the primary functions of providing information, regulating interactions, expressing intimacy, managing affect, managing impressions, facilitating service and task goals, and exercising influence (Patterson, 1991; Patterson, 2002).

Major Functions of Nonverbal Communication

The first function of nonverbal communication is to provide information. People use facial expressions, posture, and distance of another person to form impressions of that

person (Patterson, 1991). After seeing just a few seconds of behavior, people are better than chance at judging another person's personality and motivation (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1992; Patterson, 2002). Nonverbal communication may help a person to understand his or her own motivations. According to facial feedback theory, a person may make judgments about his or her own mental state based on feedback from facial muscles (Tomkins, 1982). Nonverbal communication can also provide information by qualifying the meaning or impact of a statement. For example, in sarcasm a person's tone can reverse the meaning of the verbal message.

A second function of nonverbal communication is to regulate interactions (Patterson, 2002). Communication could become ineffective without this function. There is a set of cues in conversation that mark when one person is done speaking and the next may begin (Patterson, 1991). For instance, the first speaker may look toward her conversation partner to signal that he may begin. While this is occurring, the listener is giving indications that he or she is paying attention, such as by nodding. Even in situations with no verbal communication, nonverbal behavior may still be used to regulate interactions. For instance, when waiting in line, walking down the sidewalk, or sharing a ride in an elevator, two people make subtle behavioral adjustments to each other that create more comfortable and predictable interactions (Patterson, Iizuka, Tubbs, Ansel, & Anson, 2006).

Expressing intimacy is a third function of nonverbal communication. Nonverbal behavior signals interpersonal attitudes and intentions. This may be evidenced by increased gaze, a light touch, or an increased lean toward a close partner. People who dislike each other may purposefully look elsewhere, turn away, or not offer a hand to

shake when greeting each other (Patterson, 2002). The level of nonverbal involvement generally increases as relationships become more intimate (Patterson, 1991).

A fourth function of nonverbal communication is to manage affect. This is accomplished through adjustments in the level of nonverbal involvement. When a baseball team wins the World Series it triggers intense affect, resulting in the players often coming together on the field and spontaneously hugging and jumping up and down. Negative affect can also trigger responses, as evidenced by someone who has been embarrassed attempting to avoid others (Patterson, 1991).

A fifth function of nonverbal communication is to manage impressions. By manipulating their nonverbal behavior, people can influence the impressions formed by others (Patterson, 2002). That is, people can manage their nonverbal behavior to create desired impressions. In the courtroom, a normally scruffy looking defendant will wear a suit and tie to present a more favorable image to the jury. Conversely, a poker player holding a strong hand may try to appear nervous by wringing her hands or not making eye contact to induce other players to bet more freely. The job interview is an organizational example of a situation where impression management is commonly used. The prospective employee is trying his best to put forward a positive image to obtain employment (Patterson, 1983, p. 115). Prospective employers also attempt to create a positive impression to increase the odds that a candidate will accept an offer or employment, or to ensure that the candidate will remain a loyal consumer of that organization's products in the future.

Facilitating service and task goals is a sixth function of nonverbal communication. The way in which people act in a professional service interaction typically follows a

predictable routine (Abelson, 1981). For example, a person would have a similar experience when going to different dentists. Task goals also influence behavior (Patterson, 1991). A book editor will find a quiet room alone to review a manuscript, while a swimming coach may need to jump in the pool to work very closely with her pupils. Task involvement may also be used as a means to initiate further involvement, such as by joining a church or social group to search for a potential date. The common interest shared by group members allows for the initiation of interaction (Patterson, 1983, p. 126).

The function that is most relevant for the present study is exercising influence. Because this merits extended discussion, the next section focuses specifically on exercising influence.

Exercising Influence

Exercising influence is a form of social control in which people use their nonverbal behavior in an attempt to influence others (Patterson, 1991). Even though it is purposeful communication, the specific nonverbal behaviors used may be activated more or less automatically. For instance, when asking a friend for a favor, a person may be unaware that he is smiling, a behavior likely to boost his chances of having the favor granted. There are various forms of exercising influence, including attempts to persuade or gain compliance from others, to provide feedback to another person, or to dominate others (Patterson, 2002).

Persuasion or compliance-seeking is the first way in which nonverbal communication is used to exercise influence. Mehrabian and Williams (1969) identified several behaviors used by speakers in persuasive appeals: more eye contact, increased

gesturing, affirmative nods, increased facial expressiveness, less self-manipulation, and less of a lean backward. Gaze is particularly important for persuasiveness when speaking (Edinger & Patterson, 1983), though it is less important when listening (Linkey & Firestone, 1990). In an experiment where participants acted as jurors attempting to convince each other of the trial outcome, eye contact was found to be the only nonverbal behavior that distinguished successful from unsuccessful persuaders (Timney & London, 1973). The authors speculate that this was the result of all participants in the study attempting to persuade each other, rather than only one participant attempting to persuade others. When a single actor presented a legal argument to participants, a confident style, consisting of forceful gestures, continuous eye contact, and a less rigid posture was found to be more persuasive than when the actor fidgeted, avoided eye contact, and sat tensely (Maslow, Yoselon, & London, 1971).

Exercising influence can also be witnessed through attempts to provide feedback to another person in an attempt to change behavior (Patterson, 2002). Positive forms of nonverbal feedback include increased smiling and nodding, a forward lean, more frequent gazing, and increased touching. The most effective of these cues are eye contact, nodding, and smiling. Negative forms of nonverbal feedback include increased frowning or scowling, knitted brows, less eye contact, angry/cold vocal tones, and silence (Burgoon, Buller, & Woodall, 1996; Patterson, 2002). There is a small amount of research on communication channel reliance that is set within the organizational performance appraisal feedback context. Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) manipulated the valence of a simulated videotaped manager's verbal and nonverbal feedback. They

found that the nonverbal channel had a significantly greater impact on the subordinate's perceived relationship quality with the manager than the verbal channel.

Exerting dominance is a third way in which nonverbal communication may be used to exercise influence (Patterson, 1991; Patterson, 2002). The nonverbal expression of dominance may be broadly categorized as involving physical potency, resource control, and interaction control (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006). Displays of physical potency can be seen in threats, size and strength, and expressivity. Threats may come through in stares or gazes (Le Poire & Burgoon, 1994). Silence may be treated as a threat when it conveys the recipient has lost status. Subordinates can be frustrated by silence from their supervisor and exhibit detrimental behaviors (Bruneau, 1973). To combat dominance and show subordination, a person may develop a stooped posture, use a hesitant gait, retreat, or expose vulnerable parts of the body (Mehrabian, 1981). Size and strength are another way to exert dominance. In a review of the literature, Burgoon and Dunbar (2006) listed a rapid gait, erect posture, firm stance, animated gestures, loud and deep-pitched voices, rapid speaking tempo, and clear articulation as nonverbal means of expressing size and strength. Physical potency may also be displayed through increased expressiveness (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006). Behaviors indicating increased expressivity include wide smiles, frequent, broad and emphatic gestures, quick and energetic movement, vertical sitting posture, hands away from the body, a smooth voice and rhythmic speech (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006; Gallaher, 1992). Uniforms can also influence perceptions of dominance. Bickman (1974) found that even though most people felt they would not be influenced by how a person is dressed, participants were much more likely to respond to a request asked by a person dressed in high-status

clothing (e.g. a suit and tie) than when the person was dressed in low-status clothing (blue-collar working clothes).

Resource control is reflected in the potential to withhold needed resources (Fridlund, 1991). Dominant individuals often have command of space, allowing them to sit in open body positions and use expansive gestures (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006). In response to this, subordinates take up less space by contracting their sitting position, such as by folding their arms or legs, and using few gestures (Burgoon, Buller, Hale, & deTurck, 1984). Dominant individuals also often hold precedence, in that they are allowed to enter a space or speak first and have the prerogative of initiating and controlling the use of touch (Burgoon, 1991; Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006; Patterson, 2002). When touch is used to convey dominance it is usually one-sided. For instance, a boss may poke his finger into the arm of a subordinate, but the subordinate is not expected to do the same (Burgoon & Bacue, 2003).

Dominance may also be expressed through interaction control (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006; Patterson, 1983). Dominant individuals tend to place themselves in more central locations, allowing them to be protected from threats while holding the place of greatest visual access in the group (Sommer, 1971). Dominant individuals may use gaze to control interactions, as they are more likely to look at their subordinates when speaking rather than when listening. In contrast, subordinates typically look more when the dominant individual is speaking, but look less when they are speaking (Exline, Ellyson, & Long, 1975). Height or elevation in an interaction may express dominance, as the more powerful individual often looks down upon other interactants (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006). Handshakes, distance, and the decision to sit or stand are typically

controlled by dominant individuals, who may also talk more rapidly, interrupt others, or talk more (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006; Hall, Coats, & Smith LeBeau, in press). Finally, dominant individuals may choose nonreciprication as another means to display their dominance, such as by staring with a blank expression at someone who is smiling at them (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006).

In addition to the different forms of nonverbal behavior reflecting influence, outcomes to these attempts provide insight into the importance of nonverbal communication. For example, in the courtroom, an expert witness with a mature face is likely to be perceived as more credible than an expert witness with a babyface (Brownlow, 1992). In the classroom, students with teachers exhibiting high levels of nonverbal involvement provided more positive course evaluations, self-reported higher levels of learning, and, to a lesser extent, showed actual performance improvements (Harris & Rosenthal, 2003). In the workplace, candidate's perceptions of how personable the recruiter was with them were predictive of perceptions of recruiter effectiveness (Connerly & Rynes, 1997). In turn, interviewer ratings of candidates are influenced by both the candidate's verbal responses and nonverbal behavior (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989; Schmitt, 1976). Clearly nonverbal communication plays an important role in attempts to influence others. The effects of nonverbal communication are, however, moderated by a variety of variables, including gender or individual differences. In today's global economy, a particularly relevant moderator in the organizational context is culture (Burgoon & Bacue, 2003).

Culture

No matter where or when people have lived, they have faced shared challenges, such as the need to secure shelter, food, reproduction, and safety. Humans have developed a variety of responses to the challenges found in their environment. Over time these responses become a part of their mental programming. Within a collective, the shared mental programming of its members creates a group's culture (Hofstede, 2001, p. 9). Culture is "the product of the interaction between universal biological needs and functions, universal social problems created to address those needs, and the context in which people live…(Culture) is a shared system of socially transmitted behavior that describes, defines, and guides people's ways of life" (Matsumoto, 2006).

The term culture is often applied at the societal level. Culture is an evolutionary process that is passed on from one generation to the next (Matsumoto, 2006). It is important because it aids in survival by giving people a framework to understand and interact with the world and people around them. Culture allows us to understand similarities and differences between people (Tooby & Cosmides, 1992). It sets standards for decision-making, cooperation, and division of labor (Matsumoto, 2006). In general, culture provides people with guidance in how to succeed in life and overcome challenges. For example, people in all cultures need and have devised a method of communication. Even though the need is the same, the response is different across cultures, as evidenced by the large number of languages spoken across the world today.

Before differences in culture can be discussed, a framework of cultural dimensions must be identified. This framework helps us to understand not only how people interact differently across cultures, but also why they interact differently

(Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996). The best way to understand culture is by identifying specific dimensions on which cultures may vary. Although there are obviously different ways of construing the salient dimensions of culture, a particularly useful structure was proposed by Hofstede (1980; 2001).

Dimensions of Culture

Based on surveys conducted in IBM with respondents from forty different countries, Hofstede put proposed five dimensions of culture: Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity-Femininity, Long- versus Short-Term Orientation, Individualism-Collectivism, and Power Distance (2001, p. 29). These dimensions were based on a factor analysis of the survey data that compared each country's mean responses. Items relating to these dimensions were only validated at the cultural dimension level, not as an individual-differences measure, as the correlations found across countries were not identical to the correlations found across individuals (Hofstede, 2001, p. 65). Uncertainty Avoidance deals with how ambiguity is handled. A high Uncertainty Avoidance culture would create formal rules for behavior and not allow for deviation. Masculinity-Femininity refers to whether values are characterized as more assertive and acquisitive (Masculine), or are characterized as more caring and tolerant (Feminine). Long- versus Short-Term Orientation refers to a culture's persistence, thrift, respect for tradition, and face saving. For example, a management team with a Long-Term Orientation would make decisions based on the future well being of the company rather than on short-term goals (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Power Distance is the extent to which people accept the unequal distribution of power. That is, people in a high Power Distance culture are more accepting of hierarchical social structures. Individualism-Collectivism refers to

how a society balances the interests of the individual vs. the collective. According to

Hofstede, "Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are

loose: Everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family only.

Collectivism stands for a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into

strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them

in exchange for unquestioning loyalty" (2001, p. 225).

Since Hofstede's cultural dimensions were first advanced in 1980, other

researchers have attempted to build upon his work. There was concern that these

dimensions were based on work within one company (Smith & Bond, 1999) and that all

of the researchers held Western values (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987). In a review

of some of these attempts to refine Hofstede's dimensions, Smith and Bond (1999) note

that Individualism-Collectivism is supported by subsequent research. In an attempt to

create a value structure devoid of a Western bias, the Chinese Culture Connection (1987)

created a survey based on important values to the Chinese tradition provided by Chinese

participants. Respondents from twenty-three different countries completed it. One of the

dimensions they found, Integration, was similar to Hofstede's dimension of Collectivism.

A second researcher, Shalom Schwartz, also attempted to create a unique set of cultural

dimensions. Based on a factor analysis of responses to a survey designed to elicit

responses on fifty-six values given to people in over 50 countries, Schwartz (1994) found

seven dimensions that apply at the cultural level. Much like the findings of the Chinese

Culture Connection, one of Schwartz's dimensions, Conservatism vs. Autonomy, is

similar to Individualism-Collectivism. Because Individualism-Collectivism seems to be

particularly robust across different measurement approaches, it may be especially relevant for investigating the effect of culture on the PAI.

Individualism-Collectivism

Both Individualism and Collectivism are apparently present in all cultures, but an emphasis on one or the other can shape social behavior (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996). In an Individualistic culture, people are socialized to view themselves as distinct from others. Although people in Individualistic cultures are still affected by the various groups to which they belong, they learn through their culture that they are unique. Consistent with this focus on each person being unique, Individualistic cultures reward personal achievement (Hofstede & Bond, 1984).

In a Collectivistic culture people are socialized to view themselves as part of an ingroup. Depending on the specific culture, the ingroup may vary, and include the family, company, religion, or other organizations. It is this focus on the ingroup that most differentiates Collectivistic from Individualistic cultures (Triandis, 1988). In Collectivistic cultures it is group membership that is valued over individual identity (Hofstede & Bond, 1984).

The relationship between the individual and the collective is a major influence on societal norms (Hofstede, 2001, p. 210). For example, when a person in an Individualistic culture changes religion, it is unlikely that the rest of her family will follow suit; however, in Collectivistic cultures, it is likely that an entire family would convert together because it keeps their collective identity intact (Hofstede, 2001, pg. 210).

Communication style is another norm influenced by Individualism-Collectivism. The impact of Individualism-Collectivism on communication is evident in the way people interact. One way that Individualism-Collectivism influences communication is through context (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996). Hall's (1976) cultural dimension of low vs. high context communication is nominally different but practically similar to Individualism-Collectivism (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). High-context communication involves most of the information being relayed in the environment or in the speaker's nonverbal communication rather than in the explicitly stated message. Low-context communication involves more direct statements and less ambiguity in the verbal communication (Hall, 1976).

In general, people in an Individualistic culture use more low-context communication because they typically communicate directly with one another. People in Collectivistic cultures generally use high-context communication as evidenced by the large amount of information transmitted, through nonverbal rather than verbal, communication (e.g. hand gestures, use of silence, the setting chosen, etc.). In a Collectivistic culture, it is the responsibility of the listener to infer the meaning of the conversation (Yum, 1988). Clarity is considered an important component of effective communication in Individualistic cultures, where direct requests, rather than inferred meaning, are the most effective strategy to accomplish goals (Kim & Wilson, 1994).

High- and low-context is not the only aspect of communication influenced by Individualism-Collectivism. People in collectivistic cultures suppress emotional reactions in front of in-groups more than people in Individualistic cultures do (Fernandez, Carrera, Sanchez, Paez, & Candia, 2000). This is done to preserve harmony within the

in-group. Individualistic cultures permit emotional exchanges because they help to assert each person's uniqueness. Social relationships are generally not harmed by showing emotion in Individualistic cultures (Fernandez et al., 2000). From an early age, people in Collectivistic cultures learn to keep personal opinions to themselves if they do not match those of the family, whereas people in Individualistic cultures value free speech and expressions (Hofstede, 2001, p. 229). Students in Individualistic cultures are more likely to speak up in class than are their counterparts in Collectivistic cultures. Unlike Collectivistic cultures, in Individualistic cultures the truth may hurt, allowing for adults in these cultures to learn to accept direct feedback constructively (Hofstede, 2001, p. 229).

Individualistic and Collectivistic cultures use language differently. Individualistic cultures tend to use the pronoun "I" while Collectivistic cultures tend to drop this pronoun (Kashima & Kashima, 1998). Hofstede (2001, pg. 233) notes that English happens to be the language used in most Individualistic cultures and one of the few languages that capitalizes the pronoun "I." People in all cultures use statements that do not imply other people, such as "I am tired," but the use of statements referring to a group or category such as "I am a baseball player" are used more frequently in Collectivistic societies (Bochner, 1994). This is likely due to the role of the group in determining identity in these cultures.

Culture and Organizational Processes

As organizations become more international, they are increasingly influenced by culture (Fletcher & Perry, 2001). The human resources practices of an organization must fit the cultural values of its employees for an organization to succeed (Mendonca & Kanungo, 1996). Furthermore, there is no guarantee that research findings obtained in

one culture will hold in a different culture (Smith, Dugan & Trompenaars, 1996).

Organizational performance is higher when management practices match the host

country's cultural values (Newman & Nollen, 1996).

Culture also leads to differences in how people perceive and react to their

workplace. In the PAI, a manager transmits information to an employee, and sometimes,

to make a point, this information needs to be expressed strongly. How this is perceived

may change depending on the cultural values of the person receiving feedback, as people

from different cultures do not necessarily perceive emotions in the same manner. In one

study, Japanese and American participants were shown the same photos of people

expressing different emotions and asked to rate both the external intensity of the

displayed emotion (i.e., how strongly does it appear the subject feels the displayed

emotion) and to make an inference as the intensity of the emotion actually felt (i.e., how

does the subject really feel) by the photo's subject (Matsumoto, Kasri, Kudoh, &

Kooken, 1997). The ratings of Japanese participants showed no significant difference

between the displayed and inferred internal emotional intensity, while the ratings of the

American participants listed displayed emotion as being more intense than inferred

internal emotion. In other words, the American participants downplayed the intensity of

someone else's emotions in comparison to how strongly it was displayed, while the

Japanese participants felt the person experienced the emotion at the same intensity it was

displayed. (Matsumoto, Kasri, Kudoh, & Kooken, 1997). If this contrast between

displayed and inferred emotion is representative of Japanese-American differences, then

it may have implications for the PAI. For example, if a supervisor starts to raise his

voice, expressing frustration with a subordinate, an Individualistic employee may not

think the supervisor is as frustrated as he appears to be and downplay the situation, while a Collectivistic employee may feel that the supervisor is indeed feeling the expressed frustration and react as such.

Further increasing the chances of misunderstandings in the workplace is that Americans tend to pay less attention to an interaction partner's contextual cues while at work than do Asians (Sanchez-Burks, Lee, Choi, Nisbett, Zhao, & Koo, 2003). This same difference in attention to contextual cues is not always found outside of the workplace, where Americans and Asians tend to pay a similar level of attention to contextual cues. Without careful attention to how communications occur, misunderstandings can occur in a culturally diverse workplace (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003). It is imperative that the influence of culture on organizational practices be better understood to improve communication. To do this requires an understanding of how culture should be measured.

The Measurement of Culture

There is some debate over how to measure culture. It has traditionally been measured at the societal or national level (Matsumoto, Consolacion, Yamada, Suzuki, Franklin, Paul, Ray, & Uchida, 2002). Because culture can exist on different levels (Hofstede, 2001, p. 10) and is hard to define, it can be difficult to pinpoint exactly what a culture is and who its members are (Matsumoto, 2006). This may be the reason that many researchers use nationality to define a person's culture. Culture is not always, however, the same as national identity, which does not take into account the vast differences found across the people of one nation, and the similarities shared between people of different nations. For example, Japan is typically thought to be more

Collectivistic than the United States, but a few studies have show that some Japanese samples are similar to or even less Collectivistic than American samples (Matsumoto, Weissman, Preston, Brown, & Kupperbusch, 1997). Because culture is almost never directly measured in cross-national studies, assumptions must be made about its underlying constructs, making it difficult to interpret differences found between nations. While there has been a great deal of research conducted at the general or macro level, there has not been much research conducted at the individual level (Matsumoto et al., 2002).

Recently, researchers have argued for an individual-level approach to research on culture (Bond & Tedeschi, 2001; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998; Yrizarry, Matsumoto, Imai, Kooken, & Takeuchi, 2001). Focusing research at the societal or national level without also measuring culture at the individual level does not address the differences between people within a culture, even people of the same geographic location, gender, race, ethnicity or age. Investigating individual differences in cultural values allows researchers a clearer interpretation of results. The individual measurement of cultural values such as Individualism-Collectivism serves as a manipulation check and eliminates the need to assume members of one nation are homogenous on that value (Matsumoto et al., 1997). It is critical that researchers carefully consider the manner in which culture is measured to investigate business problems properly, rather than blindly rely on cross-national divisions to serve as cross-cultural comparisons. When studying differences between organizational practices across nations, measuring culture at the individual level allows the researcher to check if the samples accurately reflect the assumed cultural values of those geographic areas.

Thus, it is important to understand culture at both the macro (i.e. societal or group) level and at the micro (i.e. individual) level. General cultural information (e.g. Asian cultures value ingroups) and specific cultural information (e.g. Japanese people often value the company as the most important ingroup) are required to understand communication (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996; Triandis, 1988). Differences in Individualism-Collectivism between countries are context-specific (Matsumoto et al., 1997). That is, there are differences in both group and individual behavior across situations that are not captured without context specific assessments of culture.

While Collectivistic cultures place great value on ingroups, this does not mean that they treat all ingroups equally. For example, people in Collectivistic cultures may display more group-centered behaviors at home and more self-centered behaviors at work (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1998). In addition, while the majority of research has found Japanese samples to be more Collectivistic than American samples (Hofstede, 2001), Matsumoto et al. (1997) found that an American sample reported more Collectivistic values and behavior toward family than a Japanese sample, contrary to the generally held belief that Japan is more Collectivistic than the United States. In contrast, in the workplace, there was no significant difference in Collectivistic values or behavior between the Japanese and American samples. Findings such as these stress the value of understanding culture within a given context, such as the workplace.

This focus on context specific measurement of Individualism-Collectivism is a new approach to investigating the effects of culture on behavior. Because past cultural research has not focused on context specific differences, generalizability of previous findings might be questioned. For organizations to make the proper decisions about how

to conduct business and develop employees, the influence of culture on the work environment must be understood. One very real problem facing multinational organizations today is how to appraise and develop employees living in different countries around the globe who respond uniquely to organizational practices. Because it is unlikely that organizations will be able to develop a performance appraisal specific to the cultural values of each individual employee, this research will focus on culture at the national level as it is more realistic that an organization would be willing and able to create a performance appraisal process specific to each country where it operates. While culture will be studied at the national level, it will still be measured at the individual level to check that participants hold the values it is assumed they hold based on their national identity. This research will examine how members of nations representing different cultural values react to different communication channels and types of feedback in the workplace.

Hypotheses

Performance appraisals allow organizations an opportunity to provide feedback to employees about their performance. The valence of both the manager's verbal and nonverbal feedback is likely to influence how the employee reacts to the PAI. In general, positive feedback is related to positive employee reactions to the appraisal process (Kacmar, Wayne, & Wright, 1996). On the basis of past research, positive verbal feedback is expected to lead to more positive employee reactions. Positive nonverbal feedback should also lead to more positive employee reactions, as evidenced by research in many different contexts, such as the courtroom (Brownlow, 1992), the classroom (Harris & Rosenthal, 2003), and in organizational recruitment (Connerly & Rynes, 1997).

Hypothesis 1: Positive verbal feedback and positive nonverbal feedback from the manager will produce (1) more positive affective reactions to the performance appraisal, and (2) more positive affective reactions to the manager than will negative feedback.

Valence is not the only part of the PAI that impacts employee reactions. Another integral part of the manager's communication is the communication channel used to provide feedback. In general, people tend to rely on the nonverbal channel more than the verbal channel, particularly when developing affective reactions, such as forming impressions of a speaker (McMahan, 1976; Rotenberg, Simourd, & Moore, 1989). Because of this reliance on the nonverbal channel over the verbal channel, the effect of feedback valence provided through the nonverbal channel is magnified (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). Based on these findings, the following hypothesis is offered.

Hypothesis 2: An interaction between valence and channel is expected, as the effect of valence will be qualified by channel. Thus, it's hypothesized that the effect of valence will be significantly greater in the nonverbal channel than in the verbal channel.

Finally, it is expected that culture will moderate the relationship between valence and channel. Members of Collectivistic cultures tend to rely more on contextual (i.e. nonverbal) cues while communicating, while members of Individualistic cultures tend to rely more on the explicit message (Hall, 1976; Yum, 1988). This is particularly the case in the workplace, where employees in Collectivistic cultures are significantly more in tune with contextual cues than employees in Individualistic cultures (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003).

Hypothesis 3: A three-way interaction between valence, channel, and culture is hypothesized in that the interaction between valence and channel will be moderated by

culture. That is, the valence by channel interaction will be significantly greater for Collectivists than it will be for Individualists.

Method

Design and Participants

A 2 (Verbal feedback valence: positive vs. negative) x 2 (Nonverbal feedback valence: positive vs. negative) x 2 (Culture: Individualistic vs. Collectivist) factorial design was utilized.

One hundred forty-six participants took part in this study. Participants were divided into Individualists or Collectivists based on their country of origin. The Individualist sample was comprised of 91 participants. All data for the Individualist participants were collected in the United States. Two samples of Collectivist participants took part in the study. Data for twenty participants were collected at a Japanese school, while the remaining thirty-four Collectivists participated at the same University in the United States as the Individualist sample. Table 1 lists the demographic information for participants from each country included in this study. All countries were designated as Individualist or Collectivist based on Hoftede's research (1980; 2001), with the exception of Vietnam (Johnson, 2003), Russia (Naumov & Puffer, 2000), and Nigeria (Gire, 1997), which were not included in Hofstede's work. Data for two participants were not used in the full analysis. The first participant couldn't understand the task and left the study, while the second person's country of origin could not be classified as Individualist or Collectivist, dropping her from any analysis involving culture.

Students at the university in the United States (all Individualists and 34 Collectivists) were asked to participate in exchange for extra credit. They were also

recruited by the experimenter during classes whenever possible or from the international

exchange student population to participate. The 20 Collectivist participants at the

university in Japan received a small cash payment, approximately $5, to participate.

Measures

Reactions to the performance appraisal interview (overall scale alpha = 0.75) were

measured using the satisfaction (alpha = 0.75) and perceived utility (alpha = 0.76)

subscales of the reactions to the performance appraisal process scale (see Appendix A)

developed by Greller (1978). One item from the perceived utility scale was dropped

because it did not accurately reflect what the participants experienced in this study. The

remaining six items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 =

neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and were averaged into an overall

performance appraisal satisfaction score. One of the six items was reverse coded.

Reactions to the manager providing performance feedback were measured using a

nine item scale. Eight of the items are similar to a supervisor reactions scale developed

by Kacmar, Wayne, and Wright (1996). The final item was an overall measure of

satisfaction similar to an item used to measure satisfaction with a manager developed by

Dorfman, Stephan, and Loveland (1986). The nine items that comprised the scale

(overall scale alpha = 0.92) included two items regarding perceptions of the manager's

leadership ability (alpha = 0.73), three items measuring the perceived similarity between

the manager and subordinate (alpha = 0.77), three items measuring subordinate liking of

the supervisor (alpha = 0.77), and one item measuring overall satisfaction with the

manager. These nine items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree,

3 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and were averaged together into an overall satisfaction with the manager score (see Appendix B).

While analyses involving culture treated it as a categorical variable (Individualistic or Collectivistic) based on national origin, it is important to measure the values of the sample to ensure participants hold the assumed value structure based on national identity. The Psychological Collectivism measure developed by Jackson, Colquitt, Wesson, and Zapata-Phelan (2006) was used. Scale items were set within a work context (see Appendix C). This measure consisted of 15 items (alpha = .90) and was scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The scale consisted of 5 subscales, each containing 3 items, measuring Preference (alpha = 0.94), Reliance (alpha = 0.83), Concern (alpha = 0.86), Norm Acceptance (alpha = 0.80), and Goal Priority (alpha = 0.92). Higher scores reflected higher levels of Collectivism.

Participants were asked to complete a short demographics questionnaire (Appendix D). This questionnaire gathered information about the participants' gender, national origin, race, and English-language ability. The English-language ability measure was scored on a 3-point scale (1 = Not well and 3 = Very well).

A check of the verbal and nonverbal feedback manipulations was created (Appendix E). The verbal feedback manipulation check items were based on a scale developed by Greller and Jackson (1997). Items were changed to assess only verbal feedback. These three items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The overall alpha for this scale was 0.90. The nonverbal feedback manipulation check items were adapted from Richmond,

Gorham, and McCroskey's (1987) measure of teacher immediacy. Their 14-item scale was reduced to four items, and revised to reflect the context of the current study. These items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree). One of the four nonverbal feedback manipulation check items was reverse coded. The overall alpha for participants whose data was collected in the United States was 0.74. The twenty participants from the Japanese university inadvertently received a different version of this scale. These items are listed in Appendix F, and had an alpha = 0.83.

Two items were given only to participants from other countries. These items, listed in Appendix G, asked participants how well they understood the manager in the performance appraisal video and how well they understood what the survey asked of them.

Items for each of the scales listed above are broken-down by scale and subscale in Appendix H. While all scales with subscales were averaged into an overall score, subscales are also provided to further illustrate how each variable was conceptualized.

Procedure

Male and female participants were run in separate sessions so that the participants heard a gender appropriate voice on the videotape. At the start of each session, participants were seated individually facing a video screen. Sessions were limited to a maximum of three participants to reduce distractions that may have been produced by larger groups. For a similar reason, all participants were seated at least three feet apart so that they could concentrate on the video rather than each other.

Participants received information regarding their role at a fictitious snack foods company and performance over the past year (the amount of time since their last appraisal). Participants were next shown a videotape of a manager providing performance appraisal feedback. Participants were asked to assume that they are receiving feedback from their immediate manager. After the performance appraisal video was completed, participants were asked to complete ratings on their reactions to the performance appraisal and to the manager providing feedback, the manipulation checks, and the measure of cultural values. Each of these steps is described in more detail below. Appendix I lists the order of procedures.

All participants in each session received the same verbal and nonverbal feedback manipulations as sessions were block randomized. Once everyone was seated at the start of each session, the experimenter explained what is involved in the study and asked participants to complete an informed consent form. The experimenter script is in Appendix J. The italicized portions were read aloud to participants.

Once these are collected, the experimenter passed out the form entitled "Background Information." The same form was used across all conditions, and provided participants information about their company, their job, and their performance over the past year (Appendix K). It is the information provided in this form that served as the foundation for the performance appraisal feedback that the participants received from their manager. The experimenter read through this form with the participants and asked if there are any questions. This process took approximately five minutes.

Once all questions were answered, the experimenter played the performance appraisal interview video. There was a video for each of four different conditions: 1)

Positive verbal and positive nonverbal feedback (Script in Appendix L), 2) Positive

verbal and negative nonverbal feedback (Script in Appendix M), 3) Negative verbal and

positive nonverbal feedback (Script in Appendix N), and 4) Negative verbal and negative

nonverbal feedback (Script in Appendix O). While the manager was the played by the

same person in each video, the voice of the off-camera subordinate (whom the participant

was instructed to think of as "their voice") differed across videos so that male participants

heard a male subordinate voice and female participants heard a female subordinate voice.

Both the male and female subordinate voices read the same script. In each script a

general description of the nonverbal behaviors the manager should exhibit was provided

at the beginning, and then at certain points in the script specific nonverbal behaviors were

listed. The verbal feedback manipulation includes all the text in italics. Appendix P lists

the verbal and nonverbal feedback manipulations across conditions. The video lasted

approximately four minutes.

After the video finished, the experimenter handed out a packet of surveys to each

participant. This packet included the reactions to the performance appraisal interview

scale, the reactions to the manager scale, the culture inventory, a demographics

questionnaire, and the verbal and nonverbal feedback manipulation check. Upon

completion of all scales, participants turned in their materials to the experimenter, who

recorded any necessary information needed for the participants to obtain extra credit.

Pilot Test

The videos used in this study were pilot tested prior to data collection to ensure

that both the verbal and the nonverbal feedback manipulations were successfully

executed in the performance appraisal videos. Seventeen students from a Midwestern

urban university in the United States participated. Participants were assigned to one of two conditions. In the first, participants were asked to watch one of the four video conditions with the sound muted so they could focus on only the manager's nonverbal behaviors. They were then asked to listen to a second video of the opposite verbal valance without being able to see the video so they could focus on the manager's verbal feedback. After each video they were asked to complete a short survey about the manager's verbal or nonverbal feedback (see Appendix Q). In the second condition, they were asked to read a copy of either the positive or negative performance appraisal script so they could focus on the manager's verbal feedback without being influenced by the manager's vocal tone. After reading the script, participants were asked to complete a short survey about the manager's verbal behavior (see Appendix R). Both the verbal and the nonverbal measures consisted of 3 items and were scored on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree), with the scores for each set of 3 items being averaged to create an overall score for both verbal and nonverbal valence perceptions.

Results

Pilot Test

For the verbal feedback condition, participants rated the positive valence ($M = 6.37$, $SD = 0.65$) condition as being significantly more positive than the negative valence condition ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.15$), $t(15) = 8.24$, $p < .01$, $d = 4.08$. For the nonverbal feedback condition, participants rated the positive valence ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 0.84$) condition as being significantly more positive than the negative valence condition ($M =$

1.61, $SD = 0.71$), $t(10) = 8.99$, $p < .01$, $d = 5.22$. Based on these findings, both the verbal

and nonverbal videotaped manipulations were deemed appropriate for use.

Preliminary Analyses

Before testing the hypotheses, a variety of preliminary analyses were conducted.

First, the English comprehension items were examined for possible differences between

the Collectivist samples collected in the United States (referred to as USA Collectivists)

and in Japan (referred to as Japan Collectivists). These self-report items assessed how

well Collectivist participants understood the English language, the manager, and the

survey. For the single item asking participants to rate how well they understood English

there was no significant difference between the USA Collectivists ($M = 2.23$, $SD = 0.72$)

and the Japan Collectivists ($M = 2.11$, $SD = 0.68$), $t(47) = 0.55$, $p = .58$, $d = 0.17$. For the

item assessing how well the survey was understood there was no significant difference

between USA Collectivists ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 0.59$) and Japan Collectivists ($M = 4.35$, SD

$= 0.59$), $t(42) = 1.08$, $p = .29$, $d = 0.32$. The item assessing how well the manager was

understood was also assessed; however, the t-test assumption of homogeneity of

variances was violated, as evidenced by a significant Levene's test for equality of

variance, $F(1, 41) = 8.97$, $p = .01$. That is, the variance in ratings for Japan Collectivists

was significantly larger than the variance in ratings for USA Collectivists. The

distribution of t when variances are heterogeneous is not always the same as the

distribution of t when variances are homogeneous (Howell, 1997). The Satterthwaite

(1946) method was used to adjust the degrees of freedom in this analysis so that the t

based on heterogeneous variances could be compared to the normal t distribution

(Howell, 1997). Using this method a significant difference in how well they understood

the manager, $t(26.60) = 3.22$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.00$, was found between USA Collectivists (M = 4.58, $SD = 0.58$) and the Japan Collectivists ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.18$), matching the findings of the uncorrected test, $t(42) = 3.41$, $p < .01$. Based on this difference in how well the manager was understood, the decision was made not to combine the two Collectivist samples into one sample. Thus the remaining analyses were conducted using three levels of Cultural Group: Individualist, USA Collectivist, and Japan Collectivist. The Japan Collectivists were still included because their data is valuable in assessing the nonverbal feedback manipulation. Japanese and Americans show no difference in success rates of interpreting nonverbal behaviors when verbal language is absent (Iizuka, Patterson, & Matchen, 2002).

Next, the correlations between the two dependent variables and their subscales were computed, as described in Table 2. Reactions to the manager were correlated with reactions to the performance appraisal, $r(143) = 0.63$, $p < .01$. Even though these variables were significantly correlated, they were analyzed separately because there was still a large amount of variance in each that is not accounted for by the other variable. Furthermore, how people react to a manager is a conceptually distinct construct from how they react to an appraisal.

Manipulation checks were conducted for each of the independent variables. First, the assignment of participants to either the Individualist or Collectivist sample based on their country of origin was checked to ensure this sample held the expected cultural values. An ANOVA with Collectivism scores as the dependent variable and the three cultural groups as the independent variable revealed a significant main effect of Collectivism scores for the three groups, $F(2, 140) = 3.84$, $p = .02$, $\omega^2 = 0.04$. As

expected, a subsequent Tukey HSD test revealed that the Collectivism scores of the USA Collectivists ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 0.70$) were significantly higher than the Collectivism scores of the Individualists ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.66$), $p = .03$; however, the Japan Collectivists' ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.65$) scores were not significantly different from either group. It is possible that the Japan Collectivists' scores were not significantly higher than the Individualists' scores as the USA Collectivists' scores were because not all of the Japan Collectivists may have understood the questions as well as the USA Collectivists. Given that Japan Collectivists' scores were nearly 4/10 of a standard deviation higher than Individualists' scores on the Collectivism scale, it is likely that a significant difference would have been found if data had been collected from more than twenty Japan Collectivists.

Second, the verbal feedback manipulation was examined. Positive verbal feedback participants ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.74$) provided significantly more positive ratings on the verbal feedback manipulation scale, $t(143) = 17.39$, $p < .01$, $d = 2.89$, than did participants in the negative verbal feedback participants ($M = 1.74$, $SD = 0.72$).

The nonverbal feedback manipulation check was conducted for each of the two nonverbal manipulation check scales. For participants whose data was collected in the United States, positive nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.55$) rated their feedback as more positive than negative nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 0.64$), $t(123) = 17.68$, $p < .01$, $d = 3.13$. The manipulation was also checked for the data collected in Japan; however, the t-test assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as evidenced by a significant Levene's test for equality of variance, $F(1, 18) = 6.72$, $p = .02$, meaning the variance under negative nonverbal feedback was significantly larger than the variance under positive nonverbal feedback. This is possibly due to the

small sample size ($n = 20$). Again using the Satterthwaite (1946) method as previously described, positive nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.51$) rated their feedback as significantly more positive, $t(13.70)$, $= 3.99$ $p < .01$, $d = 1.78$, than did negative nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.95$), matching the findings of the uncorrected test, $t(18)$, $= 3.99$ $p < .01$. Based on these findings, all manipulation checks, with the exception of the Collectivism scores of Japan Collectivists not differing from the Collectivism scores of Individualists, supported the success of the intended manipulation.

Primary Analyses

     Verbal Feedback

A 2 (Verbal feedback valence: positive vs. negative) x 2 (Nonverbal feedback valence: positive vs. negative) x 3 (Cultural Group: Individualistic vs. USA Collectivistic vs. Japan Collectivistic) factorial ANOVA was used to test the three hypotheses. Overall descriptive statistics are listed in Table 3. ANOVA results for reactions to the performance appraisal are listed in Table 4, and ANOVA results for reactions to the manager are listed in Table 5. For reactions to the performance appraisal, the main effect of verbal feedback valence was significant, $F(1, 132) = 12.94$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.06$, with positive verbal feedback participants ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.66$) reacting more positively to the appraisal than did negative verbal feedback participants ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 0.74$). For reactions to the manager, the main effect of verbal feedback valence was also significant, $F(1, 132) = 28.08$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.10$, with positive verbal feedback participants ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.63$) reacting more positively to the appraisal than did negative verbal feedback participants ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.83$). These results support the first hypothesis,

predicting more favorable reactions to the performance appraisal and to the manager after receiving positive verbal feedback than after receiving negative verbal feedback.

Nonverbal Feedback

For reactions to the performance appraisal, the main effect of nonverbal feedback valence was significant, $F(1, 132) = 11.29$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.05$, with positive nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.73$) reacting more positively to the appraisal than did negative nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 0.69$). For reactions to the manager, the main effect of nonverbal feedback valence was also significant, $F(1, 132) = 26.60$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.10$, with positive nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.76$) reacting more positively to the appraisal than did negative nonverbal feedback participants ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.87$). These results support the first hypothesis, predicting more favorable reactions after receiving positive nonverbal feedback than after receiving negative nonverbal feedback.

Cultural Group

For reactions to the performance appraisal, the main effect of cultural group was significant, $F(2, 132) = 6.28$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.05$. Subsequent means comparison testing revealed that USA Collectivists ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.70$) reacted significantly more positively to the performance appraisal than the Individualists ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 0.75$), $p < .01$; however, the Japan Collectivists' ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.67$) reaction to the performance appraisal scores were not significantly different from either group. For reactions to the manager, there was no significant difference, $F(2, 132) = 1.47$, $p = .23$, $\omega^2 = 0.00$, between the scores of the Individualists ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 0.89$), the USA Collectivists ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.84$), and the Japan Collectivists ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.88$).

Two-way Interactions

There was no significant interaction of verbal feedback valence and nonverbal feedback valence on either the reactions to the performance appraisal, or to the reactions to the manager. Thus, there was no support for the predicted channel x valence interactions on reactions to the performance appraisal or reactions to the manager. The only significant interaction was that between cultural group and verbal feedback valence, $F(2, 132) = 6.91$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.04$. For Individualists, the simple effect of verbal feedback valence was significant, $F(1, 132) = 57.45$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.02$, with positive verbal feedback participants ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.57$) reacting more positively to the manager than did negative verbal feedback participants ($M = 2.43$, $SD = 0.79$). For USA Collectivists, the simple effect of verbal feedback valence was also significant, $F(1, 132) = 16.56$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.01$, with positive verbal feedback participants ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.57$) reacting more positively to the manager than did negative verbal feedback participants ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.71$). For Japan Collectivists, however, the simple effect of verbal feedback valence was not significant, $F(1, 132) = 0.03$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = 0.00$, with positive verbal feedback participants ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.75$) reacting no differently to the manager than did negative verbal feedback participants ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.03$). Rather than showing a true interaction between verbal feedback valence and cultural group, this finding is likely due to the Japanese Collectivists not understanding the manager as well as the USA Collectivists. This interaction is presented in Figure 1.

Verbal Feedback Valence x Nonverbal Feedback Valence x Cultural Group

The three-way interactions of verbal feedback valence, nonverbal feedback valence and cultural group for either reactions to the performance appraisal, $F(2, 132) =$

1.20, $p = .31$, $\omega^2 = 0.00$, or for reactions to the manager, $F(2, 132) = 0.47$, $p = .63$, $\omega^2 =$

0.00, were not significant. These results provide no support for hypothesis 3.

Additional Analyses

Finally, hierarchical regression was used to assess whether the significant effects

of Cultural Group still held after the effect of Collectivism was parceled out. A

regression was run for each dependent variable with the participants' Collectivism scores

entered in step 1, all independent variables entered in step 2, and all interaction effects

entered in step 3. Table 6 lists the results for the regression calculated with reactions to

the performance appraisal as the dependent variable. While the first step was not

significant, $R^2 = 0.01$, $F(1, 141) = 1.77$, $p = .19$, the addition of the three independent

variables entered in step 2 resulted in significant incremental variance above that

accounted for by Collectivism scores, $R^2 = 0.30$, $F(4, 137) = 14.03$, $p < .01$. This was

due to verbal feedback valence and nonverbal feedback valence contributing significantly

to the prediction of reactions to the performance appraisal. Cultural group did not add

significantly to the prediction of reactions to the performance appraisal beyond what was

accounted for by Collectivism scores. This supports Collectivism being responsible for

the main effect of cultural group described earlier, and not another cultural differences

factor. The addition of the interaction effects in step 3 did not account for significant

incremental variance, $R^2 = 0.32$, $F(7, 130) = 0.59$, $p = .76$.

Table 7 lists the results for the regression calculated with reactions to the manager

as the dependent variable. While the first step was not significant, $R^2 = 0.00$, $F(1, 141) =$

0.51, $p = .48$, the addition of both step 2, $R^2 = 0.43$, $F(4, 137) = 25.96$, $p < .01$ and step 3,

$R^2 = 0.51$, $F(7, 130) = 3.06$, $p < .01$ resulted in significant incremental variance above

that accounted for by Collectivism scores. Specifically, verbal feedback valence, nonverbal feedback valence, and the interaction between cultural group and verbal feedback valence contributed significantly to the prediction of reactions to the manager, again mirroring the results of the ANOVA. While the significant interaction suggests that there is an effect of cultural group above and beyond the effect of Collectivism, this is likely due to differences in how well the different cultural groups understood the manager in the video. The results of these two regressions support Collectivism as being responsible for the effects of cultural group.

Discussion

This study attempted to unravel how an employee's cultural values and the type of verbal and nonverbal feedback given by a manager affect reactions to the performance appraisal process. Past performance appraisal research has tended to focus on either verbal or written feedback (Bloom & Hautaluoma, 1987; Van-Dijk & Kluger, 2004), but little attention has been shown to the nonverbal side of feedback (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). One of the few studies in this area found that positive verbal and nonverbal feedback positively affected participants' perceptions of the quality of the relationship they had with their manager. Relationship quality perceptions were more heavily influenced by the nonverbal feedback than by the verbal feedback (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). This study is the first to document the effects of both nonverbal feedback and cultural values in addition to verbal feedback on reactions to the manager and to the performance appraisal itself. As predicted, participants who received positive verbal feedback were more satisfied with the performance appraisal process and with the manager who provided the feedback than were participants who received negative verbal

feedback. This mirrored the results of past research on verbal feedback in performance appraisals (Bloom & Hautaluoma, 1987; Kacmar, Wayne, & Wright, 1996).

Participants who received positive nonverbal feedback were more satisfied with the performance appraisal process and with the manager who provided the feedback than were participants who received negative nonverbal feedback. This supports findings in other areas, such as the classroom, where higher levels of nonverbal involvement (similar to the positive nonverbal feedback valence in this study) were related to more positive course evaluations (Harris & Rosenthal, 2003), as well as in job interviews, where more positive nonverbal behaviors led to more positive outcomes (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989; Schmitt, 1976). Furthermore, positive nonverbal feedback was also related to having a better perceived relationship quality with one's manager (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002).

If positive feedback is merited in performance evaluations, complementing it with positive nonverbal feedback can have additional benefits in the interaction (Patterson, 1983, pp. 107). For example, when speakers receive positive verbal and nonverbal feedback, they talk more (Reece & Whitman, 1962). In contrast, when a manager provides negative nonverbal feedback, employees may become less responsive. Because the sending and receiving of nonverbal behavior occurs simultaneously and outside of conscious awareness (Patterson, 2002), a few poorly timed negative nonverbal behaviors from a manager may start a downward spiral of behavior between a manager and a subordinate.

The effect of both verbal and nonverbal feedback valence was stronger for reactions to the manager than for reactions to the performance appraisal process. The

difference between the effect of verbal feedback valence on reactions to the manager and those to the process was larger in this study than in previous performance appraisal research (Kacmar, Wayne, & Wright, 1996). Of course, this may be due to differences in the magnitude of the verbal feedback manipulation across studies, which are difficult to assess.

It was predicted that the effect of nonverbal feedback valence on both dependent measures would be stronger than the effect of verbal feedback valence on both dependent measures. This hypothesis was not supported. Specifically the verbal and nonverbal feedback manipulations had comparable effects on reactions to the manager and the verbal feedback manipulation had a slightly greater effect on reactions to the performance appraisal than did the nonverbal feedback manipulation. The hierarchical regressions revealed that verbal feedback valence was a better predictor of both reactions to the manager and reactions to the performance appraisal process than was nonverbal feedback valence.

Although there is one study showing that the nonverbal channel had a bigger impact on relationship quality in a performance appraisal context than did the verbal channel (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002), research in other contexts has shown that the verbal channel is typically a better predictor of outcomes than the nonverbal channel. For example, Langer and Wurf (1999) manipulated an interaction in which a confederate initiated either positive or negative verbal and nonverbal behavior toward a participant-partner. The critical dependent measures were the participant's metaperceptions (how an individual perceives that another person perceives him or her). Verbal valence had a greater effect on metaperceptions than did nonverbal valence when the feedback valence

provided in the two communication channels was inconsistent (Langer & Wurf, 1999).

Specifically, a person's metaperceptions were more positive after receiving positive

verbal/negative nonverbal feedback than after receiving negative verbal/positive

nonverbal feedback. Similar larger effects for verbal feedback than for nonverbal

feedback also were found in studies measuring various performance effects (Carlson,

1970; Lair & Smith, 1970). Of course, comparisons of the relative strengths of the

effects are difficult because there is no way of insuring comparability of the verbal and

nonverbal manipulations, either within or across studies.

An interaction between cultural group, verbal feedback valence, and nonverbal

feedback valence was hypothesized for both dependent variables. Because people from

Collectivist cultures are presumably more sensitive to nonverbal communication than are

people from Individualist cultures (Kim & Wilson, 1994; Yum, 1988), it was expected

that the interaction between verbal feedback valence and nonverbal feedback valence

would be stronger for Collectivists than for Individualists. That is, the valence by

channel interaction was expected to be significantly greater for Collectivists than for

Individualists. There was, however, neither a two-way interaction of verbal and

nonverbal feedback valence nor a three-way interaction of culture and nonverbal and

verbal feedback valence. One possible explanation for the lack of significant interactions

in this study may be the inclusion of participants whose primary language was not

English. It is possible that these participants actively focused their attention on the verbal

feedback to ensure they understood it, while neglecting the nonverbal feedback. That is

these participants may have used the more controlled analysis of the verbal feedback as

the basis for their judgments. This is consistent with previous cross-cultural research in

which American and Japanese participants watched, either with or without sound, fifteen short videos of interactions between people (Iizuka, Patterson, & Matchen, 2002). The Japanese participants in the audio-visual condition performed worse than the Japanese participants in the visual-only condition. Even though the Japanese participants witnessed the same nonverbal behavior in each condition, the inclusion of the English-language audio was detrimental to their performance on the task.

Cultural group also had an unpredicted effect on reactions to the performance appraisal. USA Collectivists reacted significantly more positively to the performance appraisal process than did Individualists. Japan Collectivists did not differ significantly from either group. One possibility, based only on anecdotal evidence, is that the USA Collectivists were simply more excited to be in the study. A few of these participants even participated without receiving extra credit in a course, so they may have already been more positively predisposed. Many of the USA Collectivists stayed after the experiment to ask questions of the experimenter and stated that they were interested in learning more about how American businesses are run. This interest was not generally echoed by the Individualist sample. Perhaps this excitement to participate in a business simulation led to the higher mean ratings; however, this possibility does not explain why similar differences were not found between cultural groups in reactions to the manager.

The only significant interaction involving culture was the cultural group x verbal feedback valence interaction on reactions to the manager. Specifically, the Japan Collectivists reacted slightly more positively after receiving negative verbal feedback than after receiving positive verbal feedback, while the Individualists and the USA Collectivists both reacted more positively after receiving positive verbal feedback than

after receiving negative verbal feedback. Rather than being caused by a cultural difference, this finding is likely due to the Japan Collectivists having a poorer understanding of the manager's spoken English than the USA Collectivists did.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The results indicated that while people reacted more positively after receiving positive feedback versus negative feedback in both the verbal and nonverbal channels there was no interaction of the two channels, and culture did not influence reactions differently across communication channel. One possible reason for the lack of significant interactions is that cultural group was not a "clean" variable. Participants from fifteen different countries were included in the USA Collectivist sample. While all fifteen countries are considered Collectivist countries, not all Collectivist countries are the same. For example, one Collectivist culture may have a different referent-group (e.g., company vs. religious faith) than another (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996; Triandis, 1988). Ideally a large enough sample would be collected in future research to allow for participants from different countries to be treated as distinct groups rather than as an overall cultural group.

Another possible reason for the lack of significant interactions may be related to the specific dependent variables used. Participants were asked to complete scales measuring how positive or negative their reactions were to the manager and to the performance appraisal. An alternative dependent measure that may have led to different results would be to ask participants how they would feel after receiving the feedback if they were an employee in that situation. That is, what is the actual impact on them after receiving the feedback in both the verbal and nonverbal channels? Additional dependent

variables such as later performance, how well feedback is utilized or later recall of

feedback would be interesting alternatives to the two affective reactions measured in the

present study. Perhaps a more clearly structured setting, such as a role-play, might be

devised in which a confederate playing the role of manager is trained to deliver positive

or negative verbal feedback to a subordinate while exhibiting positive or negative

nonverbal behavior. A participant in the role of subordinate would receive feedback from

the manager during the interactive role-play, and later complete scales measuring

reactions to the process and to the manager, in addition to completing the proposed

dependent measure described above.

There were two primary limitations involving the materials used. All materials

were provided in English, which may have primed participants to respond in an

Individualist manner. While past research has used only English-language materials and

still found cross-cultural differences in a performance appraisal context (e.g. Li &

Karakowsky, 2001; Milliman, Nason, Zhu, & De Cieri, 2002) as well as in self-reports of

expressed nonverbal behaviors (e.g. Fernandez et al., 2000), there is some evidence that

the language of the stimulus materials provides a cue for the way that participants might

act. In a direct test of the priming effects of language, people randomly-assigned to

receive English-language materials responded in a more Individualist manner, while

similar participants given Thai-language materials responded in a more Collectivist

manner (Sanchez-Burks, et al., 2003). Sussman and Rosenfeld (1982) examined the

effect of language on seating distances. They asked same-country pairs of Japanese,

Venezuelan, and American participants to speak in either their native language or in

English. While participants from each of the three countries sat at different average

distances apart when speaking their native language, they all sat approximately the same distance apart from their conversational partner when speaking English (Sussman & Rosenfeld, 1982). Thus, it seems possible that people can be primed by language to act in a culturally-consistent manner with that language.

The second limitation involving the materials was in terms of how well they were understood by participants. Care was taken to include only participants who could adequately understand the stimulus materials, but the level of comprehension was not equal across groups. Even though Japan Collectivists reported that they understood the videotaped manager, their self-reported level of comprehension was significantly lower than the USA Collectivists' self-reported comprehension. Thus, the one significant interaction (cultural group x verbal feedback valence) was likely not due to actual cultural differences, but rather due to comprehension differences. A second limitation of the video used in this study is that one male Caucasian actor was used to portray the manager in all of the conditions. A review of the literature reveals that both a manager's gender (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002) and ethnicity (Wohlers, Hall, & London, 1993) can influence reactions to the manager. It is possible, particularly because of the diverse group of participants in this study, that using a manager with different demographic characteristics could lead to different findings. For example, it would be interesting to replicate the study with a Japanese manager who provided the verbal feedback in English. Future researchers in this area might also consider translating materials into the participants' native language while using a diverse group of managers. This would require a great deal of work in developing comparable translations, but it would eliminate the comprehension issues associated with testing people in a non-native language.

There are two limitations to this study related to the use of college students as participants in a lab setting. First, while the lab setting allows for better control of the independent variables, the external validity is decreased by not using real subordinate-supervisor dyads in a field setting. Although the USA Collectivists seemed very interested in the study, it is not possible to know how invested the college student participants were. Second, the lab setting did not allow for the ongoing relationship between a manager and a subordinate that is found in an organization. It is possible that this relationship could change how a subordinate reacts to feedback. Their history together may allow the subordinate to understand the manager better and react appropriately, even when there is an inconsistency in valence across channels. It is also possible that subordinates could react differently based on the fear that if they react unfavorably, future interactions with their manager may be negative.

Ideally this research could be conducted in a cross-national organizational setting to understand better the importance of culture, feedback, and communication channel in the context of an ongoing manager-subordinate relationship. An exact replication of this study could not be conducted in an applied setting because it would be unethical to assign positive or negative verbal and nonverbal feedback randomly to employees. Nonetheless, the role-playing scenario described earlier might be one possible way of mimicking a real world interaction. The realism of this research design would likely improve the external validity of the study.

There are also a number of other possible moderators of the link between feedback and performance appraisal outcomes. For instance, the type of relationship between the supervisor and subordinate may play a role. Generally subordinates are

more comfortable receiving negative feedback from their supervisor when they have a good relationship (Klein & Snell, 1994). The format of the performance appraisal also makes a difference. Performance appraisals are more likely to lead to improvements in subordinate performance when subordinates have a chance to participate in the appraisal and give their own views (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Even the format for performance appraisals can affect feedback. For example, performance appraisals given over the computer tend to be less polite than performance appraisals given face-to-face (Sproull & Kielser, 1991).

Next, only one of Hofstede's (2001) five dimensions of culture was examined in the present study. Other dimensions may also be relevant in an organizational setting. Newman and Nollen (1996) found that work unit performance was higher when management practices were matched to the host country's culture for four (Individualism/Collectivism, Power Distance, Masculinity/Femininity, and Long-term vs. Short-term orientation) of Hofstede's (2001) five cultural dimensions. Uncertainty avoidance was the only dimension where this did not apply. It is also unclear whether organizational or national culture has a stronger impact on outcomes to the performance appraisal process. Additional research into areas of culture beyond Individualism/Collectivism would provide insight into these situations.

A final area for future research is to investigate the effects of feedback valence, communication channel, and cultural values on actual performance in the workplace. While the outcomes measured in this study are important, organizations would clearly be interested in how performance is influenced by these variables. It may be that, although

the proposed interactions were not found in the ratings measures of the present study,

they might appear in the actual performance measures.

Conclusions

Performance appraisals are important to an organization's success, as they are a

primary tool in promoting organizational development. They provide a formal

opportunity for employees to learn about how their performance is viewed by their

supervisor, and gives them an opportunity to discuss developmental opportunities with

their supervisor. Performance appraisals are an important function, but much is not

understood about them. Little is known about how a manager's verbal and nonverbal

communications might interact to influence outcomes to the appraisal process.

Furthermore, the effects of culture on the performance appraisal process are not clear.

This research was the first to examine the role of verbal and nonverbal feedback in the

context of a simulated multinational organization. It is possible that people from

countries differing on other cultural dimensions may also show different reactions to

feedback valence and the manager's communication channel. Further research is needed

to understand more fully the importance of culture on a wide range of organizational

practices, including performance appraisal.

References

Abelson, R. P. (1981). The psychological status of the script concept. *American Psychologist, 36*, 715-729.

Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1992). Thin slices of behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 11*, 256-274.

Ang, S., & Cummings, L. L. (1994). Panel analysis of feedback-seeking patterns in face-to-face, computer-mediated, and computer-generated communication environments. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 79*, 67-73

Argyle, M., Salter, V., Nicholson, H., Williams, M., & Burgess, P. (1970). The communication of inferior and superior attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*, 221-231.

Arvey, R. D., & Campion, J. E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. *Personnel Psychology, 35*, 281-322.

Banks, C. G., & Murphy, K. R. (1985). Toward narrowing the research-practice gap in performance appraisal. *Personnel Psychology, 38*, 335-345.

Becker, T. E., & Klimoski, R. J. (1989). A field study of the relationship between the organizational feedback environment and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 343-358.

Bickman, L. (1974). The social power of a uniform. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4*, 47-61.

Bloom, A. J., & Hautaluoma, J. E. (1987). Effects of message valence, communicator credibility, and source anonymity on reactions to peer feedback. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*, 329-338.

Bochner, S. (1994). Cross-cultural differences in the self-concept: A test of Hofstede's individualism-collectivism distinction. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*, 273-283.

Bond, M. H., & Tedeschi, J. T. (2001). Polishing the jade: A modest proposal for improving the study of social psychology across cultures. In D. Matsuomoto (Ed.), *Handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 309-324). New York: Oxford University Press.

Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). 360-degrees feedback: Accuracy, reactions, and perceptions of usefulness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 930-942.

Bretz, R. D. Jr., Milkovich, G. T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management, 18*, 321-352.

Brownlow, S. (1992). Seeing is believing: Facial appearance, credibility, and attitude change. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 16*, 101-115.

Bruneau, T. J. (1973). Communicative silences: Forms and functions. *Journal of Communication, 23*, 17-46.

Burgoon, J. K. (1991). Relational message interpretations of touch, conversational distance, and posture. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 15*, 233-258.

Burgoon, J. K., & Bacue, A. E. (2003). Nonverbal communication skills. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 179-220). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (2006). Nonverbal expressions of dominance and power in human relationships. In Manusov, V., & Patterson, M. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Nonverbal Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Hale, J. L., & de Turck, M. A. (1984). Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. *Human Communication Research, 10*, 351-378.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1996). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Campion, M. A., & Lord, R. G. (1982). A control systems conceptualization of the goal-setting and changing process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30*, 265-287.

The Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 143-164.

Cleveland, J. N., & Murphy, K. R. (1992). Analyzing performance appraisal as goal-direct behavior. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 10*, 121-185.

Connerly, M. L., & Rynes, S. L. (1997). The influence of recruiter characteristics and organizational recruitment support on perceived recruiter effectiveness: Views from applicants and recruiters. *Human Relations, 50*, 1563-1586.

Dorfman, P. W., Stephan, W. G., & Loveland, J. (1986). Performance appraisal behaviors: Supervisor perceptions and subordinate reactions. *Personnel Psychology, 39*, 579-597.

Edinger, J. A., & Patterson, M. L. (1983). Nonverbal involvement and social control. *Psychological Bulletin, 93*, 30-56.

Exline, R. V., Ellyson, S. L., & Long, B. (1975). Visual behavior as an aspect of power role relationships. In P. Piner, L, Krames, & T. Alloway (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication of aggression* (pp. 21-52). New York: Plenum.

Fernandez, I., Carrera, P., Sanchez, F., Paez, D., & Candia, L. (2000). Differences between cultures in emotional verbal and non-verbal reactions. *Psicothema, 12*, 83-92.

Fletcher, C., & Perry, E. L. (2001). Performance appraisal and feedback: A consideration of national culture and a review of contemporary research and future trends. In Anderson, N., Ones, D. S., Sinangil, H. K., & Viswesvaran, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology* (pp. 127-144). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

French, J. R. P. Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In Cartwright, D. (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167), Oxford, England: University of Michigan.

Fried, Y., Levi, A. S., Ben-David, H. A., & Tiegs, R. B. (1999). Inflation of subordinates' performance ratings: main and interactive effects of rater negative affectivity, documentation of work behavior, and appraisal visibility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 431-444.

Fridlund, A. J., (1991). Evolution and facial action in reflex, social motive, and paralanguage. *Biological Psychology, 32*, 3-100.

Gallaher, P. E. (1992). Individual differences in nonverbal behavior: Dimensions of style. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 133-145.

Gire, J. (1997). The varying effects of individualism-collectivism on preference for methods of conflict resolution. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 29*, 38-43.

Gosselin, A., Werner, J. M., & Halle, N. (1997). Ratee preferences concerning performance management and appraisal. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 8*, 315-333.

Greller, M. M. (1978). The nature of subordinate participation in the appraisal interview. *Academy of Management Journal, 21*, 646-658.

Greller, M. M. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal review: Inflexible manager behavior and variable worker needs. *Human Relations, 51*, 1061-1083.

Greller, M. M., & Jackson, J. H. (1997). A subordinate's experience and prior feedback as determinants of participation in performance appraisal reviews. *Psychological Reports, 80*, 547-561.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Matsumoto, Y. (1996). Cross-cultural variability of communication in personal relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey, & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 19-56). Sage Publications.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor.

Hall, J. A., Coats, E., & Smith LeBeau, L. (in press). Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 898-924.

Harris, M. J. (1989). Personality moderators of interpersonal expectancy effects: Replication of Harris and Rosenthal (1986). *Journal of Research in Personality, 23*, 381-397.

Harris, M. J., & Rosenthal, R. (2003). *Teacher nonverbal immediacy and student outcomes: A meta-analysis.* Manuscript in preparation.

Henderson, R. I. (1984). *Performance appraisal* (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: Reston Publishing Company, Inc.

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

Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Cultures consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across cultures* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hofstede, G. H., & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*, 417-433.

Howell, D. C. (1997). *Statistical methods for psychology* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Iizuka, Y., Patterson, M. L., & Matchen, J. C. (2002). Accuracy and confidence on the interpersonal perception task: A Japanese-American comparison. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 26*, 159-174.

Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in an organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*, 349-371.

Jackson, C. L., Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: A measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 884-899.

Johnson, P. J. (2003). Financial responsibility for the family: The case of southeast Asia refugees in Canada. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 24*, 121-142.

Kacmer, K. M., Wayne, S. J., & Wright, P. M. (1996). Subordinate reactions to the use of impression management tactics and feedback by the supervisor. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 8*, 35-53.

Kashima, E. S., & Kashima, Y. (1998). Culture and language: The case of cultural dimensions and personal pronoun use. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 461-486.

Keenan, A. (1976). Effects of nonverbal behavior of interviewers on candidates' performance. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 49*, 171-176.

Kim, M. S., & Wilson, S. R. (1994). A cross-cultural comparison of implicit theories of requesting. *Communication Monographs, 61*, 210-235.

Kinicki, A. J., Prussia, G. E., Wu, B. J., & McKee-Ryan, F. M. (2004). A covariance structure analysis of employees' response to performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 1057-1069.

Klein, H. J., Snell, S. A., & Wexley, K. N. (1987). Systems model of the performance appraisal interview process. *Industrial Relations, 26*, 267-280.

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 254-284.

Kopelman, R. E., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1990). The role of climate and culture in productivity. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 282-318). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lair, C., & Smith, R. K. (1970). Utilization of verbal and non-verbal feedback among college subjects. *Psychological Reports, 27*, 807-810.

Langer, S. L., & Wurf, E. (1999). The effects of channel-consistent and channel-inconsistent interpersonal feedback on the formation of metaperceptions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 23*, 43-65.

Le Poire, B. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1994). Two contrasting explanations of involvement violations: Expectancy violations theory versus discrepancy arousal theory. *Human Communication Research, 20*, 560-591.

Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management, 30*, 881-905.

Li, J., & Karakowsky, L. (2001). Do we see eye-to-eye? Implications of cultural differences for cross-cultural management research and practice. *The Journal of Psychology, 135*, 501-517.

Linkey, H. E., & Firestone, I. J. (1990). Dyad dominance composition effects, nonverbal behaviors, and influence. *Journal of Research in Personality, 24*, 206-215.

Longenecker, C. O., Sims, H. P. Jr. & Gioia, D. (1987). Behind the mask: The politics of employee appraisal. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 1, 183-193.

Maslow, C., Yoselson, K., & London, H. (1971). Persuasiveness of confidence expressed via language and body language. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10*, 234-240.

Matsumoto, D. (2006). Culture and nonverbal behavior. In Manusov, V., & Patterson, M. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of nonverbal communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Matsumoto, D., Consolacion, T., Yamada, H., Suzuki, R., Franklin, B., Paul, S., Ray, R., & Uchida, H. (2002). American-Japanese cultural differences in judgments of emotional expressions of different intensities. *Cognition and Emotion, 16*, 721-747.

Matsumoto, D., Kasri, F., & Kooken, K. (1999). American-Japanese cultural differences in judgments of expression intensity and subjective experience. *Cognition & Emotion, 13*, 201-218.

Matsumoto, D., Weissman, M., Preston, K., Brown, B., & Kupperbusch, C. (1997). Context-specific measurement of individualism-collectivism on the individual level: The IC Interpersonal Assessment Inventory (ICIAI). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28*, 743-767.

McMahan, E. M. (1976). Nonverbal communication as a function of attribution in impression formation. *Communication Monographs, 43*, 287-294.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and attitudes* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mehrabian, A., & Ferris, S. R. (1967). Inference of attitudes from nonverbal communication in two channels. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31*, 248-252.

Mehrabian, A., & Williams, M. (1969). Nonverbal concomitants of perceived and intended persuasiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13*, 37-58.

Mendonca, M., & Kanungo, R. (1996). Impact of culture on performance management in developing countries. *International Journal of Manpower, 4/5*, 65-75.

Mero, N. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1995). Effects of rater accountability on the accuracy and the favorability of performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 517-524.

Milliman, J., Nason, S., Zhi, C., & De Cieri, H. (2002). An exploratory assessment of the purposes of performance appraisals in North and Central America and the Pacific Rim. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 40*, 105-122.

Mohrman, A. M. Jr, Resnick-West, S. M., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1989). *Designing performance appraisal systems: Aligning appraisals and organizational realities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance appraisal: An organizational perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Murphy, K. R., Cleveland, J. N., Skattebo, A. L., & Kinney, T. B. (2004). Raters who pursue different goals give different ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 158-164.

Newcombe, M. J., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: An experimental study. *Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 601-614.

Naumov, A. I., & Puffer, S. M. (2000). Measuring Russian culture using Hofstede's dimensions. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*, 709-718.

Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies, 27*, 753-778.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 963-974.

Patterson, M. L. (1983). *Nonverbal behavior: A functional perspective*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Patterson, M. L. (1991). A functional approach to nonverbal exchange. In R. S. Feldman & B. Rime (Eds.), *Fundamentals of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 458-495). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, M. L. (2002). Psychology of nonverbal communication and social interaction. In the *Encyclopedia of life support systems (EOLSS), Psychology*. Oxford, UK: [http://www.eolss.net].

Patterson, M. L., Iizuka, Y., Tubbs, M. E., Ansel, J., & Anson, J. (2006). *Effects of culture on pedestrian passings: A Japanese-American comparison*. Unpublished data.

Patterson, M. L., & Tubbs, M. E. (2005). Through a glass darkly: Effects of smiling and visibility on recognition and avoidance in passing encounters. *Western Journal of Communication, 69*, 219-231.

Philpott, J. S. (1983). *The relative contribution to meaning of verbal and nonverbal channels of communication: A meta-analysis*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Nebraska.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Farh, J. H. (1989). Effects of feedback sign and credibility on goal setting and task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 44*, 45-67.

Ramamoorthy, N., & Carroll, S. J. (1998). Individualism/collectivism orientations and reactions toward alternative human resource management practices. *Human Relations, 51*, 571-588.

Reece, M. M., & Whitman, R. N. (1962). Expression movements, warmth, and verbal reinforcement. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64*, 234-236.

Reilly, R. R., & McGourty, J. (1998). Performance Appraisal in Team Settings. In Smither, J. W. (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In Anderson, J. A. (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (10th ed.), Bevery Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Roberts, G. E., & Reed, T. (1996). Performance appraisal participation, goal setting, and feedback. *Review of Public Personnel Management, 32*, 29-60.

Roethlisberger, F. J. (1959). *Management and morale*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rotenberg, K. J., Simourd, L., & Moore, D. (1989). Children's use of a verbal-nonverbal consistency principle to infer truth and lying. *Child Development, 60*, 309-322.

Saal, F. E., Downey, R. G., & Lahey, M. A. (1980). Rating the ratings: Assessing the psychometric quality of rating data. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*, 413-428.

Sanchez-Burks, J., Lee, F., Choi, I., Nisbett, R., Zhao, S., & Koo, J. (2003). Conversing across cultures: East-West communication styles in work and nonwork contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85,* 363-372.

Satterthwaite, F. E. (1946). An approximate distribution of estimates of variance components. *Biometrics Bulletin, 2*, 110-114.

Schmit, M. J., & Allscheid, S. P. (1995). Employee attitudes and customer satisfaction: Making theoretical and empirical connections. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 521-536.

Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology, 29*, 79-101.

Schneier, C. E., & Beatty, R. W., & Baird, L. S. (1986). Creating a performance management system. *Training and Development Journal, 40*, 74-79.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universals in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 19-45.

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1999). *Social psychology: Across cultures* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27*, 231-264.

Sommer, R. (1971). Spatial parameters in naturalistic research. In A. H. Esser (Ed.), *Behavior and environment: The use of space in animals* (pp. 281-290). New York: Plenum.

Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. B. (1991). *Connections: New ways of working in the networked organization*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Sussman, N. M., & Rosenfeld, H. M. (1982). Influence of culture, language, and sex on conversational distance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, 66-74.

Timney, B., & London, H. (1973). Body language concomitants of persuasiveness and persuasibility in dyadic interactions. *International Journal of Group Tensions, 3*, 48-67.

Tomkins, S. (1982). Personology is a complex, lifelong, never-ending enterprise. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*, 608-611.

Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1992). Psychological foundations of culture. In J. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind* (pp. 19-136). New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N . (1998). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 323-338.

Tziner, A., Joanis, C., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). A comparison of three methods of performance appraisal with regard to goal properties, goal perception, and rate satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management, 25*, 175-190.

Tziner, A., & Kopelman, R. E. (2002). Is there a preferred performance rating format?: A non-psychometric perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*, 479-503.

Tziner, A., Kopelman, R. E., & Joanis, C. (1997). Investigation of raters' and ratees' reactions to three methods of performance appraisal: BOS, BARS, and GRS. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*, 396-404.

Tziner, A., Kopelman, R. E., & Livneh, N. (1993). Effects of performance appraisal format on perceived goal characteristics, appraisal process satisfaction, and changes in rated job performance: A field experiment. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 127*, 281-291.

Tziner, A., & Latham, G. P. (1989). The effects of appraisal instrument, feedback and goal-setting on worker satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 145-153.

Van-Dijk, D., & Kluger, A. N. (2004). Feedback sign effect on motivation: Is it moderated by regulatory focus? *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53*, 113-135.

Wexley, K. N., & Snell, S. A. (1987). Managerial power: A neglected aspect of the performance appraisal interview. *Journal of Business Research, 15*, 45-54.

Wohlers, A. J., Hall, M. J., & London, M. (1993). Subordinates rating managers: Organizational and demographic correlates of self/subordinate agreement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66*, 263-275.

Yrizarry, N., Matsumoto, D., Imai, C., Kooken, K., & Takeuchi, S. (2001). Culture and emotion. In Adler, L. L., & Gielen, U. P. (Eds.), *Cross-cultural topics in psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 131-147). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communication Monographs, 55*, 374-388.

8

Appendix A
This survey is designed to measure your reactions to the performance appraisal that you just received while in the role of the District Sales Manager. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings about this performance appraisal and how it helped you in your role as the District Sales Manager. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 3 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. The appraisal helped me learn how I can do my job better	1	2	3	4	5
2. I was satisfied with the review	1	2	3	4	5
3. I learned a lot from the appraisal	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel good about the way the appraisal was conducted	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have a clearer idea of what the boss expects from me because of the appraisal	1	2	3	4	5
6. There are many ways in which I would have liked the appraisal to be different*	1	2	3	4	5

*Item 6 is reverse-coded.

Appendix B

This survey is designed to measure your reactions to your Manager in the video who just delivered your performance appraisal. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings about your Manager in the video. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 3 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement. Remember to consider only the Manager in the video while responding to these items.

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. My manager and I share a similar attitude toward work	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel that I would probably like my manager very much	1	2	3	4	5
3. My manager showed good leadership qualities	1	2	3	4	5
4. My manager and I have similar approaches for dealing with problems	1	2	3	4	5
5. I believe that I would very much enjoy working for my manager	1	2	3	4	5
6. My manager seemed to be a natural leader	1	2	3	4	5
7. My manager and I share beliefs about how people should be treated at work	1	2	3	4	5
8. I think my manager would make a good friend	1	2	3	4	5
9. Overall, I was very satisfied with my manager	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C
This survey is designed to measure your view of workgroups. For this survey you are
NOT in the role of the District Sales Manager - Please respond based on YOUR own
views. Think about work groups to which you currently belong, and have belonged to in
the past. If you have not worked in a group before, think of group projects you have
worked on at school. The items below ask about your relationship with, and thoughts
about, *those particular groups*. Respond to the following questions, as honestly as
possible, by using the response scales provided (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly
Agree)." Remember to respond based on YOUR views and experiences; you are no
longer playing the role of the District Sales Manager.

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. I preferred to work in those groups rather than working alone.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Working in those groups was better than working alone.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I wanted to work with those groups as opposed to working alone.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I felt comfortable trusting group members to do their part.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I was not bothered by the need to rely on group members.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I felt comfortable trusting group members to handle their tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The health of those groups was important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I cared about the well-being of those groups.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I was concerned about the needs of those groups.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I followed the norms of those groups.	1	2	3	4	5

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
11. I followed the procedures of those groups.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I accepted the rules of those groups.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I cared more about the goals of those groups than my own goals.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I emphasized the goals of those groups more than my individual goals.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Group goals were more important to me than my personal goals.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D

Please circle the choice to each question below that best reflects you.

1. Gender:

    a. Male

    b. Female

2. Race:

    a. Caucasian

    b. African-American

    c. Asian

    d. Hispanic

    e. Other (Please List): _____

3. Country of Origin:

    a. United States

    b. Japan

    c. Other (Please List): _____

4. Is English your first language?

    a. Yes

    b. No (please answer question below)

5. If No, how well do you understand spoken and written English?

    a. Very Well

    b. Well

    c. Not Well

Appendix E

For this survey please once again respond based on the videotaped performance appraisal you just watched. Below are several statements designed to measure your impressions of the videotaped performance appraisal. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your impression. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 3 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. The manager nodded at me	1	2	3	4	5
2. Much of what the manager said in the appraisal was positive**	1	2	3	4	5
3. The manager maintained eye contact with me throughout the conversation	1	2	3	4	5
4. The manager said my work was more than satisfactory**	1	2	3	4	5
5. The manager crossed his arms across his chest during the conversation*	1	2	3	4	5
6. Praise outweighed criticism in this review**	1	2	3	4	5
7. The manager smiled at me during the conversation	1	2	3	4	5

*Item 5 is reverse-coded
** Verbal feedback manipulation check item (items 2, 4, and 6)

Appendix F

For this survey please once again respond based on the videotaped performance appraisal you just watched. Below are several statements designed to measure your impressions of the videotaped performance appraisal. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your impression. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 3 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. The manager gestured when speaking	1	2	3	4	5
2. Much of what the manager said in the appraisal was positive**	1	2	3	4	5
3. The manager used a monotone/dull voice when speaking*	1	2	3	4	5
4. The manager made eye contact with me while speaking	1	2	3	4	5
5. The manager said my work was more than satisfactory**	1	2	3	4	5
6. The manager had a very relaxed body position	1	2	3	4	5
7. During the conversation, the manager smiled at me	1	2	3	4	5
8. Praise outweighed criticism in this review**	1	2	3	4	5

*Item 3 is reverse-coded
** Verbal feedback manipulation check item (items 2, 5, and 8)

Appendix G
This last survey is a check of how well you were able to understand the manager on the video you watched and the other surveys you have completed. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your impression. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 3 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Agree
1. I understood what the manager said during the performance appraisal	1	2	3	4	5
2. I understood the questions asked of me on these surveys	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix H

<u>Reactions to the Appraisal</u>

Perceived Utility

1. The appraisal helped me learn how I can do my job better.

2. I learned a lot from the appraisal.

3. I have a clearer idea of what the boss expects from me because of the appraisal.

Satisfaction

1. I was satisfied with the review.

2. I feel good about the way the appraisal was conducted.

3. There are many ways in which I would have liked the appraisal to be different.*

* Item 3 is reverse-coded

<u>Reactions to the Manager</u>

Perceptions of Leadership Ability

1. My manager showed good leadership qualities.

2. My manager seemed to be a natural leader.

Perceived Similarity

1. My manager and I share a similar attitude toward work.

2. My manager and I have similar approaches for dealing with problems.

3. My manager and I share beliefs about how people should be treated at work.

Liking

1. I feel that I would probably like my manager very much.

2. I believe that I would very much enjoy working for my manager.

3. I think my manager would make a good friend.

Satisfaction

1. Overall, I was very satisfied with my manager.

Psychological Collectivism Measure

Preference

1. I preferred to work in those groups rather than working alone.

2. Working in those groups was better than working alone.

3. I wanted to work with those groups as opposed to working alone.

Reliance

4. I felt comfortable counting on group members to do their part.

5. I was not bothered by the need to rely on group members.

6. I felt comfortable trusting group members to handle their tasks.

Concern

7. The health of those groups was important to me.

8. I cared about the well-being of those groups.

9. I was concerned about the needs of those groups.

Norm acceptance

10. I followed the norms of those groups.

11. I followed the procedures used by those groups.

12. I accepted the rules of those groups.

Goal priority

13. I cared more about the goals of those groups than my own goals.

14. I emphasized the goals of those groups more than my individual goals.

15. Group goals were more important to me than my personal goals.

Demographic Questionnaire

1. Gender

2. Race

3. Country of Origin

4. Is English your first language?

5. If No, how well do you understand spoken and written English?

Verbal Feedback Manipulation Check

1. Much of what the manager said in the appraisal was positive.

2. The manager said my work was more than satisfactory.

3. Criticism outweighed praise in this review.

Nonverbal Feedback Manipulation Check – USA Data Collection

1. The manager nodded at me.

2. The manager maintained eye contact with me throughout the conversation.

3. The manager crossed his arms across his chest during the conversation.

4. The manager smiled at me during the conversation.

*Item 3 is reverse-coded.

Nonverbal Feedback Manipulation Check – Japan Data Collection

1. The manager gestured when speaking.

2. The manager used a monotone/dull voice when speaking.*

3. The manager made eye contact with me while speaking.

4. The manager had a very relaxed body position.

5. During the conversation, the manager smiled at me.

*Item 2 is reverse-coded.

Additional English Comprehension Items – Non-USA Participants Only

1. I understood what the manager said during the performance appraisal.

2. I understood the questions asked of me on these surveys.

Appendix I

Order of Procedures

1. Introduction

2. Participants read scenario explaining past performance

3. Participants watch one of four videotaped performance appraisal interviews (Gender of off-camera voice matched to gender of participants for each condition)

    3a. Condition 1: Positive verbal, positive nonverbal feedback

    3b. Condition 2: Positive verbal, negative nonverbal feedback

    3c. Condition 3: Negative verbal, positive nonverbal feedback

    3d. Condition 4: Negative verbal, negative nonverbal feedback

4. Participants complete all surveys

    4a. Reactions to appraisal

    4b. Reactions to supervisor

    4c. Culture inventory

    4d. Demographic survey

    4e. Verbal and nonverbal feedback valence manipulation check

    4f. Comprehension check (Non-American participants only)

Appendix J

Experimenter Script

Pre-Session

- Set-up room so that every seat has an unobstructed view of the video monitor

- Determine feedback condition

- Select correct DVD segment prior to the session beginning

- Have materials and a pen or pencil for each participant

Session

Experimenter directions: Read the *italicized* sections out loud to participants. Perform the actions described in ALL CAPS. Don't forget to put the "Do Not Disturb" sign on the door of the room.

Introduction: *"Hello everyone, my name is (_____), and I will be the experimenter today. Thank you for participating in this research. This study is designed to assess how people of different cultures respond to performance feedback. Before we begin I need you to read this informed consent form. You will each receive two copies. Please sign both and return them to me. I will sign both copies, and return one to you so that you have a record of being here."*

HAND OUT: Informed Consent forms and Pencils.

COLLECT: Signed Informed Consent forms.

"During today's session you will be asked to place yourself in the role of a district sales manager for an international snack foods company. It is time for your annual performance appraisal. In a few moments you will be given some background information to review. This information provides everything you need to know for today's study about the company you work for, your job, and your performance over the last year. You will watch a video of your manager giving you feedback about your performance. After the video is over you will be asked to complete several short surveys about your work values and your perceptions of your performance appraisal."

"In exchange for your participation you will receive extra credit in one of your courses. Does anyone have any questions?"

HAND OUT: Background Information

Allow all participants enough time to review the background information. Then ask:

"Has everyone had enough time to read the Background Information?"

Allow more time if needed, then read the following text once everyone has completed reading the Background Information.

"I'd like to quickly review that information with you. You are playing the role of a

district sales manager at a large international company called the Tasty Snack Foods

Company, or TSF for short. TSF sells a variety of snack foods, beverages, and frozen

desserts and is one of the leading snack food companies in the world. As the district

sales manager in a large city it is your responsibility to protect your current customer

base while adding new customers. You are also responsible for getting new products into

stores and for managing the sales force in your city. Does anyone have any questions so

far?"

Answer any questions, and then read the following:

"You had three goals to achieve during the last year. The first goal was to increase sales

by 4% over the previous year. While snack food sales were down, sales of frozen desserts

were up, enabling you to accomplish this goal. Your second goal was to get 33% of your

accounts to begin selling the new Yummy Pop! frozen dessert. You were close to

reaching this goal as 29% of your customers began carrying the Yummy Pop! frozen

dessert, and you likely would have surpassed this goal if one of your major accounts

hadn't stopped carrying frozen products altogether. Your third and final goal was to

achieve a customer satisfaction score of at least 95% on TSF's new customer satisfaction

survey. You received a customer satisfaction score of 78% and you feel that this is

primarily due to the number of new delivery drivers you had in your market this year.

There were a number of problems with orders as the new drivers learned their jobs, but

they have all been trained now and are delivering correct orders. Does anyone have any

questions about the three goals you were expected to achieve this year and your

performance toward reaching those goals?"

Answer any questions, and then read the following:

"I will now play for you a video of you receiving your performance appraisal from your

manager. You will only see the manager on the video, but you will occasionally hear a

response to the manager. Think of this as YOUR voice and YOUR response. Remember,

you are in the role of the district sales manager receiving this feedback."

PLAY: Video for only the predetermined feedback condition. Video should be matched

to participant gender.

During this time the experimenter should sign the informed consent forms so that one

may be returned to each participant at the end of the study.

Once the video is complete:

HAND OUT: Survey Packet

Then read the following:

"I have several short surveys I'd like you to complete. The instructions for each survey are at the top of the page. Pay close attention to these instructions. For some of the surveys you'll be asked to respond based on your views as the District Sales Manager who just received the performance appraisal, and for others you'll be asked to respond with your own views. Please circle what you feel is the best answer to each survey item. Do not move on to a new page until you have completed the previous page. Once you turn to a new page, you may not go back. Raise your hand if you have a question while completing the surveys and I will come to your desk to answer it. Once you are finished, please bring all of your materials, including the background information and the survey packet to me at the front of the room. Thank you for your participation in today's study."

COLLECT: Background Information and Survey Packet documents. The Background Information form may be recycled. The Informed Consent form and Survey Packet must be kept.

Post-Session

- Label packet with feedback condition
- Return packet to Jim Matchen

Appendix K
Background Information

This study is designed to look at the impact of feedback on outcomes to the performance appraisal process. During this study you will be in the role of a district sales manager at a snack food and beverage company. You work at a large organization and it is time for you to receive your annual performance appraisal. First you will have an opportunity to review the information below so that you will be adequately prepared for the performance appraisal meeting. You will then watch a video of your manager giving you feedback based on your performance. After the video you will be asked to complete a few short surveys about your thoughts on the performance appraisal meeting you'll watch on the video.

Below is all of the information you need to know about this company, what your job involves, and how you have performed over the past year. If you have any questions, please ask the experimenter immediately.

Company
You work at the Tasty Snack Foods Company (TSF). TSF is an international company that produces and sells a variety of snack foods, beverages, and frozen desserts. TSF is the first or second leading snack foods company in terms of sales volume in every market it is in.

Tasty Snack Foods Company Products		
Snack Foods	**Beverages**	**Frozen Desserts**
Pretzels	Tea	Vanilla Ice Cream
Cupcakes	Cola	Chocolate Ice Cream
Raisins	Orange Juice	Strawberry Ice Cream
Potato Chips	Sports Drink	Popsicles
Chocolate Bars	Coffee	Ice Cream Sandwiches
Peanuts		Yummy Pop!
Fruit Bars		
Brownies		

Your Job
You are the district sales manager for a sales office of TSF in a large city within your country. Within your district you are currently responsible for 25 customer accounts. The customer accounts are generally convenience stores that sell drinks and snacks to busy customers that stop in to get something quick and easy to eat or drink.

As the district sales manager, you have several responsibilities, including:
- Manage customer accounts
- Introduce new products into the stores
- Manage the district sales force

<u>Your Manager's Expectations for the Past Year</u>
After your performance appraisal last year your manager set several goals for you to achieve this year. In your next performance appraisal you will be measured against how well you did at achieving these goals. Specifically you set three main goals. The goals, and your performance toward reaching each goal, are listed below. Remember, it is how you performed in achieving these goals that will be discussed at your upcoming performance appraisal.

Goal 1: Increase sales in the district by 4% over the past year's sales.

Your Goal 1 Performance: You made this goal exactly as this year's sales increased by 4% over last year's sales. This was due primarily to additional sales of new frozen dessert products. Sales of snack foods did decline slightly, and beverage sales were approximately the same as the previous year.

Goal 2: Introduce the new Yummy Pop! frozen dessert in your region and get it on the store shelves of at least 33% of customer accounts.

Your Goal 2 Performance: You were able to sell the new Yummy Pop! frozen dessert product into 29% of your customer accounts. It is likely you would have been able to sell this product into more stores, but early in the year one of your major accounts decided to remove all frozen products from all of its stores in the city.

Goal 3: Because it is important that you maintain strong relationships with each of your customer accounts so that they do not decide to switch to your competition, TSF has decided to begin collecting customer satisfaction data. Your manager has set a goal for you of at least 95% of your customers being satisfied with the service you provide and TSF's product line.

Your Goal 3 Performance: Your customers gave you a positive satisfaction rating of 78%. This was similar to the ratings received by other district sales managers in your area, but well below the average score for the entire company, which was 89%. You feel that your score would have been much higher if it hadn't been for heavy turnover among your delivery team during the past 12 months. Many of the people delivering products into the stores were new this year, and there were some problems as these new drivers learned their jobs. The primary problem was that products were either not delivered on time, or the wrong products were delivered. Now that they have more experience, in the last month your delivery drivers have done a much better job.

Appendix L

Performance Appraisal Script: Positive Verbal/Positive Nonverbal Feedback

Positive Nonverbal Feedback Condition (+NV):

The manager should maintain eye contact with the camera the majority of the time. The manager should smile and nod his head as directed. While the subordinate discusses his/her performance toward reaching the three goals, the manager should nod his head at the end of each statement.

Manager (ARMS RELAXED): Hi, thank you for coming in today. **(SMILE)** I called you to my office because it is time for your performance appraisal. Each employee receives an appraisal once a year, and **(PICK-UP PAPER)** I see it's been about 12 months since the last time you received your appraisal. I'd like to go over your performance for the last year and talk about your future work. If you have any questions, go ahead and ask them as you think of them.

District Sales Manager (DSM): Okay, that sounds fine.

Manager: As you know, last year we set 3 goals for you to achieve. In this meeting I'd like to discuss whether you were able to achieve these goals. To determine how well you did, I reviewed a number of pieces of information to ensure I would be able to give you valuable feedback. I reviewed sales data in your district, data from the recent customer satisfaction survey, and I also spoke to a few of your customers. Do you have any questions so far?

DSM: No, I understand, it sounds like you reviewed everything you could about my performance.

Manager: That's correct, I wanted to gather as much data as possible to make this a fair process. Now, let's move on to discussing each of the 3 goals individually. For each goal I'll state what the goal was, how I viewed your performance toward reaching that goal, and then allow you to provide any additional information or ask any questions you may have. Are you ready to begin?

DSM: Yes, I'm ready.

Manager: Your first goal was to increase sales in your district by 4% over the previous year's sales. (**SMILE**) I see that you met this goal. *I know it was a tough year for sales of snack foods and beverages, but I was very impressed that you were able to make up for this by increasing sales of frozen desserts. Good job using the new products to boost sales!*

DSM: It was a tough year to sell snack foods as the competition is increasing, but I can do a better job next year at that.

Manager (DOUBLE NOD): That's good to hear. Unless you have anything further to add, I'd like to move on to your second goal for the year, which was to get at least 33%

of your customer accounts to carry our newest product, the Yummy Pop! frozen dessert. According to the sales data, 29% of your customers are currently selling this product.

DSM: That sounds about right. I would have done better, but one of my major customer accounts decided that they were no longer going to sell frozen products and removed all of the freezers from their stores.

Manager (LEAN FORWARD): *I was aware of that, and it clearly had an impact on your sales numbers. Based on how well you've done in achieving your other goals, (SMILE) I'm confident you would have achieved this goal as well if that customer account had continued to stock frozen products.*

DSM: Well, the customer dropping frozen products was out of my control, but I still tried my best to achieve the goal we set last year. Even though my results for this goal and the third goal were not as high as I had hoped, I am still very proud of the work I did.

Manager (SMILE): Let's talk about that third and final goal. Your goal was to receive favorable satisfaction feedback from at least 95% of your accounts. The results of the survey showed that 78% were satisfied.

DSM: I can explain that. I had several new delivery drivers this year, and it took them a long time to learn their jobs. If you were to ask my customers today, they would likely be more satisfied now than when they were first questioned.

Manager (DOUBLE NOD): *That's true, there are problems when you have new employees who are still learning their jobs, and the other district sales managers in your region received similar customer satisfaction ratings. (SMILE) Overall, you did a good job training so many new employees in the past year and still maintaining high levels of satisfaction from most of your customers.*

DSM: I appreciate your feedback. Next year I am expecting less turnover, so there should be fewer problems, and the customers should be more satisfied.

Manager: Okay **(NOD)**. Well that is all I wanted to talk about today. **(SMILE)** *Overall I was very happy with your performance. This year keep up the good work and you'll be sure to continue reaching your goals.* Do you have any questions for me before you go?

DSM: No, I don't have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Manager: You're welcome. We'll talk again soon.

Appendix M

Performance Appraisal Script: Positive Verbal/Negative Nonverbal Feedback

Negative Nonverbal Feedback Condition (-NV):

The manager should reduce eye contact with the camera, either looking down at the desk or looking off to the side. The manager should frown and shake his head as directed. While the subordinate discusses his/her performance toward reaching the three goals, the manager should shake his head at the end of each statement.

Manager (ARMS CROSSED): Hi, thank you for coming in today. **(FROWN)** I called you to my office because it is time for your performance appraisal. Each employee receives an appraisal once a year, and **(PICK-UP PAPER)** I see it's been about 12 months since the last time you received your appraisal. I'd like to go over your performance for the last year and talk about your future work. If you have any questions, go ahead and ask them as you think of them.

District Sales Manager (DSM): Okay, that sounds fine.

Manager: As you know, last year we set 3 goals for you to achieve. In this meeting I'd like to discuss whether you were able to achieve these goals. To determine how well you did, I reviewed a number of pieces of information to ensure I would be able to give you valuable feedback. I reviewed sales data in your district, data from the recent customer satisfaction survey, and I also spoke to a few of your customers. Do you have any questions so far?

DSM: No, I understand, it sounds like you reviewed everything you could about my performance.

Manager: That's correct, I wanted to gather as much data as possible to make this a fair process. Now, let's move on to discussing each of the 3 goals individually. For each goal I'll state what the goal was, how I viewed your performance toward reaching that goal, and then allow you to provide any additional information or ask any questions you may have. Are you ready to begin?

DSM: Yes, I'm ready.

Manager: Your first goal was to increase sales in your district by 4% over the previous year's sales. **(FROWN)** I see that you met this goal. *I know it was a tough year for sales of snack foods and beverages, but I was very impressed that you were able to make up for this by increasing sales of frozen desserts. Good job using the new products to boost sales!*

DSM: It was a tough year to sell snack foods as the competition is increasing, but I can do a better job next year at that.

Manager (SHAKE HEAD): That's good to hear. Unless you have anything further to add, I'd like to move on to your second goal for the year, which was to get at least 33%

of your customer accounts to carry our newest product, the Yummy Pop! frozen dessert. According to the sales data, 29% of your customers are currently selling this product.

DSM: That sounds about right. I would have done better, but one of my major customer accounts decided that they were no longer going to sell frozen products and removed all of the freezers from their stores.

Manager (LEAN BACK): *I was aware of that, and it clearly had an impact on your sales numbers. Based on how well you've done in achieving your other goals, (FROWN) I'm confident you would have achieved this goal as well if that customer account had continued to stock frozen products.*

DSM: Well, the customer dropping frozen products was out of my control, but I still tried my best to achieve the goal we set last year. Even though my results for this goal and the third goal were not as high as I had hoped, I am still very proud of the work I did.

Manager (FROWN): Let's talk about that third and final goal. Your goal was to receive favorable satisfaction feedback from at least 95% of your accounts. The results of the survey showed that 78% were satisfied.

DSM: I can explain that. I had several new delivery drivers this year, and it took them a long time to learn their jobs. If you were to ask my customers today, they would likely be more satisfied now than when they were first questioned.

Manager (SHAKE HEAD): *That's true, there are problems when you have new employees who are still learning their jobs, and the other district sales managers in your region received similar customer satisfaction ratings.* ***(FROWN)*** *Overall, you did a good job training so many new employees in the past year and still maintaining high levels of satisfaction from most of your customers.*

DSM: I appreciate your feedback. Next year I am expecting less turnover, so there should be fewer problems, and the customers should be more satisfied.

Manager: Okay **(SHAKE HEAD)**. Well that is all I wanted to talk about today. **(FROWN)** *Overall I was very happy with your performance. This year keep up the good work and you'll be sure to continue reaching your goals.* Do you have any questions for me before you go **(ARMS CROSSED)**?

DSM: No, I don't have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Manager: You're welcome. We'll talk again soon.

Appendix N

Performance Appraisal Script: Negative Verbal/Positive Nonverbal Feedback

Positive Nonverbal Feedback Condition (+NV):

The manager should maintain eye contact with the camera the majority of the time. The manager should smile and nod his head as directed. While the subordinate discusses his/her performance toward reaching the three goals, the manager should nod his head at the end of each statement.

Manager (ARMS RELAXED): Hi, thank you for coming in today. **(SMILE)** I called you to my office because it is time for your performance appraisal. Each employee receives an appraisal once a year, and **(PICK-UP PAPER)** I see it's been about 12 months since the last time you received your appraisal. I'd like to go over your performance for the last year and talk about your future work. If you have any questions, go ahead and ask them as you think of them.

District Sales Manager (DSM): Okay, that sounds fine.

Manager: As you know, last year we set 3 goals for you to achieve. In this meeting I'd like to discuss whether you were able to achieve these goals. To determine how well you did, I reviewed a number of pieces of information to ensure I would be able to give you valuable feedback. I reviewed sales data in your district, data from the recent customer satisfaction survey, and I also spoke to a few of your customers. Do you have any questions so far?

DSM: No, I understand, it sounds like you reviewed everything you could about my performance.

Manager: That's correct, I wanted to gather as much data as possible to make this a fair process. Now, let's move on to discussing each of the 3 goals individually. For each goal I'll state what the goal was, how I viewed your performance toward reaching that goal, and then allow you to provide any additional information or ask any questions you may have. Are you ready to begin?

DSM: Yes, I'm ready.

Manager: Your first goal was to increase sales in your district by 4% over the previous year's sales. **(SMILE)** I see that you met this goal. *While your overall sales numbers were fine because you increased sales of frozen desserts, I was disappointed in how your sales in other areas declined. You should have done better with selling the snack foods.*

DSM: It was a tough year to sell snack foods as the competition is increasing, but I can do a better job next year at that.

Manager (DOUBLE NOD): That's good to hear. Unless you have anything further to add, I'd like to move on to your second goal for the year, which was to get at least 33%

of your customer accounts to carry our newest product, the Yummy Pop! frozen dessert. According to the sales data, 29% of your customers are currently selling this product.

DSM: That sounds about right. I would have done better, but one of my major customer accounts decided that they were no longer going to sell frozen products and removed all of the freezers from their stores.

Manager (LEAN FORWARD): *I was aware of that, but you can't use that as an excuse for not reaching a goal. Based on your failure in achieving your other goals, (**SMILE**) I doubt you would have achieved this goal even if that customer account had continued to stock frozen products.*

DSM: Well, the customer dropping frozen products was out of my control, but I still tried my best to achieve the goal we set last year. Even though my results for this goal and the third goal were not as high as I had hoped, I am still very proud of the work I did.

Manager (SMILE): Let's talk about that third and final goal. Your goal was to receive favorable satisfaction feedback from at least 95% of your accounts. The results of the survey showed that 78% were satisfied.

DSM: I can explain that. I had several new delivery drivers this year, and it took them a long time to learn their jobs. If you were to ask my customers today, they would likely be more satisfied now than when they were first questioned.

Manager (DOUBLE NOD): *That's true, but it is your responsibility to make sure that your customers still receive quality service even when you have new employees, and district sales managers from throughout the entire company actually had a much higher average customer satisfaction rating than you did.* **(SMILE)** *If you had trained your new employees well, you could have kept your customers satisfied.*

DSM: I appreciate your feedback. Next year I am expecting less turnover, so there should be fewer problems, and the customers should be more satisfied.

Manager: Okay **(NOD)**. Well that is all I wanted to talk about today. **(SMILE)** *Overall I was disappointed with your performance. This year you'll need to do a much better job of reaching your goals.* Do you have any questions for me before you go*?*

DSM: No, I don't have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Manager: You're welcome. We'll talk again soon.

Appendix O

Performance Appraisal Script: Negative Verbal/Negative Nonverbal Feedback

Negative Nonverbal Feedback Condition (-NV):

The manager should frequently break eye contact with the camera, either looking down at the desk or looking off to the side. The manager should frown, shake his or her head, and lean back in the chair. While the subordinate discusses his/her performance toward reaching the three goals, the manager should shake his head at the end of each statement.

Manager (ARMS CROSSED): Hi, thank you for coming in today. **(FROWN)** I called you to my office because it is time for your performance appraisal. Each employee receives an appraisal once a year, and **(PICK-UP PAPER)** I see it's been about 12 months since the last time you received your appraisal. I'd like to go over your performance for the last year and talk about your future work. If you have any questions, go ahead and ask them as you think of them.

District Sales Manager (DSM): Okay, that sounds fine.

Manager: As you know, last year we set 3 goals for you to achieve. In this meeting I'd like to discuss whether you were able to achieve these goals. To determine how well you did, I reviewed a number of pieces of information to ensure I would be able to give you valuable feedback. I reviewed sales data in your district, data from the recent customer satisfaction survey, and I also spoke to a few of your customers. Do you have any questions so far?

DSM: No, I understand, it sounds like you reviewed everything you could about my performance.

Manager: That's correct, I wanted to gather as much data as possible to make this a fair process. Now, let's move on to discussing each of the 3 goals individually. For each goal I'll state what the goal was, how I viewed your performance toward reaching that goal, and then allow you to provide any additional information or ask any questions you may have. Are you ready to begin?

DSM: Yes, I'm ready.

Manager: Your first goal was to increase sales in your district by 4% over the previous year's sales. **(FROWN)** I see that you met this goal. *While your overall sales numbers were fine because you increased sales of frozen desserts, I was disappointed in how your sales in other areas declined. You should have done better with selling the snack foods.*

DSM: It was a tough year to sell snack foods as the competition is increasing, but I can do a better job next year at that.

Manager (SHAKE HEAD): That's good to hear. Unless you have anything further to add, I'd like to move on to your second goal for the year, which was to get at least 33%

of your customer accounts to carry our newest product, the Yummy Pop! frozen dessert. According to the sales data, 29% of your customers are currently selling this product.

DSM: That sounds about right. I would have done better, but one of my major customer accounts decided that they were no longer going to sell frozen products and removed all of the freezers from their stores.

Manager (LEAN BACK): *I was aware of that, but you can't use that as an excuse for not reaching a goal. Based on your failure in achieving your other goals, (**FROWN**) I doubt you would have achieved this goal even if that customer account had continued to stock frozen products.*

DSM: Well, the customer dropping frozen products was out of my control, but I still tried my best to achieve the goal we set last year. Even though my results for this goal and the third goal were not as high as I had hoped, I am still very proud of the work I did.

Manager (FROWN): Let's talk about that third and final goal. Your goal was to receive favorable satisfaction feedback from at least 95% of your accounts. The results of the survey showed that 78% were satisfied.

DSM: I can explain that. I had several new delivery drivers this year, and it took them a long time to learn their jobs. If you were to ask my customers today, they would likely be more satisfied now than when they were first questioned.

Manager (SHAKE HEAD): *That's true, but it is your responsibility to make sure that your customers still receive quality service even when you have new employees, and district sales managers from throughout the entire company actually had a much higher average customer satisfaction rating than you did.* **(FROWN)** *If you had trained your new employees well, you could have kept your customers satisfied.*

DSM: I appreciate your feedback. Next year I am expecting less turnover, so there should be fewer problems, and the customers should be more satisfied.

Manager: Okay **(SHAKE HEAD)**. Well that is all I wanted to talk about today. **(FROWN)** *Overall I was disappointed with your performance. This year you'll need to do a much better job of reaching your goals.* Do you have any questions for me before you go **(ARMS CROSSED)**?

DSM: No, I don't have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Manager: You're welcome. We'll talk again soon.

Appendix P
Verbal and Nonverbal Feedback Manipulations

Overall			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
N/A	N/A	- Maintain eye contact - Smile - Nod head - Forward lean	- Break eye contact - Frown - Shake head - Backward lean
Opening Remarks			
N/A	N/A	Smile	Frown
Goal 1 Discussion			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
I know it was a tough year for sales of snack foods and beverages, but I was very impressed that you were able to make up for this by increasing sales of frozen desserts. Good job using the new products to boost sales!	While your overall sales numbers were fine because you increased sales of frozen desserts, I was disappointed in how your sales in other areas declined. You should have done better with selling the snack foods.	Smile	Frown
DSM Goal 1 Response			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
N/A	N/A	Nod head	Shake head

Goal 2 Discussion			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
I was aware of that, and it clearly had an impact on your sales numbers. Based on how well you've done in achieving your other goals, I'm confident you would have achieved this goal as well if that customer account had continued to stock frozen products.	I was aware of that, but you can't use that as an excuse for not reaching a goal. Based on your failure in achieving your other goals, I doubt you would have achieved this goal even if that customer account had continued to stock frozen products.	• Forward lean • Smile	• Backward lean • Frown

DSM Goal 3 Response			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
N/A	N/A	• Maintain eye contact • Smile • Nod head • Forward lean	• Break eye contact • Frown • Shake head • Backward lean

Goal 3 Discussion			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
That's true, there are problems when you have new employees who are still learning their jobs, and the other district sales managers in your region did receive similar customer satisfaction ratings. Overall, you did a good job training so many new employees in the past year and still maintaining high levels of satisfaction from most of your customers.	That's true, but it is your responsibility to make sure that your customers still receive quality service even when you have new employees, and district sales managers from throughout the entire company actually had a much higher average customer satisfaction rating than you did. If you had trained your new employees well, you could have kept your customers satisfied.	• Nod head • Smile	• Shake head • Frown

Closing			
Positive Verbal	Negative Verbal	Positive Nonverbal	Negative Nonverbal
Overall I was very happy with your performance. This year keep up the good work and you'll be sure to continue reaching your goals.	Overall I was disappointed with your performance. This year you'll need to do a much better job of reaching your goals.	• Smile • Nod head	• Frown • Shake head • Cross arms

Appendix Q

<u>Visual Only Condition:</u>
Below are several statements designed to measure your reactions to the nonverbal performance appraisal feedback you just saw. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 4 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 7 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree			Neither Agree nor Disagree			Strongly Agree
1. The manager's nonverbal feedback was positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The manager appeared to have a warm demeanor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The manager appeared to be supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<u>Audio Only Condition:</u>
Below are several statements designed to measure your reactions to the verbal performance appraisal feedback you just heard. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 4 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 7 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree			Neither Agree nor Disagree			Strongly Agree
1. The manager's verbal feedback was positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The manager appeared to have a warm demeanor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The manager appeared to be supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix R

<u>Read Only Condition:</u>
Below are several statements designed to measure your reactions to the performance appraisal scenario you just read. Please respond to each statement by circling the number that best reflects your feelings. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement, circling a 4 means you do not agree or disagree with the statement, and circling a 7 means that you strongly agree with the statement.

Question	Strongly Disagree			Neither Agree nor Disagree			Strongly Agree
1. The manager's feedback was positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The manager appeared to have a warm demeanor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The manager appeared to be supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Table 1

Participants' Demographic Information

Country	N	Males	Females	Caucasian	African-American	Asian	Hispanic	Other
				USA Collectivist Sample				
Bosnia	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
China	5	2	3	0	0	5	0	0
Indonesia	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	0
Iran	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Japan	4	2	2	0	0	4	0	0
Nigeria	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pakistan	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Philippines	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Russia	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
South Korea	6	3	2	0	0	6	0	0
Taiwan	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Thailand	6	2	4	0	0	6	0	0
Ukraine	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnam	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
West Africa	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Collectivist Total	34	14	19	2	2	28	0	1

Table 1

Participants' Demographic Information

Country	N	Males	Females	Caucasian	African-American	Asian	Hispanic	Other
				Japan Collectivist Sample				
Japan	20	6	14	0	0	20	0	0
				Individualist Sample				
France	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Germany	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
United States	89	47	42	69	12	1	2	5
Individualist Total	91	47	44	71	12	1	2	5
				Undefined Sample				
Lithuania	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0

Table 2

Correlations between dependent measures

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Reactions to the Performance Appraisal (PA)	(0.75)						
2. PA Subscale: Perceived Utility	.80**	(0.75)					
3. PA Subscale: Satisfaction	.83**	.32**	(0.76)				
4. Reactions to the Manager (MGR)	.63**	.32**	.70**	(0.92)			
5. MGR Subscale: Perceptions of Leadership Ability	.59**	.44**	.51**	.78**	(0.73)		
6. MGR Subscale: Perceived Similarity	.50**	.20*	.60**	.88**	.54**	(0.77)	
7. MGR Subscale: Liking	.55**	.24**	.64**	.93**	.62**	.74**	(0.77)
8. MGR Subscale: Satisfaction	.63**	.31**	.70**	.87**	.66**	.67**	.81**

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent scale alpha. Alpha is not reported for MGR Subscale: Satisfaction as it was a single item measure. N = 145.

*p < .05

**p < .01

Table 3

Overall Descriptive Statistics

Cultural Group	Verbal Feedback Valence	Nonverbal Feedback Valence	N	Mean Reaction to Performance Appraisal (PA)	PA SD	Mean Reaction to Manager (MGR)	MGR SD
Individualist	Positive	Positive	23	3.22	0.62	3.73	0.52
		Negative	25	2.89	0.63	3.42	0.58
		Total	48	3.05	0.64	3.57	0.57
	Negative	Positive	20	2.78	0.82	2.86	0.81
		Negative	23	2.17	0.55	2.06	0.58
		Total	43	2.46	0.75	2.43	0.79
	Total	Positive	43	3.02	0.75	3.32	0.80
		Negative	48	2.55	0.69	2.77	0.89
		Total	91	2.77	0.75	3.03	0.89
USA Collectivists	Positive	Positive	9	3.87	0.45	3.98	0.60
		Negative	5	3.20	0.59	3.53	0.44
		Total	14	3.63	0.60	3.82	0.57
	Negative	Positive	10	3.02	0.70	2.96	0.50
		Negative	9	2.85	0.55	2.51	0.86
		Total	19	2.94	0.62	2.74	0.71
	Total	Positive	19	3.42	0.73	3.44	0.75
		Negative	14	2.98	0.57	2.87	0.88
		Total	33	3.23	0.70	3.20	0.84

Table 3 Continued

Overall Descriptive Statistics

Cultural Group	Verbal Feedback Valence	Nonverbal Feedback Valence	N	Mean Reaction to Performance Appraisal (PA)	PA SD	Mean Reaction to Manager (MGR)	MGR SD
Japan Collectivists	Positive	Positive	5	3.23	0.42	3.36	0.59
		Negative	5	3.00	0.75	2.62	0.76
		Total	10	3.12	0.59	2.99	0.75
	Negative	Positive	5	3.20	0.68	3.71	0.74
		Negative	5	2.57	0.75	2.38	0.86
		Total	10	2.88	0.75	3.04	1.03
	Total	Positive	10	3.22	0.53	3.53	0.66
		Negative	10	2.78	0.75	2.50	0.78
		Total	20	3.00	0.67	3.02	0.88

Table 3 Continued

Overall Descriptive Statistics

Cultural Group	Verbal Feedback Valence	Nonverbal Feedback Valence	N	Mean Reaction to Performance Appraisal (PA)	PA SD	Mean Reaction to Manager (MGR)	MGR SD
Total	Positive	Positive	37	3.38	0.62	3.74	0.56
		Negative	35	2.95	0.63	3.32	0.64
		Total	72	3.17	0.66	3.54	0.63
	Negative	Positive	35	2.91	0.77	3.01	0.76
		Negative	37	2.39	0.63	2.21	0.70
		Total	72	2.64	0.74	2.60	0.83
	Total	Positive	72	3.15	0.73	3.38	0.76
		Negative	72	2.66	0.69	2.75	0.87
		Total	144	2.91	0.75	3.07	0.87

Table 4

ANOVA Results for Reactions to the Performance Appraisal

				Post-hoc
Variable	df	F	ω^2	Power
Cultural Group (C)	2	6.28**	0.05	0.89
Verbal Valence (V)	1	12.94**	0.06	0.95
Nonverbal Valence (NV)	1	11.29**	0.05	0.92
C*V	2	0.65	0.00	0.16
C*NV	2	0.02	0.00	0.05
V*NV	1	0.05	0.00	0.06
C*V*NV	2	1.20	0.00	0.26
Error	132	(0.41)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

**p < .01

Table 5

ANOVA Results for Reactions to the Manager

| | | | | Post-hoc |
Variable	df	F	ω^2	Power
Cultural Group (C)	2	1.47	0.00	0.31
Verbal Valence (V)	1	28.08**	0.10	1.00
Nonverbal Valence (NV)	1	26.60**	0.10	1.00
C*V	2	6.91**	0.04	0.92
C*NV	2	1.43	0.00	0.30
V*NV	1	1.93	0.00	0.28
C*V*NV	2	0.47	0.00	0.13
Error	132	(0.41)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

**$p < .01$

Table 6

Results of Hierarchical Regression: Effects on Reactions to the Performance Appraisal

Step	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	Variables	β	t
1	0.01			Collectivism	0.11	1.33
2	0.30	0.29	14.03**	Verbal Valence (V)	0.37	5.19**
				Nonverbal Valence (NV)	0.30	4.20**
				Cultural Group 1 (C1)	-0.13	-1.30
				Culture Group 2 (C2)	0.13	1.28
3	0.32	0.02	0.59	V x NV	-0.21	-0.64
				V x C1	0.18	0.62
				V x C2	-0.03	-0.13
				NV x C1	-0.04	-0.13
				NV x C2	-0.22	-0.98
				V x NV x C1	0.05	0.15
				V x NV x C2	0.28	1.20

Note: Valence for both verbal feedback and nonverbal feedback was coded as 0 = Negative and 1 = Positive. Cultural Group was coded into two dummy variables. Culture Group 1 was coded as 0 = USA Collectivist, 0 = Japan Collectivist, and 1 = Individualist. Culture Group 2 was coded as 1 = USA Collectivist, 0 = Japan Collectivist, and 0 = Individualist. N = 143.

**$p < .01$

Table 7

Results of Hierarchical Regression: Effects on Reactions to the Manager

Step	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	Variables	β	t
1	0.00			Collectivism	0.06	0.71
2	0.43	0.43	25.96**	Verbal Valence (V)	0.55	8.43**
				Nonverbal Valence (NV)	0.35	5.39**
				Cultural Group 1 (C1)	0.02	0.21
				Cultural Group 2 (C2)	0.11	0.21
3	0.51	0.08	3.06**	V x NV	-0.28	-0.98
				V x C1	0.60	2.49*
				V x C2	0.26	1.48
				NV x C1	-0.31	-1.29
				NV x C2	-0.35	-1.83
				V x NV x C1	0.03	0.13
				V x NV x C2	0.17	0.87

Note: Valence for both verbal feedback and nonverbal feedback was coded as 0 = Negative and 1 = Positive. Cultural Group was coded into two dummy variables. Cultural Group 1 was coded as 0 = USA Collectivist, 0 = Japan Collectivist, and 1 = Individualist. Cultural Group 2 was coded as 1 = USA Collectivist, 0 = Japan Collectivist, and 0 = Individualist. N = 143.

*p < .05

**p < .01

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Interaction between culture and feedback valence in the verbal channel.